



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2020

No. 30

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.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 day.

As Members prepare to return to their home districts, endow them with ears to hear the voices of their constituents, those who voted for them and those who did not. It is the strength of our representative democracy that all have a voice in the governing of the Nation.

Our Nation will soon be remembering Presidents Washington and Lincoln, giants of American history. One presided over a nation united in its inception behind their President, the other over a nation divided soon after his election.

May each of their examples be inspiration to all Americans that faithfulness to the Constitution and all the laws of our land and the hope of our Founders is the responsibility of us all to bring to our political discourse.

Bless us this day and every day. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. WALORSKI 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, President Trump stood in this very Chamber last week promising that he would protect Medicare and Social Security, but like so many things with this administration, that empty promise didn't even last a week. In fact, when he sent his budget proposal to Congress on Monday, it cut more than \$1.6 trillion for Medicare, Medicaid, and other healthcare programs. It cut another \$24 billion from Social Security.

As the top 1 percent of wealthy corporations continue to benefit from the President's tax cut, he is now asking for you, the American people, to pay for it.

He likes to brag that the stock market is up and unemployment is down, but what he refuses to acknowledge is that the economy isn't working for most working folks.

Healthcare costs are rising as his administration sues to eliminate the ACA in its entirety. The cost of living is increasing as he tries to cut funding for affordable housing. And prescription drug prices continue to climb despite our passage of H.R. 3, which is collecting dust on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk.

The President's budget is nothing more than assault on hardworking families just trying to keep a roof over

their heads and put food on their table. The American people deserve better.

House Democrats are going to continue passing legislation that actually gets government working for the people again, and the President and MITCH MCCONNELL should get off the sidelines and join us in this effort.

ABORTED FETAL REMAINS BURIAL

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the 2,411 unborn children whose remains were finally laid to rest with dignity yesterday in South Bend, Indiana.

These victims of Indiana's most prolific abortionist would be in their late teens now, graduating from high school and entering into college, but their innocent lives were cut short, and they were denied a proper burial. Instead, their remains sat for almost 2 years in a garage, a car trunk, in moldy boxes and Styrofoam coolers.

Such callous disregard for human life should shake us to the core. These children deserve justice and dignity.

To ensure this never happens again, the House must pass the Dignity for Aborted Children Act to build on Indiana's law, upheld by the Supreme Court, that requires dignified treatment of aborted fetal remains.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in observing a moment of silence for the thousands of innocent victims who were laid to rest yesterday.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE TO HOLD GUN TRAFFICKERS LIABLE

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

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, 1 year ago Saturday, five people lost their lives and many more were

□ 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.

H1127

injured when a gunman entered an Aurora, Illinois, warehouse and started shooting.

At the vigil for those victims, I made it clear that, if we want to stop people from getting shot, we have to politicize this and we have to take legislative action.

Now, Illinois has some of the strongest gun laws in the country, but our neighbors don't. In Chicago, 60 percent of the guns recovered from crime scenes were trafficked in from out of State. And, worse, we have never had the courage to regulate guns the same way we regulate cars. If my daughter took my car out and crashed into my neighbor's garage, I would be liable. That is common sense.

That is why, yesterday, I introduced the Gun Trafficker Detention Act. This bill requires gun owners to report if their gun is lost or stolen within 48 hours and imposes criminal penalties if they fail to do so and their gun turns up at a crime scene. It would also allow the victims of gun violence to hold traffickers legally liable for death or injury caused by their guns, regardless of who pulled the trigger.

Are there people who won't like this bill? Yes—gun traffickers. Every other American will be safer, and I encourage my colleagues to join me and support this bill.

HELPING TO REFORM OUR BLOATED FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, advancing the cause of our constitutional Republic by adopting policies that restore the confidence of the public in the U.S. Congress is one of the goals I have had since my election last November.

The current lack of confidence is largely due to the dysfunction, partisanship, and distrust that is so prevalent. That is why I am proud to work together with my colleagues who are on the Republican Study Committee government reform task force and who are committed to helping reform our bloating Federal Government in order to expand opportunities for all Americans.

Congress was established through Article I of the U.S. Constitution, and, as such, our Founding Fathers put the utmost responsibility in lawmakers to uphold their inalienable rights and to maintain proper transparency while doing so.

Sadly, today's Congress has strayed far from that through Federal overreach. This makes the task force even more timely and important.

The three main focuses of this task force are reforming government power structures, practices, and personnel policies. Each of these categories has a considerable amount of reform that would be meaningful and effective if enacted.

I am committed to ensuring the beliefs of our Founding Fathers live on today through Congress' actions by reforming government so that it truly serves the people for whom it was created and by whom it is empowered.

PFAS WATER CONTAMINATION

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

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, PFAS water contamination continues to threaten the purity of our drinking water and the health of our communities, including my own.

FAS contaminants exist on more than 400 military bases nationwide and threaten the health and safety of those who live nearby. This public health crisis demands our full attention and requires a national solution.

This 116th Congress has proposed and passed more PFAS legislation than any previous Congress in history, including the PFAS Action Act, which would require the EPA to enforce cleanup of contaminated sites and require a nationwide PFAS drinking water standard.

Still much work remains to be done. We must stand up for stronger regulations, cleaner water, and healthier communities.

Clean drinking water cannot be another issue that the Senate majority continues to ignore and add to their graveyard. We have an obligation to address this national health crisis.

Madam Speaker, I urge the Senate, including my own Senators, to prioritize the well-being of our communities and to act swiftly on the passage of the PFAS Action Act.

BRINGING JUSTICE TO MISSING AND MURDERED NATIVE AMERICAN WOMEN

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

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, in advance of the fifth annual Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women's Memorial March that is taking place in my hometown of Duluth, Minnesota, tomorrow, I rise to bring attention to the violence facing our Native American communities.

Everyone has a right to live safely in their communities, but the murder rate of Native American women is currently 10 times the national average. More than half of Native American women have been sexually assaulted, and thousands of Native American women and girls have gone missing.

This national crisis has been ignored for far too long, and it is time that Congress acts. That is why I cosponsored Savanna's Act, legislation that would better prepare Tribal law enforcement to respond to these crimes. I believe that this should be one of the

easiest bills that we pass this year and call for its quick passage.

Madam Speaker, I will be proud to march with our Native American communities this Friday and honor those we have lost. I believe that, together, we can bring justice to the missing and murdered indigenous Native American women and hold the individuals who commit these acts of violence accountable.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S 2021 BUDGET

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the irresponsible and immoral budget request proposed by President Trump.

The President's shameful betrayal of Americans most in need of vital services comes just days after he stood in this very Chamber and promised he would protect them.

A budget reveals our priorities, and this document makes clear President Trump does not prioritize hardworking Americans and their families. Once again, the President goes out of his way to target Americans' access to healthcare and affordable education.

In the President's upside-down budget, \$500 billion is stripped from Medicare, \$900 billion from Medicaid. Student loan funding is cut by \$170 billion. Public Service Loan Forgiveness would be completely eliminated. More than \$200 billion would be cut from the SNAP program, the safety net for families facing temporary challenges putting food on the table.

Madam Speaker, these cuts are wrong, and the House must not let them go forward. I will continue to work with my colleagues in Congress to protect these critical programs that our seniors, working families, young people, and children depend on.

RECOGNIZING ARIZONA'S BIRTHDAY AND 108TH ANNIVERSARY OF STATEHOOD

(Mrs. LESKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize my home State of Arizona's birthday and our 108th anniversary of statehood.

Since February 14, 1912, the great State of Arizona has welcomed those who wish to experience a life of prosperity, opportunity, growth, and a culture second to none.

Every year people from all the over the world come to Arizona to experience our State's treasured beauty, and, of course, the five C's.

I know I speak for all of us who live in Arizona when I say we are incredibly grateful to call the Grand Canyon State our home. Our State motto means "God Enriches." Arizona is proof of that.

RECOGNIZING TRIBAL LEADERS

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

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tribal leaders from around the country gathered in Washington, D.C., for the National Congress of American Indians' 2020 Winter Executive Session.

NCAI was founded in 1944 with the mission to protect and enhance the sovereign rights of Tribal nations and to secure a prosperous future for Native communities.

In fact, initially, NCAI had to fight against many restrictions and injustices perpetrated by this very body. It is this complicated and challenging history that is the backdrop of the work we do here today.

It is important, then, that the United States Government works to honor Tribal sovereignty, promote self-determination, and fulfill the trust responsibility to Native Tribes.

We must also pass advanced appropriations for the Indian Health Service and provide resources to upgrade the roads, schools, and internet access across Indian Country.

Madam Speaker, I urge the House to take up these issues immediately and do our part to support our Tribal partners.

□ 0915

HONORING JOE BONAMASSA

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Joe Bonamassa. He is one of the most gifted, talented, and accomplished singers, songwriters, and guitarists in modern-day blues music.

Joe works incredibly hard to give back. Joe has founded the Keeping the Blues Alive Foundation. This foundation fuels a passion for music by funding projects and scholarships to allow students and teachers the resources and tools that they need to further music education.

Joe also gives back in other ways. He is an aficionado of guitars and has a vast collection that he uses to extend music history. And he allows people to come and visit his collection of guitars and amplifiers in a place he calls Nerdville, California.

Joe has done an incredible amount for music, for music history, and to advance the cause of music having an impact in an increasing number of people's lives.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and honoring Joe Bonamassa for his contributions to the world of music.

REMOVING DEADLINE FOR RATIFICATION OF EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 844, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WEXTON). Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the joint resolution, is adopted and the joint resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H.J. RES. 79

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any time limit contained in House Joint Resolution 208, 92d Congress, as agreed to in the Senate on March 22, 1972, the article of amendment proposed to the States in that joint resolution shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the United States Constitution whenever ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

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

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.J. Res. 79.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, this is long-overdue legislation to ensure that the equal rights amendment can finally become the 28th amendment to the United States Constitution.

This year, we will celebrate the 100th anniversary of women gaining the right to vote. Despite the century that has elapsed, our Constitution still does not recognize or guarantee full equal protection of the law for women and gender minorities, but H.J. Res. 79 would bring us one step closer.

The resolution removes the previous deadline Congress set for ratifying the ERA and will, therefore, ensure that recent ratifications by Nevada, Illinois, and Virginia are given full effect.

The ERA offers a basic and fundamental guarantee: Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

That is it. Very simple.

In the years since it was passed by overwhelming bipartisan majorities in the House and the Senate, we have made great strides to secure that equality, including through existing case law decided under the 14th Amendment.

The ERA would enshrine those principles and take the final critical step of ensuring that laws disadvantaging women and gender minorities are subject to the most rigorous form of constitutional scrutiny.

In recent years, we have seen a series of breakthroughs for women's rights and gender equality. We have seen millions of women march in support of their rights and dignity as equal citizens. Through the #MeToo movement, we have had long-overdue and sometimes painful conversations about the violence and harassment that women and gender minorities experience, whether in the workplace, at home, or in schools and universities.

We have seen women get elected to Congress in record numbers. And just weeks ago, Virginia became the necessary 38th and the last necessary State to ratify the equal rights amendment. We are on the brink of making history, and no deadline should stand in the way.

The Constitution itself places no deadlines on the process for ratifying constitutional amendments, making it doubtful whether Congress had the authority to impose such a deadline in the first place. But if it had such authority, then Congress clearly also has the authority to remove any deadline that it previously chose to set.

I want to thank Representative JACKIE SPEIER for introducing this resolution, which takes that important step. This resolution will ensure, at long last, the equal rights amendment, having been proposed by Congress years ago, having now been ratified by three-quarters of the States, can take its rightful place as part of our Nation's Constitution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, three-quarters of the States failed to ratify the equal rights amendment by the 1979 deadline set by Congress, yet House Democrats are trying to retroactively revive the failed constitutional amendment.

Congress does not have the power to do that. Congress set the deadline; it was passed; it did not get approved; and now there is an end run to go around that.

The United States Supreme Court recognized this in 1982 when it stated that the issue was moot because the deadline for ERA ratification expired before the requisite number of States approved it.

The next year, the Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives,

acting on the same understanding, started the entire process of ERA approval over again. But that new ERA also failed to achieve the required two-thirds majority in the House on November 15, 1983.

But today, in defiance of historical reality and the clear acceptance of the situation by all relevant participants in the original debate, the Democrats have brought forward a resolution that denies the obvious. Now, the proponents of this resolution want to convince their base that if both Houses of Congress pass this joint resolution, and it is signed into law, the 1972 ERA will become part of the Constitution just because the Democrats control the Virginia State legislature and that legislature passed the ERA this year.

Even current Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg—and she is taking a lot of heat for this—a supporter of ERA since its beginning, has said, just a few months ago:

I hope someday we will start all over again on the ERA, collecting the necessary States to ratify it.

On Monday of this week, Justice Ginsburg said of the ERA:

I would like to see a new beginning. I would like to see it start over. There is too much controversy about latecomers—Virginia, long after the deadline passed. Plus a number of States have withdrawn their ratification. So if you count a latecomer on the plus side, how can you disregard States that said: We have changed our minds.

Congress does not have the constitutional authority to retroactively revive the failed constitutional amendment and to subject the citizens of all 50 States to what may be the current political trends in just one State.

The U.S. Supreme Court has already recognized that. Past Democratic leaderships of the House have recognized that. Justice Ginsburg has recognized that. But apparently, the current Democratic leadership is intent on re-writing history.

As we have our debate today, I will show, and our speakers will show, what the real intent about this is, and it has nothing to do with equal rights. It has a lot to do with other issues that will be exposed today.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), the chief sponsor of this bill.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his extraordinary leadership on this issue.

This is very simple, Members. Women want to be equal, and we want it in the Constitution.

I am equal on this House floor with all of my male colleagues, but when I walk out, I have fewer rights and protections than them.

I rise today because the women of America are done being second-class citizens. We are done being paid less for our work, done being violated with impunity, done being discriminated

against for our pregnancies, done being discriminated against simply because we are women.

The ERA is about equality. The ERA is about sisterhood, motherhood, survival, dignity, and respect.

The world recognizes this. Of the 193 countries in the United Nations, 165 have put this kind of language in their constitutions, but not the United States of America.

From the Women's March to the #MeToo movement to the pink wave, the outrage we have seen among women is because we have been disrespected, devalued, and diminished in our society. And we are fed up.

It is no wonder recent votes to ratify the ERA came in 2017, 2018, and 2020, because we want the ERA now. We have waited for almost a century for the ERA.

I want to thank my Republican cosponsors of this resolution, including Congressmen Reed, Fitzpatrick, and Van Drew.

I know most of you recognize that this is the right thing to do for your wives, daughters, and granddaughters. Ninety-four percent of Americans already support the ERA. In fact, they are surprised it is not already in the Constitution.

Now, some of you will say just restart the process, but you are the same people who admit you won't vote for it. Some will say, "Well, women already have equality," while they vote against VAWA reauthorization, vote against paycheck fairness, chip away at title IX.

For too long, women have relied on the patchwork quilt of laws and precedents. We have put our lives on the line. We have been forced to take our cases all the way to the Supreme Court, and often, there, we lose.

For my colleagues who think we already have women's equality, talk to Christy Brzonkala, who was raped by two football players at Virginia Tech. She sought justice under the Violence Against Women Act, but the Supreme Court struck down the civil suit provisions, claiming Congress lacked the authority to pass it.

Talk to Lilly Ledbetter, who had to rely on an anonymous note to learn she was paid less than her male colleagues at Goodyear.

Talk to Betty Duke, who was passed over for promotions and paid \$10,000 less for her work at Walmart.

Talk to Peggy Young, who was placed on unpaid leave, losing her health insurance, while pregnant, at UPS, all the while men were granted the exact same accommodation that she was denied.

The ERA is about building the America we want. It is about forming a more perfect Union because, simply put, there can be no expiration date on equality.

I urge my colleagues to affirm their support for women's equality and vote for this resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I am a woman, so I obviously care and support equal rights for women. But I oppose this bill for three reasons.

First, the bill is not constitutional. When the ERA originally passed Congress, it explicitly set a deadline for ratification. The deadline was in 1979, almost 41 years ago. Only 35 States of the 38 needed had ratified it. Then five States unratified it. So the count is down to 30. Thus, the equal rights amendment was dead.

The U.S. Department of Justice issued a legal opinion just last month, reiterating that the ERA's ratification timeline is expired.

Supreme Court Justice Ruth Ginsburg said:

The deadline passed. I would like to see a new beginning. I would like it to start over.

Secondly, the ERA is not necessary. Women's equality of rights under the law is already recognized in our Constitution in the Fifth and 14th Amendments. The ACLU's women's rights director wrote: "It has been clearly understood that the 14th Amendment prohibits discrimination based on sex." Plus, many Federal, State, and local laws already prohibit sex discrimination.

The third reason I oppose this bill: If ratified, the ERA would be used by pro-abortion groups to undo pro-life legislation and lead to more abortions and taxpayer funding of abortions.

But don't take my word for it. Let's look at what pro-abortion groups have done and what they say.

In 1998, the New Mexico Supreme Court ruled unanimously that the State's ERA required the State to fund abortions. NARAL Pro-Choice America, which supports abortions, asserted that the ERA would reinforce the constitutional right to abortion and would require judges to strike down anti-abortion laws.

In a 2019 letter to the House Judiciary Committee, the ACLU stated: The equal rights amendment could provide an additional layer of protection against restrictions on abortion.

In conclusion, this bill is unconstitutional. The ERA is unnecessary, since constitutional Federal, State, and local laws already guarantee equal protections. And the ERA, if ratified, would be used by pro-abortion groups to undo pro-life laws.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, again, the deadline was not part of the amendment. It was a resolution by Congress. And if Congress can set a deadline, it can remove a deadline.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader of the House.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 0930

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank Representative SPEIER, Representative MALONEY, and all of those who have been such warriors on this issue for such a long period of time. They are keeping the faith.

This constitutional amendment was passed in 1972, to be specific, in the early part of 1972. I was a member of the Maryland State Senate in 1972, and I had the honor in the late spring of 1972, just months after the ERA had been passed, of voting to ratify that.

Now, the previous speaker said in only 35 States. That is 70 percent of the States ratified that in a timely fashion. Timely in the sense that we set in a resolution, as the chairman pointed out, a date. Seventy percent of the States of this Nation.

Now, it needed three more States. It has now received three more States. I have been an advocate for the equal rights amendment for essentially 4 decades, actually longer. I will be proud to vote for it today.

Just a few months, as I said, after Congress adopted the ERA, Maryland voted for ratification. I thought that it was long overdue even then in 1972. Here we are some 48 years later, and it still is.

Our Founders declared “all men are created equal” in their Declaration of Independence. Surely, no Founder, if they were writing that document today, would have said “men” meant white, property-owning men. Surely, they would not have written that. Surely, none of us would have supported that.

Since the very beginning Americans have been taking steps, therefore, to define that in a more expansive, inclusive term representing our universal values. We amended the Constitution to ensure African Americans and women could not be denied the right to vote. It took a long time. Particularly, I hope the women in this body will think of the suffragettes who were extraordinarily active and involved in our community and making decisions in our families and in our communities and country but who could not vote prior to 1919.

From 1789 to 1919 women could not vote. I am the father of three daughters, the grandfather of two granddaughters, and the great-grandfather of three great-granddaughters. For me to go home to them tonight and say I voted against your being equal in America. Now, my wife passed away, but if I went home to her tonight and said I voted against your being equal in America or those grandchildren and great-grandchildren who happen to have been born as women and say to them I voted against your being equal in America today.

We passed the Civil Rights Act to make clear that all must be treated equal regardless of race. We passed the ADA, which I cosponsored 30 years ago to ban discrimination against those with disabilities. But still nowhere in our Constitution does it state clearly that women must be treated equally

and that one must not be subject to discrimination because of their gender.

The ERA would enshrine that basic tenant of our democracy in our Constitution at long last. Seventy percent of the States and then three more said that ought to be in our Constitution. Three-quarters of the States have voted to ratify this amendment.

Discrimination against women has through our history kept bright and talented Americans from achieving their full potential in our economy. Because of their hard work, the sacrifices, the leadership, and the perseverance of trailblazing women, we have seen barriers come down, doors of opportunity open, and glass ceilings shatter.

Discrimination, inequality, and injustice persist, and we will hear arguments on this floor rationalizing why discrimination ought to still exist. And as long as our Constitution does not explicitly ban discrimination based upon gender as it does based on race, we will continue to see forms of legal discrimination against women linger in our country.

Taking this step to add the equal rights amendment to the Constitution is one of the many that House Democrats are taking to combat discrimination against women simply because they are women.

Last year, we passed the Paycheck Fairness Act. Not everybody voted for that, but, in my opinion, everybody voted for that who thought equal pay should mean equal pay, irrespective of gender and based upon work performed. That built on the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 to ensure equal pay for equal work.

We also passed the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. Most of us on our side voted for that, but there was a rationalization why some thought, no, we will not protect women against violence.

We have continued working to protect women's rights to make their own healthcare choices and to access quality affordable care.

Who said that was part of the Constitution?

The Supreme Court of the United States. They said that was a constitutional right and we see effort after effort to erode that constitutional right.

I am proud that the Democratic Caucus in the 116th Congress is not only the most diverse in American history, but also includes the greatest number of women.

In Virginia, it was an election that saw the house of delegates reach 30 percent women and the State senate reach 28 percent. Once it got there, the women of Virginia stood up and said this ought to be in the Constitution of the United States, and they voted to do so. Virginia now has a woman speaker of the house, as we do in our U.S. House, and as my home State of Maryland has in our house of delegates. It is because more women are stepping up to run for office and winning elections that more women's voices are being heard in our democracy.

That is why this resolution is on the floor. That is a wonderful thing, and I have been proud to help recruit talented women to run for the House as Democrats. And very frankly, we need more women as Republicans, a diminishing group, I might add.

I urge my colleagues, men and women, Democrats and Republicans, to join in supporting this resolution.

And, finally, is it too late?

It is too late. But it is never too late to do the right thing.

Make this part of our Constitution. Stand up and say, yes, women should be included as all humankind who are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights. That is the principle that we are articulating today.

Alice Paul, who first wrote the ERA and campaigned for it for most of her life was once asked why she kept all her focus on getting the job done, and she said this, “When you put your hand to the plow, you can't put it down until you get to the end of the row.” We are not at the end of the row, but this is a way upon that row to make it complete to make our Constitution protect all people, male or female, Black or white, all people.

At long last, let's hold firm to that plow. Let's get the job done. Vote “yes” on this resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today to commend the women who have gone before us to celebrate the achievements that women have made and to reaffirm the fact that we are equal in the eyes of God and in law.

Women make up 51 percent of the population, comprise over half of the college students, make up most of today's medical and law school students and own the majority of new businesses.

Women are not victims in need of validation. Little girls can be whatever they want to be, whether that be an astronaut, a doctor, a full-time mom working at home, or a member of Congress.

In addition, Federal law and court precedent uphold our rights. That is something to applaud, and I do. However, today's legislation is problematic on several fronts.

First, the resolution is unconstitutional. The time limit to pass the ERA expired decades ago. Congress can't go back and remove a deadline from a previous constitutional amendment initiative. The Supreme Court has recognized that the 1972 ERA expired, and the Department of Justice issued a ruling saying Congress may not revive a proposed amendment after a deadline for its ratification has expired. Pretending that we can remove the time limits for passage is both futile and deceptive.

Secondly, if the time limit could be extended, the ERA would not bring

women any more rights than they currently have right now, but it would entrench the legality of abortion. We know this from court precedent by listening to those who have the most to gain from constitutionally protecting abortion on demand.

In 1998, the New Mexico Supreme Court ruled that the equal rights amendment in their State constitution requires State funding of abortions. Federal courts are likely to do the same. Perhaps that is why every pro-abortion organization is endorsing passage of the ERA.

NARAL Pro-Choice America says, "With its ratification, the ERA would reinforce the constitutional right to abortion."

The National Organization for Women says, "An ERA—properly interpreted—could negate the hundreds of laws that have passed restricting access to abortion. . . ."

But that is not the only concern with passing this resolution. Besides being unconstitutional and shredding State and Federal pro-life protections, the ERA would also erase decades of progress which have provided opportunities for women, advance women's progress through Federal programs, and secure necessary protections for women and girls.

How? By incorporating gender identity in the definition of sex, jeopardizing private spaces for women, girls' sports programs, and women's educational institutions.

The ERA endangers laws, programs, and funding designed to benefit women providing a pathway for legal challenges to welfare programs, grants for battered women's shelters, efforts to bolster women participating in STEM programs, as well as State laws governing child support, alimony, and custody. These outcomes are anything but pro women.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 79, which takes a key step to ensure that the equal rights amendment will become part of our Constitution.

Nearly 100 years after women gained the right to vote, it is difficult to believe we still haven't given women equal rights. It is hard to believe it is a serious disagreement in this Chamber.

In the year 2020, it is unacceptable that women still make only 80 cents for every dollar earned by men and that women are still subject to violence, harassment and attacks on their freedom to control their own bodies.

In Judiciary Committee this morning, a brilliant female law clerk is describing sexual harassment by a distinguished and respected ninth circuit judge. This should never happen. And with ongoing efforts to undermine

progress we have made; the equal rights amendment is more important than ever.

It took over 130 years to give women the right to vote. It is almost 100 years since they have gotten it. It is time to give women their proper place in the Constitution of the United States, which most modern constitutions have, equality regardless of sex.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 79.

Of course, I believe in equal rights. Women should never face discrimination and harassment. I believe we should be empowering women and girls to achieve their dreams.

So it is disappointing today to stand in this Chamber and see this important issue turned into some type of political stunt. The deadline for States to ratify the ERA passed nearly 4 decades ago. Even Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg has stated the only path forward is to start over.

Let's be honest, this is not about equality or women's rights. This is about enshrining unrestricted abortion in the Constitution and allowing full taxpayer funding for abortion. Now is not the time to be weakening pro-life protections.

Yesterday, in South Bend, Indiana, in my district, the remains of 2,411 victims of abortion were finally given a dignified burial after spending 20 years in moldy Styrofoam boxes in the back of the doctor/abortionist's car and in his basement.

□ 0945

These unborn boys and girls would be young men and women today entering college.

Moments ago, we stood on this House floor together and we offered a moment of silence that these innocent lives were taken and there were victims, over 2,400.

Madam Speaker, I would ask that, together, we stand again to defend the rights of the most vulnerable among us, that we stand together today for the sanctity of life, to lift women up, to protect women, and to strengthen families.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this misguided resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, with Virginia becoming the 38th State to ratify the equal rights amendment, today we make it clear that Congress never intended the arbitrary deadline to act as a barrier to ratification of this vital amendment.

Ratification of the equal rights amendment affirms our Nation's values by codifying an expressed prohibition

against sex discrimination in our Nation's foundational document.

While our Nation's courts have properly recognized that women are entitled to equal protection under the law, we have a responsibility to do all that we can to guarantee that, regardless of sex, all Americans are treated the same in every aspect of their lives, including making a living, obtaining healthcare, and accessing public services.

These rights must not be swayed by political ideology or depend on judicial philosophy. Equality is a founding value of this great country and, more than any other word, describes the very idea of America.

Madam Speaker, a vote for H.J. Res. 79 is a vote for equality. I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 79.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Listening to people on the other side say that there is a cornucopia of benefits awaiting women should the ERA become a part of the Constitution, I am here to ask Members on both sides of the aisle to look past what looks nice on a bumper sticker or a 40-second sound bite to realize that there are going to be many consequences that will hurt women should this be ratified. I will just talk about insurance, because insurance is regulated by the States.

Girls get substantially lower rates on auto insurance because they are better drivers. With the ERA and the State regulation, that would become unconstitutional, and girls are going to have to pay boy drivers' rates for auto insurance, which really does not reflect the actuarial exposure of that at all.

Secondly, look at life insurance. Women live longer than men and, as a result, in life insurance, also regulated by the States, you see women's rates being lower than men's rates becoming unconstitutional, and women are going to be paying more to life insurance companies for the coverage that they decide on.

I could go on and on and on. We had a lot of hearings on this in 1973.

I am here to say that, when the ERA was originally passed in 1972, women's rights were not enshrined in a lot of State laws. There has been tremendous progress in this area both at the Federal level and in the States. The proponents of this resolution completely ignore that happening. We don't.

We think that the statutory protections that have been passed all around the country in the last almost 50 years have advanced women and have addressed a lot of the complaints that we hear from that side of the aisle.

This is going to unleash a Pandora's box of lots of litigation that has been raised by this, some of which has been brought up by my colleagues on this side.

Let's not enrich the lawyers. Let's do the right thing. Don't pass this resolution. Enforce the laws that have been passed both here and in the State capitols.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank all of the women of America. I thank the sponsor of this bill. I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the ranking member for being on the floor. I thank him.

I ask the question: Does anybody see the sense of women not being in the most powerful document of laws and power of the American people?

Let us be reminded of the words of Abigail Adams: "I long to hear that you have declared an independency. And, by the way, in the new code of laws"—which she is saying to her husband—"which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make, I desire you would remember the ladies and be more generous and favorable to them than your ancestors. Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of the husbands."

I rise enthusiastically to support H.J. Res. 79 and to say to my colleagues there is no constitutional prohibition for passing this.

We are grandly involved because this is the 1972 passage by the State of Texas of the equal rights amendment. And here, in 1977, Betty Friedan and Bella Abzug were in Houston at the 1977 National Women's Conference that our predecessor, Barbara Jordan, was at.

Let us pass H.J. Res. 79, because, as Abigail Adams said, let's remember the ladies.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary and an original cosponsor, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.J. Res. 79, which eliminates the ratification deadline for the Equal Rights Amendment and will lead to the long overdue adding of the ERA as the 28th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I am reminded of the imperative powerfully expressed on March 31, 1776 in Braintree, Massachusetts in a letter from Abigail Adams, the future First Lady, to her husband John Adams:

I long to hear that you have declared an independency—and by the way in the new Code of Laws which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make I desire you would Remember the Ladies, and be more generous and favourable to them than your ancestors. Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of the Husbands.

The resolution before us will help enshrine for all time the belief, promise, and commitment that all men, and women, are created equal and endowed with by the Creator with the same inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We are making real this promise thanks to the bipartisan resolution introduced by Congresswoman Spiers of California.

The Constitution does not prohibit the action we are taking; in fact, it permits it since ratifi-

cation deadlines are not even mentioned, much less imposed by the Constitution. This resolution reinforces that, the previous deadline is no bar to passing the ERA.

Under Article V of the Constitution, the Equal Rights Amendment "shall be valid to all intents and purposes whenever ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states."

A resolution identical to H.J. Res. 79 has been introduced in the United States Senate, which I call upon the Senate to take up and pass forthwith.

Madam Speaker, it is useful to review how we arrived at this moment in history.

Beginning in the late 1960s, the National Organization for Women (NOW) devised and began implementing a strategy of pushing for equal rights through a combination of impact litigation and advocacy for the Equal Rights Amendment.

I remember this particularly well because in November 1977, the first National Women's Conference was held in Houston, Texas and attended my congressional predecessor, the Honorable Barbara Jordan.

The National Women's Conference was inspired by a 1975 United Nations-sponsored event from two years prior which led President Gerald Ford to establish a national commission to investigate women's issues.

Congress later voted to provide \$5 million to fund the organization of regional conferences and to hold a national gathering at the conclusion, the result of these efforts was the National Women's Conference meant to unite all women and give them an opportunity to voice their hopes for the future of the government.

I remember that Phyllis Schlafly of the conservative Eagle Forum organized and came to Houston to lead backlash demonstration protesting the ERA and the women's movement, claiming that the ERA would force women to give up their right to be supported by their husbands, and subject them to the military draft and deployment to Vietnam.

That was the launch of the conservative counter-offensive to derail ratification of the ERA and the beginning of the schism that has seen equality between the sexes and expanding the economic, privacy, and political rights of women subject to increasing partisan debate and action that is continues to the present day.

In 1970, Congresswoman Martha Griffiths of Michigan filed a discharge petition in the House to bring the ERA to the floor, after the Judiciary Committee consistently refused to act on it.

The discharge petition was adopted, and the ERA passed the House by a wide margin.

The Senate Judiciary Committee also held several days of hearings in 1970 on its version of the ERA but it failed to gain enough votes that year.

On October 12, 1971, the House voted by 354–24 to approve a version of the ERA that stated:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each house concurring therein), that the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years of its submission by the Congress:

Section 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex.

Section 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

Section 3. This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification.

On March 22, 1972, the Senate passed the ERA by a vote of 84–8.

The following month, Madam Speaker, I graduated from college in the first undergraduate class of women to attend Yale University in September 1969.

I was a member of the group of 250 upper-class women who transferred to Yale University, a number that eventually led to 1,500 women being admitted over the years, in addition to the 4,000 male students.

Between September 12–14, 1969 undergraduate women students arrived on campus and at that time, 48 of 817 FAS faculty were women and only two had tenure.

I am proud to be a part of the history of Yale University and had the opportunity to speak about my experience at the 50th Anniversary last year.

The presence of women at Yale, which had been an all-male institution was a sign of the change that was sweeping the nation.

I first arrived at Yale with the anticipation and anxiety of any college student arriving on campus for the first time.

This was an extraordinary milestone—both for Yale and for us young women.

But being a "first" is not all that people may assume that it is.

In the centennial year of the 19th Amendment, on January 15, 2020, the Virginia General Assembly became the 38th state to vote to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment, the magic number needed to become enshrined in the Constitution.

Because of the ERA, women are finally included in our Constitution, making them equal to men under law.

A vote to eliminate the ratification deadline for the ERA is a vote for equality; a vote against the measure is a vote to preserve the legacy of sex discrimination.

Women will not continue to be second-class citizens in their own country.

The absence of the ERA has meant that women can be paid less for their work, violated with impunity, and discriminated against simply for being women.

Women made up more than 6 in 10 seniors who lived in poverty last year, with the poverty rate for senior women at 11 percent.

The average Social Security benefit for women 65 and older is about \$14,270 per year, compared to about \$18,375 for men 65 and older.

In the 116th Congress, women hold just 23.6 percent of seats in the U.S. Congress.

In 2019, just 33 Fortune 500 CEOs are women, a new record.

While women-owned businesses account for 42 percent of all firms, women-owned business account for just 8 percent of the total private sector workforce and 4.3 percent of total revenue.

Some legal scholars note the location of the deadline in the preamble is important, because the ERA's deadline was not part of the text that the states voted on when they ratified the amendment.

Other scholars argue that the deadline itself is unconstitutional because Article V of the

Constitution does not include mention of deadlines.

A close reading and clear understanding of the Constitution leads inescapably to the conclusion that when the Framers considered a time period to be of the essence, they specified the time period clearly in the document itself.

Moreover, in *Coleman v. Miller*, 307 U.S. 433 (1939), the Supreme Court rejected the idea that Article V contains an implied limitation period for ratifications.

Madam Speaker, as a country founded on principles of liberty, justice and equality, and a global leader in formulating international human rights standards, the United States need to pass the ERA to meet basic standards for women who are denied equal access to legal rights and protections.

Too many women in the United States inexplicably lag behind international human rights standards and it is a myth that women in the United States already enjoy all of the expected standards of rights and protections afforded under America.

The reality is, women in the United States experience continued discrimination and daunting disparities that prevent them from fully participating as equal members of society.

For example, women have risen to some of the highest levels of legislative and executive representation over the years, yet with 20% of Congressional Members and an average of 24.9% of state legislatures, but the United States ranks #72 in the global market of women represented in public and political positions.

While the number of women justices has significantly increased, women litigants' access to justice is severely limited.

Although women vote in higher percentages than men, women's access to voting is under attack in many states where increased voter ID requirements and voter purges pose unprecedented barriers.

Although women constitute nearly half of the US labor force, at a participation rate of 57%, equal economic opportunity is severely lacking given deficient or nonexistent mandatory standards for workplace accommodations for pregnant women, post-natal mothers and persons with care responsibilities.

What also remains a shameful truth in America, is the gender wage gap which has remained at or near 21% over the past decade.

And women with higher levels of education experience the largest earning gaps, as do minority women regardless of educational attainment.

The percentage of women in poverty has increased over the past decade, from 12.1% to 14.5%, with a higher rate of poverty than men and women are exposed to higher rates of homelessness and violence without adequate protections in place in shelters and housing support options.

Women in detention facilities throughout the country also experience increasingly high rates of over-incarceration, sexual violence, shackling while pregnant, solitary confinement, lack of alternative custodial sentencing for women with dependent children, and insufficient access to health care and re-entry programs.

Migrant women traveling to the U.S., many victims of trafficking and violence, including

sexual violence, are kept in detention centers with children for prolonged periods of time.

The U.N. has reported that women, particularly black and LBTQ women, in the U.S. experience police brutality and increased incidents of homicide by police.

Even though women own over one-third of commercial businesses in the United States, primarily in small and medium sized businesses, these businesses face greater barriers in obtaining low cost capital from sources such as the SBA—which awards less than 5% of federal contracts to women-owned business.

Finally, one of the most alarming deficiencies for women in America is the inability to access basic health care and the imposition of devastating barriers to reproductive health and rights.

Too many women are suffering dire and deadly consequences.

Between 1990 and 2013, the maternal mortality rate for women in the U.S. has increased by 136%.

Black women are nearly 4 times more likely to die in childbirth, and states with high poverty rates have a 77% higher maternal mortality rate.

The United States deserves to much better.

It is unacceptable that women in America are facing a health care crisis so dire that the global community is denouncing it as a human rights violation.

Sadly, the direction States are taking will only further dismantle women's access to affordable and trustworthy reproductive healthcare.

While clinics are shutting down at drastic rates throughout the country, devastating restrictions and barriers imposed throughout Texas strike at the core of this abomination.

A Texas statute known as HB2 (House Bill 2), was enacted several years ago under false claims to promote women's health, when in fact it only set in motion dangerous restrictions on women's access to reproductive health care.

In addition to constant attacks on funding for reproductive health care clinics, abortion providers in Texas were forced to undergo impossible million-dollar renovations and upgrades.

Denying hundreds of thousands of women health care services in Texas, nearly half of all reproductive health care clinics were forced to shut down, and now only 10 remain in the second largest state in the country.

No woman in America should be denied the dignity of being able to make choices about her body and healthcare.

Access to safe, legal and unhindered healthcare must be realized by all women.

These simple facts can no longer be denied, and hypocrisy can no longer be tolerated.

A woman's personal autonomy over her own body and her right to choose whether to bear or beget a child is a constitutionally protected fundamental right.

More than 40 years ago in the landmark decision in *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113, (1973), the U.S. Supreme Court ruled 7–2 that the right to privacy under the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment extends to a woman's decision to have an abortion.

We cannot ignore the obvious hypocrisy of imbalanced protection and access to fundamentally protected rights for women in America when it is easier to purchase and lawfully possess a firearm—even for a person on the terrorist watchlist—than it is for a

woman to exercise her constitutional right to terminate a pregnancy.

Madam Speaker, this is not fair, and it is not right.

And with the ERA added to the Constitution, it will also not be lawful.

Madam Speaker, Congress had the authority to extend the deadline and it chose to do in 1979; a fortiori, it has the power to eliminate the deadline today.

And that is the right, just, and moral thing to do.

I urge all Members to stand on the right side of history and join me in voting to pass H.J. Res. 79 so that the Equal Rights Amendment can take its rightful place as the 28th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, we have heard my Democratic colleagues say that passing the equal rights amendment is necessary to secure basic rights under the law for women. Not only is this untrue, it obscures a fundamental fact. This ERA actually denies the most basic human right: the right to life. This ERA uses gender equality as a smokescreen to create an unlimited constitutional right to abortion.

Instead of working to craft legislation that protects women's rights without trampling on the right to life, Democrats have put forward, today, an unconstitutional, partisan measure.

Not only would this result in on-demand abortions across all 50 States, but it would also clear the way to provide taxpayer-funded abortions throughout all 9 months of pregnancy, costing millions of dollars every year.

This measure is not about advancing women's rights, especially as women across the country, Republicans and Democrats alike, are increasingly horrified by the practice of late-term abortion and by recent comments made in New York and Virginia that lifesaving treatment should be denied to some newborns.

Allowing women to discard their unborn children at taxpayer expense is not ensuring gender equality. It is not protecting women. It is not empowering women. It is not providing women equal pay for equal work. It is simply another step down the path of devaluing all human life and dignity.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this measure.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA).

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for yielding.

In Texas, many years ago, I marched in support of the equal rights amendment. Today, I join my colleagues to reaffirm that support.

Women are behind some of this Nation's greatest achievements. We fought for civil rights, set athletic records, sent men to space, and then went there ourselves. We have forged

our paths in history, yet we are still not equal to men under the eyes of the law.

We must remove this stain from our Constitution. Today, we are voting to remove an arbitrary deadline so we can finally prohibit gender discrimination under the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I will proudly vote in favor of the resolution, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

As many in my district would say, "It is time to approve the ERA." "Ya es hora de aprobar el ERA."

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.J. Res. 79.

It pains me to say that life is under attack in our Nation. The pro-abortion discussions taking place around this country are sickening. In the last year, we heard a Governor promote infanticide, and we saw State legislatures take action for the same.

We still haven't had a vote on this floor in the United States House of Representatives to protect babies who survive abortion. Yesterday, in committee, I even introduced legislation that would protect babies who survive abortion. It failed along party lines once again.

We have millions of American families who would love to adopt, yet we don't discuss that. I know women who have cried every month when they realized that they had not conceived the baby they so desperately wanted. I know men and women who have undergone multiple tests and procedures just to conceive a child. They would gladly adopt a baby that someone else didn't want.

Instead, today, we are voting once more on another piece of legislation that would drastically reduce protections for life. This bill would create the basis for taxpayer-funded abortion at the Federal level, and it would permanently allow abortion until birth for any reason throughout the Nation. It would force government-funded healthcare providers and hospitals to provide abortions.

We cannot have that. We cannot bring abortion into a healthcare debate because it is not healthcare. Abortion is murder.

If we want to discuss protecting rights for all Americans, it needs to pertain to everyone, including and, especially, newborns.

While I always welcome a conversation with my colleagues about how we can advance women's rights and the rights of all people, this is not the way to do it. It is not through thinly veiled messaging bills with nice names but radical policies.

We can pass good pro-woman, pro-family, pro-American legislation through bipartisan solutions.

So if we are going to do it, let's do it; but today, sadly, we won't, and that is so disappointing.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership.

I rise today in strong support of the equal rights amendment and the resolution before us.

Today, this body comes together unabashed in our conviction for a future that expands the vision set forth by our Founders. Together, we strive for a nation that advances the notion of equality, that takes up the mantle of the unfinished work that is the American Dream and the practice of government by and for the people—for all the people.

My daughter, Natalie, is just over a year-and-a-half old, and I look forward to telling her one day about today, how the people's House, led by the Chamber's first female Speaker, voted to ensure that the women of her generation will be the first to grow up knowing that the Constitution truly guarantees equal rights.

It feels fitting to close by quoting Shirley Chisolm, the first Black female Member elected to this body and the youngest, until my good friend LAUREN UNDERWOOD took office last year, who said, when Congress sent the ERA to the States for ratification: "The time is clearly now to put this House on record for the fullest expression of that equality of opportunity which our Founding Fathers professed. . . . It is not too late to complete the work they left undone."

I support the resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 79.

As a woman who has worked all her life, often in male-dominated professions, I detest discrimination in any form against any group, and I have always done all that I can to eliminate it. Furthermore, I welcome any discussion on how to root out discrimination against women where it exists.

But do not be deceived. This is not what this legislation is about.

The 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution already provides women and all Americans equal protection under the law, but the goal of this legislation is different. The goal here is to expand access to abortion up to birth and to overturn the broadly supported policies that protect taxpayers from being forced to pay for abortions.

□ 1000

As we know all too well, *Roe v. Wade* has broadly legalized abortion in the United States, but the equal rights amendment that this resolution tries to ratify goes much further.

There is a broad consensus that the ERA could be used to overturn pro-life

laws, legalize abortion up to birth, and mandate taxpayer-funded abortions.

The expansion of abortion is not the only harmful impact of the ERA. It would have a harmful impact on shelters that protect women from violence, eliminate women-specific workplace protections, and destroy women's sports.

Furthermore, were this resolution ever to become law, the Supreme Court would undoubtedly rule that it does not ratify the equal rights amendment.

As everyone in this room knows, when Congress initially passed the equal rights amendment, it intentionally included a 7-year deadline for the required 38 States to ratify, a deadline which has long since passed. Multiple States have also rescinded their ratification.

As such, Supreme Court precedent requires that any attempt to ratify the ERA must start at the beginning. Even Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg was recently quoted saying she would like the process to start over.

To be perfectly clear, with this resolution, the Democrats are attempting to write into the Constitution the right to an abortion at all three trimesters, force taxpayers to pay for them, and eliminate all conscience protections for medical providers who wish to abstain from abortion.

This resolution is not about protecting women. It is a partisan messaging bill designed to appease radical pro-abortion groups. If the majority were serious about the equal rights amendment, it would start the process anew and give all States the option to consider the ERA again.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I would remind everyone that the equal rights amendment simply says: Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied on account of sex.

If people on the other side want to admit that equality of rights under the law means there must be a constitutional right to abortion, well, that is wonderful. Of course, the constitutional right to abortion is already established under current law.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, what a glorious day this is.

Today, the House of Representatives will vote to remove the arbitrary deadline to ratify the equal rights amendment. With our vote today, and with Virginia's historic vote to become the 38th and final State necessary to ratify the amendment, little girls, their moms, and women across this great Nation will know that, yes, our Constitution can, will, and must enshrine a ban on discrimination on the basis of sex.

Equality of sexes is not debatable. It has no expiration date.

First proposed almost a century ago and passed by Congress in 1972, the equal rights amendment would be a momentous step forward for women to

end unequal pay, pregnancy discrimination, and sexual harassment and exploitation.

So today, to women across this country who are watching, as the first South Asian woman ever elected to the House of Representatives, let me say: We see you. We stand with you. And we will fight for you.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, women have been fighting tooth and nail for decades to be recognized as equal under the eyes of the law. While we made significant gains, it is time for a full constitutional equality.

In 1866, Frances Ellen Watkins Harper, a free-born Black woman, addressed the National Women's Rights Convention in New York City, and she said: "Justice is not fulfilled so long as woman is unequal before the law. We are all bound up together in one great bundle of humanity. . . . Society cannot afford to neglect the enlightenment of any class of its members."

These words still hold true today for our mothers, for our daughters, and for our future leaders. We must take up the mantle of the women who came before us and pass this amendment for a more just future.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I am so pleased that the gentlewoman from Virginia is in the Chair and grateful to her for her leadership and our other colleagues, ELAINE LURIA and ABIGAIL SPANBERGER, as new Members of Congress who give us the opportunity as the majority to bring this important legislation to the floor. I thank them for Virginia's leadership in all of this. It is so appropriate that the Congresswoman is in the Chair for this because she was a leader in the State legislature on the equal rights amendment when she served there.

This is a historic day, a happy day, as the House takes action to move our Nation closer to our founding ideal that all are created equal. I salute Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER for her leadership on this resolution and for her lifetime of work to advance equality in America.

The gentlewoman quoted the late Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, and I think it bears repetition. Justice Scalia said: "Certainly the Constitution does not require discrimination on the basis of sex. The only issue is whether it prohibits it. It doesn't."

It does not prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex. The lack of an ERA

has allowed the Supreme Court Justice to have this interpretation.

Here it is, we say it over and over again: Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." How can you have a problem with that?

Let me also salute Chairwoman CAROLYN MALONEY, our longtime lead sponsor of the equal rights amendment in the House, for her great leadership, and Chairman NADLER, the members of the Judiciary Committee, and all the Members who came to Congress committed to finishing this fight for the equal rights amendment.

I also want to acknowledge that yesterday, at our press presentation on this, in the audience was a Republican from Illinois who was responsible for Illinois passing the equal rights amendment, Steven Andersson. He was with us at the Capitol. We commend him for being a leader on the ERA, passing it through the Illinois statehouse.

What an honor and how clear that this is not partisan, perhaps only in the House of Representatives, but not in the rest of the country.

Let us acknowledge the millions of women in Nevada, Illinois, Virginia, and across America who have raised a drumbeat for ratification and reignited a nationwide movement for equality.

Nearly 100 years ago, Alice Paul, a Republican, introduced the equal rights amendment, the first proposed amendment to the Constitution calling for women's equality in America.

Fifty years ago, soon after becoming the first African American woman to serve in the Congress, Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm stood on this House floor to urge passage of the ERA, calling it "one of the most clear-cut opportunities we are likely to have to declare our faith in the principles that shaped our Constitution."

But today, in this year that marks the centennial of women having the right to vote, it is a shameful reality that the equal rights amendment still has not been enshrined in the Constitution. As a result, millions of American women still face inequality under the law and injustice in their careers and lives.

Without full equality under the Constitution, women face a devastating wage gap, and this has an impact not only on what families earn today but on women's pensions and retirement in the future. This is wrong.

Women face discrimination as they raise families. Sixty-two percent of pregnant women and new moms are in the workforce, but current law allows pregnant workers to be placed on unpaid leave or forced out of their jobs. And sexual harassment and assault too often go unchecked, all leading to women's underrepresentation at the decisionmaking table.

We know what the statistics are—what was it?—33 CEOs of the Fortune 500 companies are women. Really?

Today, by passing this resolution, the House is paving the way to enshrin-

ing the equal rights amendment in the Constitution. It will achieve justice for women and achieve progress for families and for our children, lowering wage disparity and increasing paychecks so moms can pay for their family's needs, such as rent, groceries, childcare, and healthcare.

We are able to strengthen America. It is not just about women. It is about America.

The ERA will strengthen America, unleashing the full power of women in our economy and upholding the value of equality in our democracy.

I have four daughters, one son, two granddaughters, and I can't even imagine how anyone could think of his or her daughter not having equality; his or her sister, mom, wife, not having equality. What is that about, that women should not have the same status of equality as men?

This has nothing to do with the abortion issue. That is an excuse. That is not a reason. It has everything to do with a respect for women: your daughter, your sister, your wife, your mother. And you are saying, by voting against this, that your daughter, your sister, your mother, your spouse should not have equal protection under the law in the Constitution of the United States.

To those who say that the ERA is not necessary, let me quote from a recent statement from the American Association of University Women. It states that many "Americans mistakenly believe that the U.S. Constitution explicitly guarantees equality between men and women." Perhaps you think that. "The equal rights amendment would, once and for all, guarantee constitutional equality between men and women. Its ratification would provide the constitutional guarantee that all men and women are truly equal under the law."

I urge a strong bipartisan vote for this resolution. It will be bipartisan in the United States Senate when we send it over there shortly, to ensure that women are truly equal under the law in America. Because we know in America, when women succeed, America succeeds.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining for both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 15 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for bringing this resolution to a vote and thank Representative SPEIER and Representative MALONEY for their work on this legislation.

This is a historic day. It has been nearly a century since the first constitutional amendment to guarantee

equal treatment for women was introduced in 1923. Since then, 37 States have ratified the equal rights amendment, including my home State of Pennsylvania in 1972.

Virginia's ratification of the ERA this past January brought us one step closer to this basic right that we will be held equal in the eyes of the Constitution. The motto of Susan B. Anthony's newspaper was: "Men their rights and nothing more; women their rights and nothing less." Today, we again say women will accept nothing less than equality.

ERA builds on the work of Anthony and others like Jeannette Rankin, Alice Paul, Ida B. Wells, and this diverse Congress.

I am filled with joy today because I am looking forward to going home and telling my granddaughters, Aubrey and Ella, that we are one step closer to a more perfect Union.

□ 1015

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER and JACKIE SPEIER for their historic leadership on the equal rights amendment.

Madam Speaker, first introduced in 1923, the equal rights amendment is still as relevant and necessary as ever because we know that equality for women will always elude us when it isn't etched into our Constitution.

We have seen it when the Supreme Court gutted the Violence Against Women Act; we have seen it when judges don't enforce equal pay for equal work or when a Federal judge ruled that Congress didn't have the authority to outlaw female genital mutilation. But if your rights are in the Constitution, then they can't be rolled back by the changing whims of legislators, judges, or Presidents.

Women are long past due equal treatment under the law, and we will persist until it is firmly guaranteed. There is no deadline for equality. We demand our equality be spelled out in the Constitution, and we spell it E-R-A.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important vote for equality.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 79, which removes the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment. A woman's rights must be guaranteed by our government.

This bill is about the Members of Congress ensuring that the rights and equality for women are a part of our Constitution.

It is sad to watch those who lose their way because they will find any way to distract from the issue of equality. The Members on the other side are trying to interject abortion into this, but I want to say that even though we have come so far as women—there are a record number of women lawmakers here in this House—we have so far to go, and this corrects that injustice and recognizes equality for women under the law.

As the great Shirley Chisholm, the first African American woman in Congress, stated: "The time is clearly now to put this House on record for the fullest expression of that equality of opportunity which our Founding Fathers professed. They professed it, but they did not assure it to their daughters, as they tried to do for their sons."

The time is clearly now to put this House on record for the fullest expression of that equality of opportunity which our Founding Fathers possessed. They possessed it, but they did not assure it. We try as they tried to do for their sons.

Madam Speaker, I encourage support of this bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank Congresswoman SPEIER for introducing this important resolution.

In 1923 Alice Paul introduced the equal rights amendment to include women in our Nation's founding documents. Nearly 100 years later, during my time in the Virginia State Senate, I sponsored the resolution for Virginia to ratify the ERA. But it wouldn't be until January 27, 2020, with the historic number of women lawmakers serving in the State legislature that the great Commonwealth of Virginia became the 38th and final State to ratify the equal rights amendment.

This was not simply a symbolic vote. Specifically affirming equality on the basis of sex in the Constitution will strengthen State and Federal laws that protect women. We need the equal rights amendment to ensure that equal justice under law is a constitutional right for women and not just an inscription over the entrance to the Supreme Court.

Finally, these words will ring true: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex."

Today, I am proud to cast my vote in support of the ERA and in recognition of the tireless work of so many trailblazers and activists over the years, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD).

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 79, a bipartisan bill that moves us closer to adopting the equal rights amendment.

Madam Speaker, American women are barrier breakers. We have broken down barriers and shattered glass ceilings in education, at work, in the law, in the military, and at home. We are in a new era where women are leading in ways that they never have before, but legal gender discrimination, pay disparities, and inequality remain. They will not go away on their own. That is why we need to ensure that women's rights are guaranteed by adopting the equal rights amendment.

I was so proud in 2018 when Illinois ratified the equal rights amendment at long last. Two years later, I am here on the House floor because the women of northern Illinois sent me here to fight for them. I am here to fight for our right as women to equal treatment under the Constitution of our great country.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to move us one giant step closer to legal equality by supporting this essential bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution to remove the arbitrary deadline to ratify the equal rights amendment. This year is the centennial of the 19th Amendment, yet women are still fighting for full and equal rights under the law.

Women continue to face many barriers to true equality, including pregnancy and gender discrimination, unequal pay, and a lack of access to a full range of reproductive healthcare services. The equal rights amendment to the Constitution would provide for fundamental equality for women regardless of who is President, who is on the Supreme Court, or changes in Federal law.

Congress first approved the equal rights amendment in 1972, and my home State of Oregon was quick to ratify it the following year. Now, 38 States—the required three-fourths under the Constitution—have ratified the amendment. Today Congress will stand with our States and make it clear that it is time—actually way past time—to adopt the equal rights amendment. It is not too late to do the right thing. It is not too late for equality.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Virginia (Mr. BEYER), who is from the 38th State.

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, it has been 97 years since the equal rights amendment was introduced in the 68th Congress and 48 years since the ERA passed the House and Senate.

In those 48 years, I have had three daughters and one granddaughter. Those four young women are brilliant, precocious, and accomplished, with strong character, great morality, and true nobility. These women are every bit the equal of any man I have ever met, yet our Constitution does not recognize their equality nor prohibit discrimination against them.

I am very proud that the Commonwealth of Virginia was the 38th State to ratify the ERA. We must permanently remove the deadline for State ratification and provide an essential legal remedy against gender discrimination.

Does this sound like a political stunt: "Women shall have equal rights in the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

No. These words belong in the United States Constitution. There is nothing partisan about recognizing men and women have equal rights under the law.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, every single constitution in the whole world written since 1959, including Afghanistan, for example, has the equivalent of the equal rights amendment, but the United States of America does not.

Though my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and President Trump's Department of Justice may tell you otherwise, we need the equal rights amendment, and we need it now.

The requisite number of States have now voted to ratify the equal rights amendment. Last year my home State of Illinois was the 37th State to ratify, and this year Virginia brought us to that number of 38.

Today I will proudly vote "yes" to show my grandchildren—my granddaughters and my grandsons—that women are not only strong, powerful, and resilient, but also equal citizens under the law.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with us.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 79 and stand shoulder to shoulder with women to demand gender equality and justice.

When I think about the future of our country and what I want it to look like for young women and girls like my granddaughter, Anna, I envision a just and equitable society with fair play, diverse leadership, and equal access to basic healthcare rights. That is why the equal rights amendment is necessary.

For too long our country's structural barriers have cast a shadow over women's rights. With 38 States having affirmed their support for the ERA, we are one step closer to shattering those barriers.

This resolution negates misguided arguments that because it is an arbitrary deadline, the equal rights amendment is effectively dead. It is clear from the recent actions of Nevada, Illinois, and Virginia, and our collective voices, it is still very much alive, and we will not rest until it is ingrained in the most sacred document of our Nation's history.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand with our country's women and support our right to constitutional equality.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, 244 years ago women were left out of our Constitution by the men who drafted it. But since then, generations of women and men have blazed a steady trail towards equality in this country; but we still do not have constitutional equality.

I attended many ERA events representing the League of Women Voters in the 1970s, and if someone would have told me then that we would still be fighting for this in 2020, I would have said that it was a failure of justice.

Why is anyone against rights for everyone?

Madam Speaker, equal rights for women transcend your politics, they transcend your age, where you are from, and your gender.

Women in this country continue to receive unequal pay, suffer from harassment in the workplace, endure discrimination for pregnancies, and fight long legal battles over domestic violence cases. A correction of our Constitution is clearly long overdue.

Liberty and justice for all must apply equally to women and men in this country. Let's pass this resolution.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished

gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, 28 days ago on Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday, Virginia became the 38th State to ratify the ERA. After decades of struggle, 48 years after congressional passage, two-thirds of the States agreed to an amendment that secures equal rights for all American citizens regardless of sex. This amendment would touch every corner of our lives.

With 24 words our Nation will finally fully recognize women as equal participants in society.

To my colleagues opposing the ERA: What are you afraid of?

How can you oppose this resolution and then look women in your district, in your churches, and in your own homes in the eye?

Today is your chance to stand on the right side of her story. I implore my colleagues, vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 79. Let us finish this struggle and at long last have women and men finally equal under the law with their rights enshrined in the U.S. Constitution.

□ 1030

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, since women gained the right to vote 100 years ago, we have made incredible progress—rolling back laws like those that kept us from serving on juries, owning land, or even getting our own credit card—and this Congress has more women than ever.

But true equality is still a goal, not a reality. The fact is women are still paid less than men for the same work, and we still have men passing laws that dictate our choices about our bodies.

It is clear, if we want equality, we need the ERA, and the people agree. We saw that at women's marches across the country and in the groundswell of the #MeToo movement.

That energy is leading to change. The people are speaking. It is up to us to listen. Arbitrary deadlines are no reason to silence our voices.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" and give women the same rights as men.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support today of Congresswoman SPEIER's bill, H.J. Res. 79. I thank Congresswoman SPEIER and Congresswoman MALONEY for their consistent leadership as warrior women.

The ERA would guarantee rights to all and would finally affirm women's equality in our Constitution by removing this arbitrary deadline.

We know that, too often, women have been relegated to the sidelines and left

out of the Constitution, especially Black women and women of color. For example, there is still rampant gender wage discrimination.

Discrimination against women must end. That is why the ERA is so important. It would make sure that our government would ensure that women are treated equally, a right that needs to be clearly outlined in every aspect of our country.

I want my granddaughters, Jordan, Simone, and Giselle, to know that they are equal to men, that their rights are enshrined in the Constitution. They, like every girl and woman, deserve equality in their country. They should know that their country, the United States of America, has finally joined the rest of the world to stand up for their rights as American women.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this resolution to advance the cause of full and equal rights for all women. I do so for my 1-year-old granddaughter for whom I deeply hope that, when she reaches the age of understanding, the ERA will be as enshrined in our Constitution as is the right to vote today. I also do so as a proud citizen of my Hawaii.

On March 22, 1972, when the U.S. Senate sent the ERA to the States, it was early in the morning in Hawaii; but by shortly after noon that same day, our legislature voted for ratification, the first State to do so.

For my country and Hawaii and for all of our women leaders who led this fight, past and present, I proudly join my colleagues in voting for the ERA.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, after nearly a century, the equal rights amendment is on the cusp of ratification.

At America's founding, women were intentionally left out of the Constitution. As second-class citizens, we lacked the right to vote, hold most jobs, or even own property. Today, we still receive less pay for the same work, and we face violence and harassment just for being women. But the ERA will prohibit all of that. In the eyes of our most sacred document, we will finally be equal.

Women's rights should not depend on congressional whims or who occupies the White House. These basic fundamental rights must be guaranteed.

But, if we want to hand a more perfect union to our daughters—and I have two of them—we must seize this moment to end sex discrimination. We owe it to the women who sacrificed before us and all of our daughters and sons who deserve a life of true equality.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution to remove the arbitrary and outdated deadline for ratifying the ERA.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER). The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. COLLINS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for a parliamentary inquiry.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, it is my intention to raise a point of order that this resolution requires a two-thirds vote. I will argue the point of order when it is made, but I need to know when the proper time is to raise the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The proper time would be when the Chair puts the question on passage.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, do I put the question before or after it is passed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At the time the Chair puts the question on passage.

Mr. COLLINS. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, it has been interesting, the discussion on the floor today. It has been interesting on both sides to hear the different aspects of why this bill is on the floor, why we are doing it, why we shouldn't be doing it, and many things. It has been interesting, the discussion, if you go from a strictly number-of-States category.

What has been interesting is my colleagues across the aisle have talked about that there are now 38 States, but they fail to mention 5 States that rescinded their votes. Five States would put you under 38.

What was interesting to me in the Rules Committee the other night, the argument was that, if they rescind it, it is not valid to rescind, yet you can add States after the time limit is up. That is an interesting argument to make if you are actually looking at it from the perspective of if they rescind it within the timeframe yet passed it after the timeframe, that that is okay.

Then I heard one of my colleagues actually mentioned the fact that, if we passed it in here today, that this would now become part of the process, along with the State of Virginia ratifying it, it is now part of our Constitution.

I am sure this was just a euphoric discussion about how this would actually go about, but they were also forgetting the Senate is involved in this. It is amazing.

I was really worried at one point in the discussion that it was said on multiple occasions that there was no protection in the Constitution for women. I was almost scared for a moment that

the 14th Amendment had been repealed and I didn't know it.

It is in there and still is in there. I checked just a few minutes ago. It is safe.

It is interesting to determine, when Ruth Bader Ginsburg, one of the foremost architects in looking at this bill even in the 1970s, coming forward, has said: If you want to do this, start over. Do it the proper way.

As my chairman has said earlier, basically, a deadline should not get in the way of what we want. A deadline should not get in the way of what I want to have happen. That is becoming more and more of a concern in this body, that the rules and parliamentary procedures don't matter if it interferes with what we want.

But, at the end of the day, the question really becomes: Why are we doing this? Why are we bringing this forth when there is absolutely no legal precedent, no constitutional precedent, no anything out there—including some of the founders who actually started this whole process 40-plus years ago, who said this is not the way you do it.

The reason I know that that is a concern is because some of those who have actually said this have been criticized in the media from the perspective of supporters of the ERA to say Ruth Bader Ginsburg's comments have now killed the ERA, or effectively done it. The reason is because she is speaking the truth about this issue.

We disagree on most everything from a legal perspective, but on this one, we happen to agree, and she has laid forth clearly what should happen here.

But let me also say—and it has been talked about a great deal, so I think we just need to come to the real scenario why this is happening. It is not that we believe it will actually happen. For anybody here who believes that today is actually going to put it in part of the Constitution, that is not going to happen.

So what is it? It is a political nod to the understanding of those who are speaking for this.

As we have heard earlier, NARAL Pro-Choice America:

With its ratification, the ERA would reinforce the constitutional right to abortion by clarifying that the sexes have equal rights, which would require judges to strike down anti-abortion laws.

Also, NARAL:

The ERA will support protecting women's right to abortion. With five anti-choice Justices on the Supreme Court and *Roe v. Wade* on the chopping block, it is more important than ever we codify women's bodily autonomy in our lives.

Codirector of Reproaction:

Abortion restrictions amount to sex discrimination because they single out people for unfair treatment on the basis of sex.

The senior counsel of National Women's Law Center:

The ERA would help create a basis for challenging abortion restrictions.

This is what this is actually about. This is what the basis has needed because there has been a shifting in this

country to understand that, in our opinion—in the opinion of many—abortion is simply murder in the womb. It is not about life.

It is interesting, we are talking about the rights of women today—which, again, this bill doesn't have anything to do with—but we are not concerned if the young women in the womb are even able to have a birthday. That is not a concern.

So what would happen from these folks who are supporting your resolution today? Why do they want it? Because it gives a claim, from start to finish, unfettered abortion.

So what does that mean? That means let's bring back partial-birth abortion, which, if I have to remind anybody here, means the delivery of the child all the way until the moment the chin comes almost out, and then actually crushing their skull. That is what that is.

If that is a right we are protecting, I don't want any part of it, and neither do most Americans. They don't want a part of it. But that is one of those restrictions that will be laid back.

It would also continue to allow unlimited abortions in any State for any reason, including sex selection.

It is interesting that we would talk about this today, the ERA, and use this, yet a family could choose to abort a child because it is a male or a female. Let's be honest about this.

But the bottom line for me, what really bothers me the most about when it is unlimited, unfettered access to abortion that this bill opens up, if it were to have passed, is one that hits close to home for me.

You see, a European country recently stated that a geneticist in Iceland said: We have almost basically eradicated Down syndrome people.

I thought to myself, for a second: That would be great. I mean, if we could actually remove Down syndrome and help those and cure that, that would be an amazing medical discovery for all people. Except there is one portion.

Do you know how they have done it? Through genetic testing and killing the children in the womb. They don't even let them have a birthday.

One Icelandic counselor counsels mothers as follows:

This is your life. You have the right to choose how your life will look. She said: We don't look at abortion as murder. We look at it as a thing that we ended.

Do you want to know why this has opened up, America? This is why.

And for those of us like myself who have a disabled child, I do not want to hear that we are protecting disabled rights and other rights when we are not even allowing them to be born in certain arenas.

Every day, I get a text on this phone. It is from my daughter. Jordan is 27 years old. She has spina bifida. She cannot walk and has never taken a step, and I believe it probably, given

the medical condition, will not happen this side of Heaven. But she rolls and she smiles. She goes to work 3 days a week. She gets herself up early to put her clothes on and take her shower and get a bus that she calls, and she goes to work.

The folks in Sweden, do you know what they want to do? Kill her. Because she is not as valuable, as a Down syndrome child is not as valuable.

Do you want to open this Pandora's box of no abortion restrictions? Then own what you are doing.

But when Jordan texts me, she texts me: Good morning, Daddy. I love you. How was your day?

Madam Speaker, when we found out 27 years ago—a week ago, 27 years ago—that Jordan was going to have spina bifida, we were a young couple just happy that God gave us a child, and to find out that she had a disability only kept our hearts more in tune to what God had given.

My wife went to school the next week, and she was telling the teacher about what was going on. She said: We are trying to figure out where we need to go to have Jordan, help when she is born and get some more medical attention.

This person looked at her and said: You know you have choices, correct?"

And my wife said: Well, yes. There is Northside Hospital and others.

She said: No. Oh, no, dear. You don't have to go through with this. That is your choice.

□ 1045

In other words, as my wife looked at her and said: "You're talking about my baby."

You see, when we go down this path, don't flower this bill up. Look at the ones who actually talk about it and say this is an open door to abortion on demand, with no restrictions, no government interference—in fact, government pays for it.

But before you do that, America, as we look around, I want you to think of the picture on the new Gerber baby ad of the young person with Down syndrome, who is now the face of Gerber baby food. If he was in Iceland, he would have been one of those that, as it said: Oh, we ended.

Think about my daughter, who, when we allow it out there for people who are struggling—and to get news that you have a child with a disability, that is one of the most amazingly devastating things that you can hear because you don't know what the future holds.

But what you do know is life is a gift from God, and that it is my joy to take care of her. We had 30 major surgeries before she was 5 years old, three of which were 9 hours in length. Tell me her life doesn't matter.

For someone who doesn't have the possibility of understanding, and they are given a choice because they have a disability, and somebody tells them and gets to them and says: Don't

worry. Disabilities are bad. Just go ahead and end that life, and go on with your life.

This is what this opens up.

So don't give me a bill that is going nowhere for the reasons that have been given. The true reasons are found in your own supporters. The true reasons are found in what we know to be true.

When you understand what this is about, then I will stand till I have no more breath in my body for the rights of those who can't speak for themselves.

It is amazing to me that it was said: What would I be saying to my daughter if I voted against this?

I would be saying to Jordan, as I will: Jordan, the 14th Amendment is still there. Protections in law are still there. And by the way, restrictions on abortion will not be done away with, and your life matters.

So if you want a picture of this, picture Jordan.

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

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

Once again, if Congress can enact a resolution putting a time limit, it can enact a resolution removing a time limit. And when the Senate passes this resolution, the ERA will be part of the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIIB).

Ms. TLAIIB. Madam Speaker, I rise very proudly, the first Muslim woman ever elected in the Congress, in support of H.J. Res. 79.

Madam Speaker, what is even more interesting is what I have been hearing about this obsession to control and oppress women in the United States of America. I cannot believe it is 2020, and we are still debating the merits of the equal rights amendment. It is beyond time.

I want you all to know this is about women of color, women with disabilities, transgender women, immigrant women. These women are affected by issues like unequal pay, sexual violence, lack of access for healthcare, and poverty.

So much of what we are doing here, in trying to promote women's equality, is about gender, racial, and economic justice.

Madam Speaker, know this: A "no" vote today is condoning oppression of women in the United States of America. I urge support.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of equality and the principle that our Constitution was designed, not to shore up the dominance of the historically powerful, but to ensure the rights of all and to foster a society in which each of us is free to shape our future based on our abilities. The resolution today removes the deadline Congress put in place for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. While ratification of

the Equal Rights Amendment is imperative to enshrine equal rights for women, I do not believe it is necessary to strike the deadline for ratification. By voting on this legislation we may imply that it is necessary for Congress to lift a self-imposed deadline. I do not prescribe to this view.

Congressional authority to propose Amendments to the Constitution and the mode of ratification is absolute. The language of Article V of the Constitution represents the Founders intent to create a stable government designed for change. Article V requires two-thirds of the House and Senate to propose an amendment. Congress can choose ratification through three-fourths of the state legislatures or state ratifying conventions. Once the amendment is proposed to the states, there is no Constitutionally imposed time limit on the ratification process. Article V of the Constitution is silent with regard to when a state must consider and ratify an amendment. For example, the ratification process for the 27th Amendment took more than two hundred years.

Historically, Congress has ratified amendments without specific time limitations. The first amendment to contain a time limit was the 18th Amendment which established the prohibition of alcohol. The text of the 18th, 20th, 21st, and 22nd Amendments each contained language limiting the time frame for ratification. In contrast, the text of the Equal Rights Amendment ratified by the states does not contain a time limit. It is the proposing clause sent to the states for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment which contains a seven-year time limitation. The language of a proposing clause is not binding. The current ratification process of the Equal Rights Amendment is properly before the states and is reasonable and sufficiently contemporaneous.

Having been ratified by Virginia, according to Article V, the ERA has become part of the Constitution. Furthermore, if the deadline is binding, then passage of this resolution, without passage in the Senate, does not cure the defect. Because the deadline is not binding, this resolution is not necessary, but also not harmful.

Women continue to face additional hurdles in the pathways to success. On average, women still earn less than men for the same job functions. Pregnant women often lack basic protections and reasonable accommodation in the workplace. Perhaps most concerning of all, violence against women is still widespread and undermines the educational and social potential of women and young children in this country.

I am proud to have worked with my Democratic colleagues in the House to pass legislation to remedy these inequalities. The House recently passed the Protect the Right to Organize Act (H.R. 2474) which protects workers who are trying to form a union. In most of America, women earn less than men, but women and men working under a union contract receive equal pay for equal work. We have worked to fill the gaps in the patchwork of existing laws governing how and when workers take time off to care for themselves and their families. Expanding the Family and Medical Leave Act to cover more working parents and low wage workers who are currently excluded from leave policies is a top priority.

Nearly two thirds of minimum wage workers in the United States are women. The House has successfully passed the Raise the Wage

Act (H.R. 582). This will raise the income levels of the most economically insecure households and is a step in the right direction towards pay equity. The Pregnant Worker's Fairness Act (H.R. 2694) is an important piece of legislation that will provide reasonable accommodations to pregnant women in the workforce. The House also passed the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (H.R. 1585) which expanded protections and provides critical funding for victim services, law enforcement training, and data collection.

However, even if all this legislation were to become law, it would not be the same as amending the Constitution to guarantee women equal rights.

Discrimination in the workplace, violence in the home, and institutional barriers require systemic legal and cultural change. Ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment provides an additional legal tool for combatting discrimination on the basis of sex.

We will continue the fight for equality and work towards a more inclusive and equitable society.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, over the course of many years, I have consistently sponsored and promoted women's rights legislation to ensure equal pay for equal work including most recently, the Paycheck Fairness Act.

In the struggle against wage discrimination, I voted in favor of 2009 the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

To help ensure that women are not disadvantaged in their careers because of time taken to attend to their families, I was an early and strong advocate of multiple legislative initiatives to provide family medical leave—including the groundbreaking bill that became law, the Family and Medical Leave Act.

And this year, I have cosponsored the FAMILY Act.

I voted to ensure that women's rights are protected in higher education by strongly supporting Title IX.

I have supported legislation to amend pension and tax policies that negatively impact women and I supported numerous bills to establish certain rights for sexual assault survivors including the Survivors' Bill of Rights which is now law.

Since the mid-1990s, I have led the effort to end the barbaric practice of human trafficking, a human rights abuse that is a perverted and unimaginable exploitation of women and girls that thrives on greed, disrespect and secrecy.

Twenty years ago, the U.S. Congress approved and the President signed legislation that I authored—the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000—a comprehensive whole-of-government initiative to combat sex and labor trafficking in the United States and around the world.

The Violence Against Women Act (See Division B) was reauthorized and significantly expanded by my law. Last year, I cosponsored the Violence Against Women Extension Act of 2019.

This past January, I authored another bill that was signed into law—my fifth major law on human trafficking—The Frederick Douglass Trafficking Victims Prevention and Protection Act.

After a young college student from my district, Samantha Josephson, was brutally murdered by the driver of what she thought was her Uber ride, I introduced Sami's Law to

make the ride share safer for all. In recent months it has been shocking to learn that thousands of women who use Lyft or Uber have been sexually assaulted and some have been murdered.

I arrive at the debate on the elimination of the deadline for the ERA from the perspective of my work to ensure equality and protection for women and every woman's right to be treated fairly and without exploitation.

The words of Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg on the legal impermissibility of extending the deadline for ratification have sealed the fate of the proposed amendment. Justice Ginsburg's judgment is that the deadline has expired and that she "would like it to start over" presents a definitive view that the process has come to an end.

According to Vox, Justice Ginsburg also said "There's too much controversy about latecomers, plus, a number of states have withdrawn their ratification. So, if you count a latecomer on the plus side, how can you disregard states that said 'we've changed our minds?'" Five states—Idaho, Kentucky, Nebraska, Tennessee, and South Dakota—voted to ratify the ERA but later rescinded that ratification.

Today, however, one thing is absolutely clear from both sides of the abortion divide: ratification of the ERA with its current wording will likely overturn laws prohibiting public funding of abortion—like the Hyde Amendment—and undo modest restrictions on abortion including waiting periods, parental involvement, women's right to know laws, conscience rights including the Weldon Amendment and any ban on late term abortion including the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

Should the ERA be ratified without clarifying abortion-neutral language—to wit: "Nothing in this Article shall be construed to grant or secure any right relating to abortion or the funding thereof"—abortion activists will use the ERA as they have successfully used state ERAs in both New Mexico and Connecticut—to force taxpayers to pay for abortion on demand.

Consider this:

The Supreme Court of New Mexico ruled in 1998 that the state was required to fund abortion based solely on the state ERA and said the law "undoubtedly singles out . . . a gender-linked condition that is unique to women" and therefore "violates the Equal Rights Amendment."

In like manner, the Supreme Court of Connecticut invalidated its state ban on abortion funding and wrote in 1986: "it is therefore clear, under the Connecticut ERA, that the regulation excepting . . . abortions from the Medicaid program discriminates against women."

Today in Pennsylvania, activists are suing to eviscerate the abortion funding restriction in that state claiming that the Hyde-type restriction violates the Pennsylvania Equal Rights Amendment.

While I take issue with abortion activists who refuse to recognize an unborn child's inherent dignity, worth and value, at least activists on both sides agree that the ERA as written will be used in court as a means to compel public funding of abortion and to strike down the Hyde Amendment and other modest abortion restrictions at both the state and federal level.

NARAL Pro-Choice America plainly states: "With its ratification, the ERA . . . would require judges to strike down anti-abortion laws . . ."

A senior lawyer of the National Women's Law Centers said: "The ERA would help create a basis to challenge abortion restrictions."

The National Right to Life Committee states that "the proposed federal ERA would invalidate the federal Hyde Amendment and all state restrictions on tax-funded abortions."

And the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops agree and wrote "One consequence of the ERA would be the likely requirement of federal funding for abortions . . . (and) arguments have been proffered that the federal ERA would . . . restrain the ability of the federal and state governments to enact other measures regulating abortion, such as third-trimester or partial birth abortion bans, parental consent, informed consent, conscience-related exemptions, and other provisions."

According to the most recent Marist Poll (January 2020), 60 percent of all Americans oppose using tax dollars for abortion, seven in ten Americans including nearly half who identify as pro-choice want significant restrictions on abortion, a majority of Americans—55 percent—want to ban abortion after 20 weeks, and nearly two-thirds of Americans oppose abortion if the child will be born with Down Syndrome.

I believe that all human beings—especially the weakest and most vulnerable including unborn baby girls and boys—deserve respect, empathy, compassion and protection from violence.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 79, which will remove a deadline for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. This will ensure that our country fully accepts the impact of the recent ratifications by the states of Nevada, Illinois, and Virginia.

The Equal Rights Amendment represents the further advancement of women in our society. It enshrines the American ideal that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex". While other existing statutes have been interpreted as prohibiting some forms of sex discrimination, there are still numerous avenues in which they are inefficient for the full protection of women under the law.

As representatives of communities across our nation, we must set an explicit example of our championing of women's rights. Women continue to face obstacles to their full equality, including through unequal pay, pregnancy discrimination, sexual and domestic violence, and inadequate access to health care services. As the United States, we must be mindful of the global influence we have, and we must ensure that gender equality is, without a doubt, enshrined in our foundational principles.

The bipartisan support of this legislation captures the will of Americans for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. Therefore, I am proud to support this resolution as a crucial step forward for gender equality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 844, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I make the point of order that a two-thirds vote is required for passage of this joint resolution because it does have the effect of amending the Constitution.

And on the point of order, Madam Speaker, there was an extension that was passed in 1978, where this issue came up, which extended the deadline until 1982.

In 1982, the Equal Rights Amendment deadlines expired. In 1983, Chairman Peter Rodino, of the Judiciary Committee, decided to introduce H.J. Res. 1, which started the process over again.

The difference between what happened in 1978 and 1983 is that Chairman Rodino, and those who supported re-introducing and attempting to pass the Equal Rights Amendment, realized that it had expired and required a start-over.

I believe that this does fall under that, and that it does require a start-over, and I would ask the Chair to rule on whether or not the point of order is well-taken and this does require a two-thirds vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Pursuant to House Resolution 842, an affirmative vote of a majority of Members present and voting, a quorum being present, is required on final passage of the pending measure. The gentleman's point of order is overruled.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I appeal the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The terms of House Resolution 842 are unambiguous and so, consistent with the ruling of the Chair on September 16, 1977, to permit an appeal in this case would be tantamount to permitting a direct change in that resolution. As such, the Chair has not issued an appealable ruling, and the Chair will put the question on passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I appeal that ruling of the Chair as well, which I believe is appealable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That ruling is not subject to appeal.

The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 183, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—232

Aguilar	Garcia (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez
Allred	Golden	Omar
Axne	Gomez	Pallone
Barragán	Gonzalez (TX)	Panetta
Bass	Gottheimer	Pappas
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Pascarell
Bera	Grijalva	Pelosi
Beyer	Haaland	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Harder (CA)	Peters
Blumenauer	Hastings	Peterson
Blunt Rochester	Hayes	Phillips
Bonamici	Heck	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
F.	Himes	Porter
Brindisi	Horn, Kendra S.	Pressley
Brown (MD)	Horsford	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Houlihan	Quigley
Bustos	Hoyer	Raskin
Butterfield	Huffman	Reed
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Jayapal	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Case	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Casten (IL)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Ryan
Cicilline	Khanna	Sánchez
Cisneros	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Scanlon
Clarke (NY)	Kim	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Cohen	Lamb	Schrier
Connolly	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Correa	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Costa	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Shalala
Cox (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Craig	Lee (NV)	Sherrill
Crist	Levin (CA)	Sires
Crow	Levin (MI)	Slotkin
Cuellar	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Cunningham	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Curtis	Lipinski	Spanberger
Davids (KS)	Loebsock	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Stanton
Davis, Danny K.	Lowenthal	Stevens
Davis, Rodney	Lowey	Suozy
Dean	Lujan	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Luria	Takano
DeGette	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Malinowski	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Maloney,	Titus
Delgado	Carolyn B.	Tlaib
Demings	Maloney, Sean	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Matsui	Torres (CA)
Deutch	McAdams	Torres Small
Dingell	McBath	(NM)
Doggett	McCollum	Trahan
Doyle, Michael	McEachin	Trone
F.	McGovern	Underwood
Engel	McNerney	Van Drew
Escobar	Meeks	Vargas
Eshoo	Meng	Veasey
Espallat	Moore	Vela
Evans	Morelle	Velázquez
Finkenauer	Moulton	Visclosky
Fitzpatrick	Mucarsel-Powell	Wasserman
Fletcher	Murphy (FL)	Schultz
Foster	Nadler	Waters
Frankel	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Neal	Wexton
Galleo	Neguse	Wild
Garamendi	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (IL)	O'Halleran	Yarmuth

NAYS—183

Abraham	Bilirakis	Carter (TX)
Aderholt	Bishop (NC)	Chabot
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Cheney
Amash	Bost	Cline
Amodei	Brady	Cloud
Armstrong	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Arrington	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Babin	Buchanan	Comer
Bacon	Buck	Conaway
Baird	Bucshon	Cook
Balderson	Budd	Crenshaw
Banks	Burchett	Davidson (OH)
Barr	Burgess	DesJarlais
Bergman	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Biggs	Carter (GA)	Duncan

Dunn	Kelly (MS)	Rose, John W.
Emmer	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer
Estes	King (IA)	Roy
Ferguson	King (NY)	Rutherford
Fleischmann	Kustoff (TN)	Scalise
Flores	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Fortenberry	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Fox (NC)	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Fulcher	Lesko	Shimkus
Gaetz	Long	Simpson
Gallagher	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
Gianforte	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Gibbs	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Gohmert	Marshall	Smucker
Gonzalez (OH)	Massie	Spano
Gooden	McCarthy	Stauber
Gosar	McCauley	Stefanik
Granger	McClintock	Steil
Graves (LA)	McHenry	Steube
Graves (MO)	McKinley	Stewart
Green (TN)	Meadows	Stivers
Griffith	Meuser	Taylor
Grothman	Miller	Thompson (PA)
Guest	Mitchell	Thornberry
Guthrie	Moolenaar	Timmons
Hagedorn	Mooney (WV)	Tipton
Harris	Murphy (NC)	Turner
Hartzer	Newhouse	Upton
Hern, Kevin	Norman	Wagner
Herrera Beutler	Nunes	Walberg
Hice (GA)	Olson	Walden
Higgins (LA)	Palazzo	Walker
Hill (AR)	Palmer	Walorski
Holding	Pence	Waltz
Hollingsworth	Perry	Watkins
Hudson	Posey	Weber (TX)
Huizenga	Ratcliffe	Webster (FL)
Hurd (TX)	Reschenthaler	Wenstrup
Johnson (LA)	Rice (SC)	Westerman
Johnson (OH)	Riggleman	Williams
Johnson (SD)	Roby	Wittman
Jordan	Rodgers (WA)	Womack
Joyce (OH)	Roe, David P.	Woodall
Joyce (PA)	Rogers (AL)	Yoho
Katko	Rogers (KY)	Young
Keller	Rooney (FL)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Adams	Kinzinger	Mullin
Byrne	Kirkpatrick	Payne
Crawford	LaHood	Welch
Gabbard	Marchant	Wilson (SC)
Graves (GA)	Mast	Wright

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

□ 1119

Mr. GOSAR changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. LEE of California changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, due to a medical condition, I was unable to vote on the following Roll Call on February 13, 2020.

Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall No. 70 (Final Passage of H.J. Res. 79)—Removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment (Rep. Speier—Judiciary).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I was absent today due to a medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted: “yea” on rollcall No. 70.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was commu-

nicated to the House by Miss Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHRIER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HONORING MISS DAISY ELLIOTT

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, today, I stand here proud to say that I was one who cast my vote for the passage of ERA in America.

I also rise today to recognize a woman who was so very instrumental to the State of Michigan and its fight for civil rights, Miss Daisy Elliott.

Miss Elliott was only 1 of 11 women elected to the Michigan Constitutional Convention in 1961. She was key in ensuring that our State's constitution established the Michigan Civil Rights Commission, with the authority to investigate charges of discrimination based on race, religion, color, or national origin.

Daisy served in the Michigan Legislature for nearly 20 years as an effective and influential voice of equality and introduced more than 80 bills that were enacted, including the Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act. Daisy Elliott was a fierce advocate for workers, senior citizens, and people of color.

Today, in honor of Black History Month, I salute and honor Miss Daisy Elliott. Madam Speaker, I honor her legacy.

OBSERVING NATIONAL CHILDREN'S DENTAL HEALTH MONTH

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, February is National Children's Dental Health Month. This month is a time when healthcare professionals, providers, and educators help promote good oral health practices to children, families, and many others.

Tooth decay is still the number one chronic infectious disease among children in the United States.

Throughout my career as a dentist, I can attest to the benefits of proper oral health and how important it is to focus on children from a very young age. Preventive measures like brushing, flossing, and rinsing correctly are important life lessons that should be learned from a young age.

I would also like to recognize the American Dental Association for their

strenuous work in this area. They have implemented the Give Kids A Smile program. It provides hundreds of thousands of underserved kids with free oral health education, screenings, and preventive and/or restorative services throughout the entire year.

It is a very much needed program, and I am personally very proud of the American Dental Association for the work that they do in this area.

SUPPORT MEDICAID EXPANSION, NOT BLOCK GRANTS

(Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on the issue of healthcare in Oklahoma. I hear from far too many Oklahomans who can't afford the healthcare they need.

Today, Oklahoma has the second highest rate of uninsured people in the Nation. Our State ranks 48th for uninsured children. We cannot continue to let Oklahomans fall through the cracks of our healthcare system.

The answer to solving our State's healthcare crisis is straightforward. We must expand Medicaid. By not expanding Medicaid, Oklahoma has lost up to \$1 billion per year. Seven hospitals across our State have closed, in part because we did not accept the healthcare support our State is entitled to.

Expanding Medicaid in Oklahoma would extend health insurance to up to 200,000 Oklahomans who don't currently have insurance. It is the right choice for our State. Instead, the administration and our Governor are proposing an alternative plan to turn SoonerCare into a block grant program.

The plan to block grant Medicaid would encourage cuts to healthcare services, restrict access to healthcare providers and lifesaving medications, and contribute to hospital closures. Too often, block grants have often been misused for political pet projects and to fill holes in the budget.

While we are still learning the specifics of the block grant plan, here is what we do know: more than 500,000 children rely on SoonerCare, and their insurance would be threatened by the plan to cap and slash Medicaid. Enough is enough.

CONGRATULATING DALLAS HIGH SCHOOL MOUNTAINEERS

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

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Dallas High School Mountaineers football team for their outstanding championship season.

Dallas football went undefeated during their regular season, going 15-0 with playoff wins and a district championship.

For the first time since 1993, the Dallas Mountaineers made it all the way to a Pennsylvania State championship.

Back in 2016, Dallas football went 2–9, with 12 freshmen on the team. Three years later, these players led their team to a championship season.

Under the leadership of the one and only coach Richie Mannello and his great assistant coaches, Dallas was strong on all sides of the ball, with a great gang-tackling defense, a super-solid offensive line, an electrifying passing game, and a backfield I will never forget.

The Dallas Mountaineer parents, student body, band, and cheerleaders were a huge part of the Friday night victories, and they made the games an awful lot of fun. The entire community, restaurants, fire department, all the residents of the Back Mountain were all part of this great season.

We are going to miss these boys wearing Dallas blue under the Friday night lights, but we know the Dallas tradition, long established, will live on.

□ 1130

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BLUE DOG COALITION

(Mrs. MURPHY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 25th anniversary of the Blue Dog Coalition, a caucus of pragmatic Democrats I have the honor to help lead this Congress.

Since February 1995, the Blue Dog Coalition has been working to bridge partisan divide and deliver bipartisan results. While the makeup and size of our coalition has changed over the years, our focus on fiscal responsibility and a strong national security has never wavered.

Blue Dogs recognize that our constituents expect us to be good stewards of their hard-earned taxpayer dollars and that a skyrocketing national debt is a threat to our national security.

Over the last 25 years, Blue Dogs have helped deliver balanced budgets, end government shutdowns, grow the middle class, and pass commonsense laws, such as pay-as-you-go.

This Congress we are leading the fight on election security, infrastructure, and job creation, and we are pushing Congress to be better by ending partisan gerrymandering and proposing No Budget, No Pay.

Most importantly, Blue Dogs remain focused on our founding principles of fiscal responsibility and a strong national security.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing the Blue Dog Coalition's 25th anniversary this month.

CELEBRATING MARY McLEOD BETHUNE

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

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, today I rise to celebrate one of the most prominent African American women in my community and our Nation's history, Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune.

At an early age, Dr. Bethune took an interest in the power of learning and promoting civil rights. In 1904, Dr. Bethune opened the Daytona Literary and Industrial Training School for Negro Girls in Daytona Beach, which later merged with the Cookman Institute for Men in Jacksonville to form Bethune-Cookman College, now University, where she served as president.

As Dr. Bethune worked to build the school she founded, she also became a national leader on issues related to civil rights, women, and young people, even providing counsel to U.S. Presidents.

In 2018, the Florida legislature passed and the governor signed legislation to place a statue in her honor representing Florida in the National Statuary Hall collection here in the Capitol.

Dr. Bethune knew education is the key to a quality life and a better life, and it is my honor to recognize her contributions on the floor here today.

DRAWING ATTENTION TO THE TRAGEDY UNFOLDING IN IDLIB, SYRIA

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I rise to draw attention to the tragedy unfolding in Idlib, Syria.

The regime backed by Iran and Russia continues to target civilians. They target hospitals and other civilian infrastructure. Just drop bombs. They are levelling whole neighborhoods, which is indicative that the regime does not want people to return to their homes. They are killing innocent men, women, and children for no reason.

Over half a million people have been displaced in the last 2 months. There must be a humanitarian response from the world, and it must start here in the United States. There must be accountability, and we must show the Syrian people that we have not forgotten them. How can we stand idly by and allow this to continue to happen?

I call on the President and all Members of both houses to have a forceful response to the regime in Syria to say that we will not tolerate the targeting of civilians, the wholesale killing of children and women and all civilians. We need to stand on the side of justice, and we must show the Syrian people that we have not forgotten them.

CELEBRATING OREGON'S 161ST BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, on February 14, Oregon celebrates her 161st birthday. As a lifelong Oregonian whose ancestors came there by wagon train in 1845, I may be a little biased, but I can confidently say there is no place like Oregon.

She boasts of so many unparalleled wonders and sights from the mighty, powerful Columbia River and the winds of the Columbia River Gorge to the majestic Painted Hills to the rugged landscape of the Umatilla National Forest, the clear, deep blue waters of Crater Lake, the deepest lake in North America. Then think about the great Cascade Mountains or Steens Mountain or the Wallawas or the Blues, and then all the way down to the depths of Hells Canyon.

The late great Republican Governor Tom McCall said it best. He said, "Oregon is an inspiration. Whether you come to it, or are born to it, you become entranced by our State's beauty, the opportunity she affords, and the independent spirit of her citizens."

Madam Speaker, I wish a happy birthday to Oregon. She truly does fly with her own wings.

REMEMBERING SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTING

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, it has been 2 years since the shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida.

In those 2 years, the surviving families and students have turned their pain into power. They stood up to gun companies. They testified before Congress. They helped craft and pass legislation. They worked with the Federal Government. They worked with the State government. They won school board seats. They made beautiful, moving art. Students have lifted their voices, written songs. They have walked out and they have marched. That is what the survivors of my community are doing.

But there is so much more that Congress and the President can do to save lives from gun violence. There is so much more we can do to honor the lives that were lost at Stoneman Douglas: Alyssa, Scott, Martin, Nicholas, Aaron, Jaime, Chris, Luke, Cara, Gina, Joaquin, Alaina, Meadow, Helena, Alex, Carmen, and Peter.

RECOGNIZING SWEETWATER SOUND

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

Mr. BANKS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share one of Fort Wayne's great American success stories, Sweetwater Sound.

Founder and CEO Chuck Surack's dream started over 40 years ago with a recording studio housed in a Volkswagen van. It has since evolved into one of the Nation's leading retailers of professional recording and music equipment.

Madam Speaker, Sweetwater's total sales in 2018 were record breaking at \$725 million. And just recently we found out that in 2019 it was another record year with sales of \$805 million, up 11 percent from 2018.

The total sales only tell part of the success story, though. Sweetwater has recently hired 159 new employees and has given back to Hoosiers by providing middle school students with free instruments.

Hoosiers are thankful for Sweetwater Sound's big contributions to northeast Indiana, and I look forward to watching them continue to succeed moving forward. In this record-setting economy, I look forward to seeing more American success stories just like this one.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CANNOT AFFORD TO TURN A BLIND EYE TO THE HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN SYRIA

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I stand today with the chair of our Foreign Affairs Committee who just spoke here, Mr. ENGEL, as he makes a plea to this House for us to take a look at and get involved with what is going on in Syria.

Millions of folks are dying. They are being killed with the help of Assad and Russia. They are killing civilians, millions of civilians. They are killing the children. And for those who are injured that find their way to the hospital, it does no good because they turn around and bomb the hospitals. This is an outrage.

The United States of America cannot afford to turn a blind eye to this humanitarian crisis. We must get involved. We must pay attention. The families, the children, the people of Syria deserve better than this.

I want to thank Mr. ENGEL for the attention that he is paying to this issue and the way that he is trying to educate us and get us involved in saving those poor people who are being overrun, who are being killed by Assad and, of course, with the help of Russia.

RECOGNIZING ABC LIFE CENTER

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the ABC Life Center, a pregnancy center in Franklin, Pennsylvania in Venango County.

The Life Center offers pregnant women a wide variety of resources, including no-cost pregnancy tests, consultations for women with unexpected pregnancies, adoption referrals, counseling for women who have had a pregnancy end in miscarriage or abortion, and more.

The Life Center recognizes that being pro-life means supporting all life. The center itself encourages women by letting them know that their story, their life and their babies' lives matter. The center also dispels the notion that to be pro-life is to be antichoice.

In fact, pregnancy centers such as Life Center offer a great deal of choices and resources to women who find themselves unexpectedly pregnant.

Pregnancy centers like ABC Life Center encourage and empower women all around the country. I am proud of the work that they do every day to enrich the lives of women and children, and together they help spread the message that life really is a better choice.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE SOUTHERN BORDER OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-99)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the southern border of the United States declared in Proclamation 9844 of February 15, 2019, is to continue in effect beyond February 15, 2020.

The ongoing border security and humanitarian crisis at the southern border of the United States continues to threaten our national security, including the security of the American people. The executive branch has taken steps to address the crisis, but further action is needed to address the humanitarian crisis and to control unlawful

migration and the flow of narcotics and criminals across the southern border. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Proclamation 9844 concerning the southern border of the United States.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 2020.

IMPORTANT ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to be able to stand in this hallowed Hall and address some things that have occurred that are worthy of attention.

Of course, there was applause in the gallery today on the passage of trying to restart the ERA. It is an amendment to the Constitution, and it was started back in the seventies. The amendment to the Constitution had a deadline as part of the amendment. The amendment did not get the required 38 states. The time lapsed. There was, as I recall, an attempt to extend the time, but some States that had been in favor of the ERA backed off.

□ 1145

So it is very clear to anyone who pays attention to the Constitution that, when an amendment to the Constitution by its own wording has a time deadline and that deadline is passed, then that amendment has not been ratified, is not part of the Constitution, and any efforts to change the amendment itself, including the deadline for ratification, would require beginning again.

There is no more iconic liberal judge on the Supreme Court, not in history, than the former head, as I recall, of the American Civil Liberties Union. She was there back when the American Civil Liberties Union cared deeply about civil liberties and even took on some clients and some causes of people that most of us thought were not worthy of a lot of attention. But they were so committed to civil liberties back in those days, they were more concerned about civil liberties than they were the client. That was in the old days.

Now, if it is not a liberal, then they are not concerned about civil liberties and abuses, since the Obama administration was the administration that so far appears to be the most abusive of the FISA courts, committing fraud upon the FISA courts.

But in fairness to the administration, it appears the FISA court judges did not have sufficient integrity or pride in their position that they were offended by having fraud committed upon them, because, apparently, the disdain for Donald Trump, then President Trump and his administration was such that it was okay. They were okay to be defrauded as judges, which sure brings

the issue of the FISA courts into focus as that issue will be taken up, as I understand it, as will issues over parts of the PATRIOT Act and other provisions that give the Federal Government tremendous latitude to spy on American citizens.

So it is an interesting time, though, where you never know where judges are going to come down. If somebody was appointed by a liberal judge, it is amazing; they appear to stay liberal, with disdain for conservatism and the strict language of the Constitution, wanting it to be a liberal, breathing, living document.

On the other hand, Chief Justice Roberts has pointed out he doesn't believe there should be Obama judges or Trump judges or Bush judges because you can't characterize them that way.

To an extent, he is right about that, because there are some Justices, particularly on the Supreme Court, who have been appointed by conservative Presidents who were liberals in conservative clothing, and they got on the Court and became some of the biggest flaming liberals we have ever had.

So you can't tell that someone is conservative if they are appointed by a conservative President, but you sure can tell if somebody is appointed by a liberal President. They have shown that they will stay liberal and not change. So it has been interesting to see that kind of conversion.

It appears pretty clear that some of these Justices, including Chief Justice Roberts, got into the position and began to care deeply about what the media and others thought about things they were doing.

So, for example, with ObamaCare, he was, apparently, from the reports, concerned that he might go down in history as being too political of a Chief Justice if he struck down ObamaCare. So he took something that was clearly unconstitutional, in effect, rewrote it, and had a very hypocritical opinion.

At page 14, I believe it was, he said, clearly, this is not a tax, because if it were a tax, Congress would have called it a tax, and they made clear it was not; and it is only a penalty, a fine, if you don't conform your conduct to the requirements of the legislation. Therefore, it is not a tax.

Since it is not a tax, then the anti-injunction law that prevents a plaintiff from filing suit until a tax is not only assessed but paid and keeps the court from having jurisdiction to hear it until the tax is assessed and paid, that doesn't apply, so the court can take this matter up. And now that we take it up, 40 pages later, he said it is constitutional, in effect, because it is a tax.

So he had to go through all kinds of mental gymnastics to what, in his mind, would prevent him from being classified as a political Chief Justice; but, as a result, he has become one of the most political Chief Justices we have ever had—unfortunately for him and the country.

So who knows. Maybe there will be people on the Supreme Court who will decide to rewrite the Constitution as he, in effect, rewrote the ObamaCare statute. But if you are actually going to follow the Constitution the way it is written and you are not going to rewrite the Constitution at the Supreme Court level, then the truth is, when an amendment fails by its own language and is not ratified, then anybody with any sense would understand you have got to start over.

Though I have plenty of disagreements with Justice Ginsberg over some issues, she has tried to be a person of integrity. Talking about the ERA, she says:

I would like to see a new beginning. I'd like it to start over. There is too much controversy about latecomers—Virginia—long after the deadline passed. Plus, a number of States have withdrawn their ratification. So if you count a latecomer on the plus side, how can you disregard the States that said, "We have changed our minds"?

So it is interesting. Yes, this legislation passed.

JIM SENSENBRENNER from Wisconsin appropriately brought up the point that this is actually amending the Constitution; it is amending the constitutional amendment. So, to be appropriate, it is going to require a two-thirds vote in the House, a two-thirds vote in the Senate, and then 38 States. I believe it is, in order to have it ratified.

That was overruled to reinforce the fact that what we did today is really not constitutional. If we had tried to ratify it as a new amendment, like Justice Ginsberg was talking about, a new constitutional amendment, then, actually, you would, as Justice Ginsberg said, have to be starting the process all over again, and that does require a two-thirds vote here and in the Senate.

So what we did today made people that support it feel good, but it is not going anywhere; and even if it were, hypothetically, it just simply can't pass constitutional muster at the Supreme Court. A majority of the Court appears to believe that the Constitution means what it says.

We had one vote today. It was on the ERA. So we didn't do anything terribly effective today as the House of Representatives.

Also, I noted before I came over for the vote that, apparently, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, it was reported—I don't know if other members of the majority signed the letter, but there was a letter to Attorney General Barr, and it expressed what sounded like the distress of the committee over Attorney General Barr's action in reining in prosecutors who have simply gotten out of hand.

Attorney General Barr has the distinct advantage of having a bigger picture than these four very politically motivated prosecutors who were pushing so hard for virtually the maximum amount of time for Roger Stone to serve in prison.

Anyway, if that letter was going to be truly accurate, it needed to say that this majority that has been trying to throw President Trump out of office, that has been using taxpayer funds for a number of years now to try to defeat President Trump in the 2020 election, which voted for impeachment knowing that President Trump was not going to be removed from office—so it seems the logical conclusion is, again, they were using taxpayer funds to campaign against President Trump, hoping they could besmirch him sufficiently, slander his name sufficiently, that it would help them defeat him in November.

Whereas, the minority of the committee did not agree with the letter because it appears clear to all of the minority I have talked to that Attorney General Barr is trying to do something and incorporate something called fairness in our legal system, because he has seen you had people in the previous administration who strong-armed salespeople into selling guns to people they knew should not have them and that they would end up in the hands of, most likely, Mexican drug cartels. And that is what the administration wanted to do. They were assuring they would be able to follow the guns and intercede, but that is not what happened.

Then we even saw emails that, after this was all exposed, there was an idea that, gee, maybe we can still use the fact that these guns went into criminal hands, even killed one of our own United States agents, a brave soul, Brian Terry, they were hopeful they could still use that to get antigun legislation passed simply based on their criminal activity in trying to get these guns into the hands of criminals who shouldn't have them.

So nobody was held accountable for that. Nobody was held accountable for the guns that were forced into the hands of criminals, ultimately, one of which killed Brian Terry. Nobody was held accountable for any of that.

Nobody was held accountable for destroying evidence after it was subpoenaed, even with a hammer, even with applications like BleachBit, destroying subpoenaed evidence. Nobody was held accountable for any of that.

So across the Nation, it appears maybe a small majority, but a majority, understand and believe that there are two forms of justice in America: one for those high-ranking Democratic officials who are never held accountable at all, and one for Republicans whose lives are attempted to be destroyed and, in some cases, are destroyed.

□ 1200

In some cases, they did nothing wrong. In other cases, they agreed to plead to something just because the bully Federal prosecutors have threatened to go after their family and continue to harass them.

I saw a former Member of Congress from Pennsylvania who had been blasting the FBI back during my first term,

2005–2006, and he was blasting them because he said—and I had not heard of it before, at the time—but a program called Able Danger had been able to identify a majority of the 9/11 hijackers. The FBI had that information. They did nothing with it.

I didn't know if Curt Weldon, the Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, was accurate in what he was saying, but hearing him make these speeches over and over about how the FBI should have acted. They could have prevented thousands of lives from being taken, all of those people from having to jump to their deaths because they didn't want to be burned at the top of the World Trade Center. All of that could have been avoided if the FBI had stepped in and used the information they had to stop 9/11.

I didn't know if that was true or not, but I was thinking, you know, Mueller and the FBI have to respond to Congressman Weldon in some way. They have to. This is really serious stuff. I thought they would make a statement and that they would come back with evidence to refute what he was saying, but they never did that.

What Mueller's FBI did, though—it had to be with his approval, going after a Member of Congress. It was believed that they got a warrant because they raided his daughter's law office. They alerted the media for the early morning raids so there was plenty of media there and plenty of media at his congressional office. People were apparently warned in advance by the FBI because nobody else knew.

They showed up with preprinted signs condemning Curt Weldon, caught red-handed, all of this stuff. It turned out, there was nothing ever done. He told me that, months later, he was contacted by the FBI and told: You can come get all of this material we seized in the raid.

They did the raid 2 weeks before the election, as I recall, about 2 weeks before the election. So the FBI, under Mueller, was able to singlehandedly defeat Curt Weldon. It helped the Democrat opponent to defeat Curt Weldon in the narrow loss that he had.

So the FBI didn't respond with evidence. They just helped manipulate the election system so Curt Weldon would lose. He did, and he said that they told him to come pick up all of this stuff. They never did present it to a grand jury anyway. That was kind of shocking.

So, clearly, Mueller and his FBI were motivated by shutting him up so he couldn't make speeches on the House floor anymore, and that is why the raid was conducted. But in his last most recent visit, Curt was telling me that—by the way, before I wrote about Curt Weldon, I had not seen him nor talked with him since 2006 when he left. I put that in the booklet I wrote titled “Robert Mueller: Unmasked.” I wrote about what happened to Curt.

At this most recent visit this year, he told me that, as he understands, it

turns out the FBI never even got a warrant. They just raided the office without a warrant, like any good dictator would have, the brownshirts. Law enforcement does, in places: We don't need a stinking warrant. We will just go harass and destroy.

That is really shocking if there was not even a warrant. But Mueller was irritated, apparently, with Ted Stevens, so the FBI framed Ted Stevens. It turned out, after he was convicted right before his election—he lost narrowly as a U.S. Senator—an FBI agent filed an affidavit and established how they had created a case against Ted Stevens that didn't exist.

Actually, Ted Stevens had overpaid for improvements to his home. It wasn't an illegal gift. He had overpaid, at one point telling the contractor: Look, I know I am overpaying, but I have people watching. I have to do everything by the book, so just cash the check—that kind of thing.

Anyway, Mueller and his FBI helped defeat Ted Stevens by convicting him right before his election. But then that conviction was thrown out due to the prosecutorial misconduct and, I would say, crimes committed by at least one FBI agent, if not more, and also by prosecutors.

They should have gone to prison for what they did, but I can't help but think that between what the FBI did to Curt Weldon, what they did to Ted Stevens, what they have done to other people with whom they disagree, that it had become a very dangerous place where, if you were in the right political persuasion or took the right positions on the right issues, then you could commit crimes, and the FBI would leave you alone.

If you were of the wrong political positions, on the wrong issues, they would come after you even if they had to frame you or set you up, as they did Ted Stevens and Curt Weldon, destroying their political careers.

So we are at a very dangerous time in this country's history. It used to be that the FBI had the reputation that it was the most trustworthy, effective law enforcement agency body in the world. But that has changed.

Unfortunately, we have an FBI Director—an article said, at one time, back in the Bush administration, he had told James Comey, who has lied, obviously committed crimes—and we can debate about how high or low of a level. But he told Comey: Look, if you and Mueller are going to make a move, I want to be with you guys. I want to go where you are going, when you are going.

Well, that guy who thought so highly of Mueller and Comey was put in a place he never should have been, and that is FBI Director at a time that needed cleaning up.

So I am hopeful that in the days, weeks, or months ahead, we will get a new FBI Director who will be serious about punishing wrongdoing in the FBI, which I believe will help them get back their reputation.

The more Christopher Wray appears to do more covering up than he does making accountable, he really needs to go sooner rather than later. They are not going to get their reputation back simply by ignoring things.

Of course, the FISA court pointed out in an order, after going for years without having any pride or integrity in enforcing their jurisdiction and being offended by fraud upon the court, it finally came out and said: Okay, this one guy, Clinesmith, had changed the wording, basically going from saying he did work for the U.S. Government or the CIA to saying he did not.

So, clearly, 180 degrees opposite of what the truth was, knowing it was false, he submitted it to the court. But that had been clear for months, if not years, and the courts did nothing.

It is what keeps compelling me to think maybe we just need to get rid of the FISA court system and come up with a new way, because I am not sure that the court with the judges who have been appointed to be FISA judges, that we can save that system, that Americans can feel comfortable that their privacy and their civil rights are not being violated by an overzealous group, especially when you look at the thousands and thousands of FISA orders. In 2018, out of mass applications for warrants from the FISA court, I think there was only one they turned down.

Some say: Well, maybe if we have an amicus, a friend of the court who will stand up for the party against whom a warrant is sought, maybe that would help provide enough protection for American civil liberties.

But then we saw in December, I believe it was, FISA court, feeling the heat of all of those who have come to distrust FISA courts, appointed an amicus. It turned out the judge appointed the very lawyer who for years had been trashing DEVIN NUNES and others, who it turns out were 100 percent right in the things they said in their report.

So it appeared clear that the FISA court was not serious about making fixes or changes or protecting civil liberties, but also it had gone into the Christopher Wray mode of covering up, hoping people wouldn't notice that so much illegality and impropriety had been going on.

We are going to be taking up these issues, the controversial section 215 from the PATRIOT Act and other things. Hopefully, we will take up the FISA court.

I am hopeful that we will have bipartisan action because I know from my time on the Judiciary Committee, there have been Democrats—previously, Chairman NADLER had been a staunch proponent of protecting civil liberties, but that appears to be more, nowadays, only protecting civil liberties if you are a Democrat, but not so much if you are part of the Trump administration or a friend of the President.

Hopefully, we can get past some of that and do some good and actually do the job of protecting civil liberties.

I have talked to Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN over the years, including more recently, because she, in the past, has been quite zealous for civil liberties. I understand she has a bill. Hopefully, that will be helpful in dealing with some of these issues.

But I am still concerned that the abuses may have grown so profound that we may not be able to fix the FISA court system. We may need to do as some have said—I think RAND PAUL has talked about just getting rid of it. But we will see where we go.

That same kind of duality justice or dual justice has raised its ugly head in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia. Jessie Liu was the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, and she had some people, it turns out, who were extremely partisan.

In fact, in a case involving Imran Awan, an IT technician here, involved with working with computers for dozens of Democrats on Capitol Hill—since 2004, he had worked, like I say, for dozens of Democratic Representatives. And it is one of the things up here on the Hill, if a Member of Congress tells you, “Oh, this is my computer person. He is great. She is great,” then others will say, “oh, I need somebody, so I will hire them.”

Normally, somebody who does that, since you don't need them full time, they work part time. Under the rules, they are allowed to work for multiple offices as long as their income does not exceed the maximum amount allowed—I think it was around \$170,000, something like that. You could work for multiple offices and accumulate up to that maximum. You can have multiple part-time employees. Apparently, that is what Imran Awan did, and he had a brother.

If you are going to do that kind of work, you have to file financial information, financial statement information. It turns out, he didn't disclose about selling cars or some of the assets or businesses he had, and that is a Federal felony.

□ 1215

He also had filed under the requirements here if you buy something, and I think it is \$500 or more, then you have to have the serial number, you have to keep track of it, and you have to be able to document where that item is at all times if it costs more than \$500.

When I came into office in 2005, there was some couch that was on my inventory. Nobody had seen the couch in many years, but I was told you can't take it off your inventory because it is part of your office. Well, if it had cost less than \$500 then that would not have been an issue. I have no idea where that couch was or is. It wasn't around when I got here.

But Imran Awan, apparently to get around the requirement of keeping se-

rial numbers and keeping track of things that he purchased allegedly on behalf of Congress Members for whom he worked, he would list iPads that cost \$799 as costing \$499 and then say that an insurance policy for it cost \$300, and that way it got around the requirement of keeping information on where those specific items were.

It turns out from, what I have read, it appears he and his brother owed six figures to somebody foreign, I believe. And so instead of paying the person back, they put this guy, who was not a computer technician—just had various Members, oh, apparently he told them, this guy is going to help with your computer system, so we need you to put him on part-time for your office. So he had the Federal taxpayers paying their debt to this guy.

It turns out he had two wives, and one was saying he had a tremendous amount of money. He is from Pakistan, and when he goes back, he is treated like a king by the secret police there, I believe it was ISI. He is constantly sending all kinds of computer equipment back to Pakistan since he was a Pakistan national.

Anyway, he had some ties with some very questionable people. It sounds like maybe the FISA court should have been issuing warrants to look at some of his stuff.

He was arrested in July of 2017 over his alleged involvement in double charging House Democrats for House IT equipment, House computer-type equipment, and privately exposing private information online. A probe of him found more than tens of thousands of dollars in computer technical equipment had been stolen.

He was indicted by a Federal District Court in August of 2017 for “conspiracy to commit bank fraud, bank fraud, making false statements on a loan or credit application, and engaging in unlawful monetary transactions.”

As I recall, he had, I believe it was a cousin who worked at McDonald's. He got him listed on the payroll for different House Members. I am sure they didn't know that he wasn't working. So he helped out the family by bringing in extra income for family members. Each one of those events would have been a Federal felony.

Evidence indicates that Imran Awan and his team members were copying data from the computers of House Members to the House Democratic Caucus server and then even to private Dropbox accounts—totally inappropriate and absolute wrongdoing.

He and his associates were even tossed off the House computer system because they provided false information to Capitol Police that being a fake copy of the Democratic Caucus' server. But incredibly none of that was used by Jessie Liu's attorneys against him. Instead, the U.S. Attorney's office for the District of Columbia opted to let him plead to a charge of just making a false statement on a loan application, disregarding the many, many felonies

that could have been charged and pursued to just find out: Why are you such a hero back in Pakistan?

What equipment are you sending back there?

Where are you getting it from?

How come you committed a felony by not listing your car dealership?

Because as our intel people can tell you, Madam Speaker, one of the ways that money is raised for terrorist activity is through bogus car dealerships where cars are stolen and then shipped. We don't know what the situation was with Imran Awan's alleged car dealership because he didn't have a dealer lot anywhere.

It is handy, though, no matter who you are, if you can have taxpayers pay back your loans by just listing them on the payroll of people whom you lied to about who is doing the work.

The problem, though, if Jessie Liu and these Democrat attorneys in the D.C. U.S. Attorneys' Office had pursued Imran for anything other than making a false statement on his loan, then there would have been a lot of embarrassment for Democratic Members of Congress because they had some guy like that who was cheating taxpayers, cheating the government, and committing crimes working for them. In fairness, it is hard to believe they would have known the kinds of things he was doing and getting away with. Anyway, the Federal judge sentenced him.

He filed saying he was broke, and he had no money. One of his wives said she was threatened by the FBI to keep her mouth shut, but she had indicated that he had all kinds of money. He had gold, and he had all kinds of money that he had been able to save while working for all these different Members of Congress. But he said he was broke. He filed something saying he was broke, and he couldn't pay anything. But then it came down to, in order to get probation he had to pay back six figures to the government. Somehow, he magically came up—I can't remember if it was 100 or \$200,000—he came up with it. He paid it, even though he alleged he was flat broke.

So when we hear about four Federal prosecutors who worked for U.S. Attorney of D.C. Jessie Liu being all upset over the Department of Justice wanting fairness for Roger Stone and not political vengeance, four of them quit. In analyzing who it is and what they were doing and why they quit, I think it is important to see who they are. There have been some good articles written about these people just in the last week.

Jonathan Kravis was appointed by former President Obama to be associate White House Counsel where he served in 2009 and 2010. He worked for Williams & Connolly, a lobbying firm for which Kravis had worked. It has a long history of its employees donating large sums of money to Democratic candidates, organizations, and causes.

He worked with Adam Jed to prosecute Paul Manafort. They went after

him with a vengeance for working for the Ukrainian Government. Manafort was cleared of all charges except two counts of conspiracy to defraud the U.S., for which Manafort is serving a 5-year prison sentence.

Kravis and his wife are connected with Codepink that most people around here know is a far left, anti-war organization.

Then Adam Jed, himself, apparently did work in 2003 or was a fellow at Humanity in Action group, a far-left-wing organization blatantly against political diversity.

He defended the Affordable Care Act contraceptive mandate in the case *Little Sisters of the Poor v. Sebelius*. That is where the Federal Government was going after these nuns who took a vow of poverty but also a vow to help people, and they believed it was against their religion to help pay for abortions. Mr. Jed had no problem in pursuing these poor nuns. That is his choice, but it does give an indication of where he stood, and it is certainly not anywhere close to the beliefs on the pro-life positions of Donald Trump.

Adam Jed also provided oral arguments to strike down the Defense of Marriage Act in the *Defense of Marriage Act v. Windsor*.

He contributed \$1,000 to Josh Kaul's candidacy for Wisconsin State Attorney General. Of course, Kaul was a lawyer for Perkins Coie which funneled money from the Hillary Clinton campaign to Christopher Steele who was the British spy who also apparently utilized other foreigners to try to affect the U.S. election in 2016. So, obviously, Adam Jed would have been supporting Kaul who worked for Perkins Coie.

I know we don't hear a whole lot about it from the other side of the aisle, but the Hillary Clinton campaign and the DNC actually paid foreigners to try to affect our 2016 election.

I constantly hear about how outrageous it was that the now-debunked allegations that the Trump campaign conspired with Russia to affect our election, they don't want to talk about what is slam-dunk proved that the DNC and the Clinton campaign absolutely did pay foreigners to try to affect our election. One foreigner from Italy was involved and a foreigner from Australia.

I know people like to say that there were no Ukrainians involved. That is totally debunked. The mere fact that Russia has constantly tried to affect our elections—so has China and so have other countries—does not mutually exclude the fact that there were Ukrainians who tried to affect our 2016 election. Exhibit A to me, Madam Speaker, would be you had the ambassador from Ukraine to the U.S. write an op-ed trying to prevent Donald Trump from being elected President.

That is foreign interference within an election. So, anyway, I don't know where they are getting this stuff, oh, that is Russian propaganda. The only

Russian propaganda that has been the most effective is propaganda from Russia that wants to divide America, and they have done a marvelous job at dividing America instead of bringing us together.

One of the other attorneys who resigned all upset about the treatment of—well, Attorney General Barr wanting them to pull their fangs back in and not try to be so vengeful simply because Roger Stone was a friend of the President. There is no indication the President had hired him to do anything, but they sure went after him because of a connection.

Michael Marando prosecuted the Imran Awan case. He is the guy who let him get away with all of this other activity without proper investigation.

In fact, there was an inspector general here. She ended up being, I think, president of some international technology organization. She was amazing. She had all kinds of evidence to prove felony cases against Imran Awan, but representatives from the U.S. Attorney's Office, I don't know if it was Michael Marando himself, the FBI, working at their behest, ended up threatening her: Don't you bring your notebook with all that evidence.

Then they turned around and later reportedly said: Oh, we interviewed her, she didn't have anything.

Yes, when you ordered her not to bring it to show you the cases against Imran Awan.

□ 1230

But that is Michael Marando. He laid him off with a wrist slap. I don't see how you can find any other basis other than Marando's political motivation. But he didn't pursue any of these other charges, and the question still exists.

As I understand, Imran Awan has filed a lawsuit, and it appears his intention is to try to get back on the gravy train here where he was on Capitol Hill, to get people to sign up to use him. I think there are enough people who got burned that it would probably be hard for him to do.

But a lawsuit, of course, when I heard that he has a lawsuit, that means discovery is in order. I am hopeful discovery will bring out all the lies and the crimes that it appears that he has committed. But no thanks to Michael Marando. He certainly didn't do anything that would have hurt Democrats on Capitol Hill but went out of his way to want to destroy Roger Stone.

Aaron Zelensky started his career as a special assistant to Koh, who was the State Department legal adviser in the Obama administration, but he has also clerked for what I felt was one of the most liberal judges ever, Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens.

He played a key role in obtaining a guilty plea from a guy who was an adviser at one time, Papadopoulos. This poor guy, he didn't have money. When the FBI and the D.C. U.S. Attorney's Office came after him, Mueller's people, he didn't have money to fight.

He was being overwhelmed. They intimidated him enough into his agreeing to plead guilty to a minor charge.

But Zelensky was handpicked by Mueller when he was selecting people who hated Trump. Zelensky was hand-picked to be an investigator in that probe. Before joining the Mueller team, Zelensky worked for Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein.

Anyway, these people certainly had a lot of political baggage. They were clearly on a vendetta. They weren't pursuing justice. They were pursuing political vendettas, trying to get at President Trump.

There are tens of millions of dollars that were spent investigating what we now know was the Russia hoax. There was no collusion or conspiracy between the Trump campaign and Russia, despite what people are trying to allude to now. It wasn't. The evidence wasn't there. Mueller was disappointed. Weissmann was disappointed. All of these left-wingers were disappointed that, despite all the intimidation, all the threats, they couldn't find somebody who could actually implicate any kind of collusion or conspiracy between the Trump campaign and Russia.

But on Roger Stone's sentencing, when he was convicted, one of the charges was witness tampering. It sure sounds like he was kidding around by saying: Hey, I may have to come over and kill your dog.

I mean, who says that if they are not kidding? That is not all that effective of a threat. But when you have a judge who can't stand the Trump administration, and you have a juror who gets on—I would really like to know what kind of questions the jury was asked during voir dire. If Roger Stone's attorneys did not ask the jury panel their feelings about Donald Trump, then it sure sounds like that would have been malpractice. Roger should have a great case against his own lawyers, plus a great case on appeal for their impropriety as his attorneys.

But I find it hard to believe they wouldn't ask something about that because there is clearly some type of Trump derangement system. Some very smart, well-balanced people get so angry and frustrated over President Donald Trump that they don't think as straight as they normally would.

But to have the foreperson of the jury, the head juror who controls the discussions, shut people down, encourage other people to speak—the head foreperson hates Donald Trump.

Anyway, it is amazing the efforts that the Department of Justice, at least the U.S. Attorney's Office, had gone to, to become a tool for injustice. They wanted to max this guy out, the poor guy. Unbelievable.

I have sent people to prison for life. I have sent people to prison for 10 years, 9 years. I have had to look people in the eye and order them to be taken to the Texas Department of Criminal Justice and put to death. Those are serious matters, and you simply cannot let any

type of vengeance or political persuasion affect you.

I know in east Texas, we have assistant U.S. attorneys who vote Democrat. But when it comes to enforcing the law, they enforce the law. They don't care what party you are. And it is so tragic, right here in our Nation's Capital, our own Justice Department, in our own D.C. U.S. Attorney's Office, you have people who are not nearly as just and fair as you find all over the country in most U.S. Attorney's Offices.

Another issue of the local D.C. U.S. Attorney's Office was a guy named James Wolfe. He was indicted by a Federal grand jury on three counts of violating title 18, U.S. Code, Section 1001. At the time he made the alleged false statements to the FBI, James Wolfe was director of security for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and that was a position he had held for about 29 years.

As the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence director of security, James Wolfe was entrusted with access to classified, secret, and top-secret information provided by the executive branch, including the United States intelligence community that they provided to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

Wolfe was alleged to have lied to FBI agents in December 2017 about his repeated contacts with three reporters, including through his use of encrypted messaging applications. Wolfe is further alleged to have made false statements to the FBI about providing two reporters with nonpublic information related to the matters occurring before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.

He was sentenced to 2 months in prison, 4 months supervised release for lying to the FBI. He has to complete 20 hours of community service—20 hours a month during his release for those 4 months—and pay a \$7,500 fine.

You compare what he did with what Roger Stone did. Roger Stone wasn't dealing with any classified information, secret or top secret. He used some bad judgment. But Jesse Liu's attorneys, these four who have now quit—thank God they quit.

We need to get some people in there where, when it comes to prosecuting, it doesn't matter what the defendant's political persuasion is. You seek justice. And there are Democratic and Republican attorneys, prosecutors, around the country who are quite capable of doing that. So I sure hope that we will get some better attorneys in the D.C. U.S. Attorney's Office.

It is amazing. I thought about Sergeant York, that movie. I believe Gary Cooper played Sergeant York. They were in the trenches, and they couldn't see the bad guys to stop them. He ends up using a turkey call that he used back when he was turkey hunting. One after another, enemy soldiers would stick their head up, and he was able to knock them off and eventually capture

this huge group. But in order to prevail, they had to get them to stick their heads up.

I think that is what this Trump derangement syndrome has done. There are people who have been working pervasively and, apparently, with political vendettas, but they have been able to stay below the radar. Along comes President Trump, and they get so deranged that they expose who they are.

So I thank all those political opportunists and zealots who use their position in the U.S. Government, including the Department of Justice, who have now exposed themselves.

Vindman is one those people who have exposed his animosity, and it is really good that he is no longer part of the National Security Council. It is good his brother is no longer in the Office of General Counsel. I think we will see less leaks now that he is gone from there.

Anyway, we are starting to see those people who have exposed themselves as political operatives, rather than doing justice, or following the orders of their Commander in Chief, we are seeing them exposed. We are seeing them moved out.

I am hoping, in the days ahead, there will be a lot more of that occurring. I think justice will be served better so the American people can feel more like—and not one party or another. People need to be able to feel, as a whole, regardless of the political persuasion of some prosecutor, that justice is being pursued and done, as it is being done in so many Federal districts all over the country. It has been a problem here in Washington, D.C.

When that happens, we will all be better off.

Madam Speaker, with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING DR. STEPHEN A. HOLDITCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) for 30 minutes.

(Mr. FLORES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLORES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Stephen A. Holditch of College Station, Texas, who passed away unexpectedly on August 9, 2019.

Before I continue our discussion about Steve, I want to give some context about the importance of his professional career.

Let me state, first, that Steve considered his roles as a husband, a father, and a grandfather to be his most important. Because of the exceptional way that he lived those roles, his legacy is readily apparent in the lives of those he left behind—his wife, Ann; his daughters, Katie and Abbie; and their five grandchildren.

The discussion of his professional accomplishments starts with a description of current energy metrics.

Today, the United States of America is blessed to be the number one producer of oil and gas in the world. As of this year, we are a net exporter of oil and natural gas. Reserves of American oil and natural gas rank us among the top 10 countries in the world. We also lead the industrialized world in the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions over the last two decades.

□ 1245

Ten years ago, no one would have ever predicted that we would be where we are today.

This new world of American energy dominance is having dramatic implications, both domestically and internationally. We have secure, stable, environmentally responsible, and attractively-priced energy sources for American families and businesses. We have become a reliable source of energy for our allies, giving them flexibility to move away from unstable Russian and Middle Eastern energy suppliers.

The oil and gas sector of our economy has created millions of good jobs and great paychecks for hardworking Americans. Our balance of trade payments has improved, and our geopolitical position has strengthened.

This dramatic energy renaissance didn't happen by accident or because of government. It is because of the result of American ingenuity, research, and bold leadership. While no one person is solely responsible for this seismic shift in American energy, there are a number of bold leaders who took these challenges that looked impossible to solve and then solved them; particularly in the area of stimulation of low permeability, or "tight" reservoirs. Their developments, studies, research, and field experiments using horizontal drilling and very large hydraulic fracturing treatments revolutionized American oil and natural gas and transformed our economy and our security.

One of those bold leaders was the late George P. Mitchell, Texas A&M Class of 1940. Another is the person that we are honoring today, Dr. Stephen A. Holditch, Texas A&M Class of 1969.

Stephen Holditch was born on October 20, 1946, in Corsicana, Texas, to Damon and Margie Holditch. Growing up, Steve and his family moved often while his father pursued a career in the oil and gas industry. He spent most of his childhood in San Antonio before moving to Richardson, Texas for his final year of high school, where he graduated in 1965.

Following graduation, Steve attended Texas A&M University, where he joined the Corps of Cadets and began his journey as a Fighting Texas Aggie. Steve quickly excelled, both in academics and in the Corps of Cadets. While at A&M, he was a member of Company F-1, a member of the prestigious Ross Volunteers Honor Guard, and a member of the Ross Volunteers Firing Squad. During his senior year, he served as Second Battalion Commander.

In 1969, Steve graduated from A&M with a bachelor of science degree in petroleum engineering. He continued at A&M to earn a master's degree in the same discipline.

Steve began his career with Shell Oil Company in Houston, Texas. Much of his work over his 5 years at Shell was focused on designing and pumping large hydraulic fracture treatments to stimulate production from the deep, low permeability, geopressured gas reservoirs in South Texas.

It was his work with hydraulic fracturing that inspired him to return to Texas A&M and that set him apart from his peers as a true legend in the oil and gas industry for the advancement of this critically important technology.

One day in 1970, Steve was riding the elevator at work and met Ann Friddle, who was also working at Shell. Steve and Ann were married 6 months later, on January 9, 1971, and they had been married for over 48 years when he passed away.

He and Ann returned to College Station, and he pursued a Ph.D. in petroleum engineering, which he completed in 1975. In 1976, Steve joined the Texas A&M petroleum engineering faculty and, as if he didn't have enough to do as a young father and as a new professor, he started his own consulting company, S.A. Holditch & Associates.

S.A. Holditch & Associates quickly became a worldwide powerhouse in the petroleum engineering space. Over the years, Steve earned a reputation for being able to solve the most difficult petroleum engineering problems, especially those dealing with low permeability reservoirs needing stimulation, typically through hydraulic fracturing.

He was distinctly proud of the work Holditch & Associates did alongside the Gas Research Institute to advance understanding of low permeability sandstones, shales, and coalbed methane.

After over 20 years of success, Steve chose to sell Holditch & Associates to Schlumberger, where he stayed on as a fellow, the highest technical designation in that organization. As a Schlumberger fellow for 5 years, Steve traveled extensively to help solve some of the world's most difficult petroleum engineering problems.

In 1995, at age 49, Steve was elected to the National Academy of Engineering, the highest honor that can be given to an engineer. After many years of service to the Society of Petroleum Engineers, or the SPE, Steve was elected to the board of directors, then vice president of finance, and finally president of this global organization with over 70,000 members.

He was awarded almost every recognition that SPE has to give, including three of the society's top awards. He was elected as an SPE honorary member in 2006, the highest award that SPE can bestow upon an individual and was officially named a Legend of Hydraulic Fracturing by SPE in 2014.

While Steve enjoyed many professional successes in the commercial re-

gime, many of his greatest accomplishments were at Texas A&M University, where he served on the faculty for 37 years. During his tenure, he taught 97 courses and served on over 150 graduate committees.

From 2004–2012, Steve worked as head of the Harold Vance Department of Petroleum Engineering. During this time, he revitalized the Crisman Institute for Petroleum Research, and saw the number of students in the petroleum engineering department more than double. Under his leadership, the department quickly earned a reputation as the number one ranked university petroleum engineering department in the world.

It was during his time at Texas A&M that he created his second legacy for America's hydrocarbon industry; the thousands of Aggie petroleum engineers who work around the world every day utilizing Steve's teaching and mentoring to solve the world's greatest energy challenges. Their work, alongside the work of other industry legends, like George P. Mitchell and Michel T. Halbouty, along with Stephen Holditch, have contributed significantly to America's energy dominance that is changing the world today.

In 2013, Steve retired from the faculty after many years of dedicated service to the Texas A&M community. Throughout his life, Steve often credited Texas A&M University as the foundation from which his success grew. He praised the values instilled in all Aggies and, in 2014, was named a Texas A&M Distinguished Alumnus, an honor he richly deserved for a life of service and devotion to his beloved university.

In thanking the Aggie community, Steve said: "You will look back at your years at Texas A&M as one of the best periods in your life. Always remember the Aggie Code of Honor."

In 2016, Steve was inducted into the Corps of Cadets Hall of Honor, an award which made him prouder and happier than perhaps any award he had received in his life.

While in retirement, Steve enjoyed spending time in Bryan-College Station with his wife, Ann, their two daughters, and their five grandchildren. As a season ticket holder to a variety of Texas A&M sports, Steve continued to support the Aggies, but Fighting Texas Aggie football remained closest to his heart.

Steve contributed a great deal to the Texas A&M community, and can be described as a model Texas Aggie, who was true to his core values of excellence, integrity, leadership, loyalty, respect, and selfless service. One of my favorite phrases that Steve often used was: "I reserve the right to get smarter." That is what he did best, always pushing to find solutions to the world's toughest oil and gas challenges.

Madam Speaker, Steve's life was defined by his dedication to his family and his friends, his world-changing accomplishments in energy, and his true

love of Texas A&M University. He will be forever remembered as a true pioneer in his field, a devoted husband, a father, a grandfather, a teacher, a mentor, and a friend.

My father has a saying: "Go make a hand."

Madam Speaker, Steve Holditch truly "made a hand" for his family, his university, his community, our country, and our world.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Holditch family. We also lift up the family and friends of Steve Holditch in our prayers.

I have requested that the United States flag be flown over our Nation's Capitol to honor the life and legacy of Dr. Stephen A. Holditch.

As I close, I would ask all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from threats abroad, and for our first responders who keep us safe here at home.

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

THE PENDING DEBT TSUNAMI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, as I get set up, in past years, when I used to have to sit up there, it was because the Speaker was annoyed with me. I am sure that would never happen in your case. You don't have to say anything.

Madam Speaker, I try to come to the floor every week and sort of talk about what we see actually happening in the economy, what is happening in jobs, and those things. But it is more of a global discussion. And part of that discussion is we see the stories, we know the facts; we are about to be buried in a debt tsunami. And it is not Republicans and Democrats. It is demographics.

There are 74 million of us who are baby boomers; 74 million. We are halfway through turning 65, moving into our earned benefits. And it is such a difficult subject around here because, the fact of the matter is, as soon as you use the word Medicare or Social Security in any type of discussion, even when you are passionately trying to protect those programs, in our modern politics of rage, you just wrote an attack ad saying, well, he talked about Medicare; he must be meaning to do something. That is absurd. If we are not talking about it, we are not going to save them.

Here is the thought experiment. Next 5 years, just the growth of Social Security, Medicare, healthcare entitlements, but mostly Medicare, just the growth, equals the entire Defense Department.

Last week, I was here with some boards walking you through, showing

that almost all the 30-year debt, almost every dime of it, is just Social Security and Medicare. It is demographics. And my passion is, I believe there is a way we keep our promises, by using a calculator, by using, actually, economic modeling, using the tools we have around us.

The problem is, in this body, it is complex. Our ability to do simple things the last year has been just incredibly heartbreaking because everything is right now about political gamesmanship, one-upmanship, trying to get the lead, instead of dealing with the reality. It is complex.

So I put up this slide almost every time I come speak, trying to make the point that if you can grow the economy through tax policy, through trade policy, through smart regulations, population stability, getting the immigration system correct, family formation, the adoption of disruptive technology in healthcare—and we are going to talk about that a little bit today—incentives to stay in the labor force.

We are having a miracle right now, mathematically, of the number of our brothers and sisters who are in the labor force and moving into the labor force.

Last Friday, the number of folks who moved from not even looking that entered the labor force was stunning. I know that is geeky, but it is really, really, really important.

I have sat on the Joint Economic Committee now for years, and it was only 3 or 4 years ago we would have these really smart economists come and tell us that labor force participation was going to crash; this type of full employment economy was impossible.

It is here. These types of wage gains, as you know, we just had to recalculate. The productivity numbers turned out to be much higher in 2019 than we thought they were.

How do we take what is working right now, expand those concepts so we hit a level of economic stability and growth that gives us a fighting chance not to be buried in debt? And how does that become partisan rage around here?

I accept my brothers and sisters on the left live in an economic folklore of, well, we will tax rich people, and that will take care of it. And my brothers and sisters with me on the Republican side, we often will get behind microphones and say things like, well, it is waste and fraud. None of those are true.

Let's just, for once, try to tell the truth about the math. The math is stunningly ugly. Simple concepts.

And even last week, I think I brought this board here. If you take the next 30 years, and you pull Social Security and Medicare out, that next 30 years—and I have a 4-year old; I would really like her to have the same type of future I got to experience in my life. But if I strip Social Security and Medicare out of the next 30 years, we have \$23 tril-

lion in the bank. We are \$23 trillion positive. Not inflation adjusted; that is the raw number.

If I pull Social Security and Medicare back into that 30-year window, we are \$103 trillion in debt. And if you want to do constant dollars removed, then drop the number by a third.

□ 1300

You cannot be intellectually credible, honest walking behind these microphones saying you are going to protect Social Security, you are going to protect Medicare, and then not be willing to talk about the actual math. Because I think there is a way that we keep our promises; it just means we have to do everything.

So one of the first things I want to walk through today is a concept, and I am desperately trying to sell and have this sort of become intellectually sort of socialized.

The ACA, ObamaCare, if you really strip it down, what was it? It was a financing bill. Take it down to its most basic. This is hard for a lot of us to accept, but it was who got subsidized and who had to pay.

Our Republican alternative, if you really strip it down, what was it? It was a financing bill. It is who got to pay and who got subsidized.

We almost never have an honest argument around here of what to do to crash the price of healthcare. We have lots of discussions of little incremental changes, and all those incremental changes are important, whether it be HSAs, whether it be disclosures of cost and these things. Wonderful. But they are dishonest when you start to understand the scale—the scale—of what is coming at us.

Back to that 5 years; make it 10 years. Just the growth of Social Security, mostly Medicare, healthcare entitlements, equals the entire discretionary budget. Just the growth portion.

So what do you do to disrupt the cost of healthcare? And my argument is we need to legalize technology.

I am not going to show it today, but in the past, I have come here and shown that we now have the technology; it is in its final stages of hopefully being perfected. It looks like a big kazoo. You blow into it and it instantly tells you you have the flu. It instantly could bang off your medical records on your phone, instantly order your antivirals.

The algorithm we know right now is incredibly accurate, except that technology is illegal in today's conscript. Think of that.

So how do you disrupt healthcare prices? Well, one, I am going to take us to something a little bit different.

Did you know that almost a half a trillion a year—actually, over half a trillion a year, 16 percent of our entire healthcare cost, is just people not following the rules for their pharmaceuticals. They don't take their hypertension medicine. They take too much

of this. They don't take this. That is an adherence problem.

Sixteen percent of our entire healthcare cost is the failure to follow your pharmaceutical protocols. That is not drug pricing; that is not prescription pricing; that is not a PBM; that is not a benefit. That is just you and I, as Americans, we are not following the rules for the pharmaceuticals we have.

Well, it turns out the fastest thing you and I could do to actually have an immediate pop-down on the price of healthcare is actually change pharmaceutical adherence.

Well, it turns out we have technology for that, and here is the thought experiment. We have pill bottle tops that tell you when you open it up or if you didn't open it up, and it will ping you.

So we know right now the adherence of taking your hypertension medicine is one of the most powerful things we can do to actually crash the price of healthcare, but you have got to take it. How many of us forget?

Well, the fact of the matter is, for a few dollars, we could issue that pill bottle with a cap that starts pinging your phone, pinging your family, pinging whoever the hell you want to ping that you didn't follow the rules.

We have actually brought the display here before. It looks like a little dome. It actually distributes pharmaceuticals into a cup.

So, if you are my grandmother, rest her soul, and you have a couple pills you take in the morning, one for digestion at lunch, and a couple before you go to bed, it actually will distribute those at the proper time, in the proper amounts, and then tell you, reminds you, reminds the family if that little cup with the pharmaceuticals hasn't been touched.

It turns out it is a technology solution, and it is a half-a-trillion-a-year issue. Yeah, it is a little hard to explain, but 16 percent of our healthcare cost is just not taking our pharmaceuticals properly.

Is this Republican or Democrat? It is just what we are. And the fact of the matter is a bunch of really creative entrepreneurs, these small, disruptive tech companies, are coming up with a solution.

How do we make that part of what we are trying to move forward? How do you make it reimbursable? How do you actually take Medicare part D and say, instead of the rules right now where someone is supposed to be trying to call, actually, widen up that definition so they could also be providing the technology to make sure someone is taking those pharmaceuticals in the proper fashion?

I am begging this place to open up our minds and think a bit more creatively about what do we do to disrupt the price of healthcare, because, remember, that 30-year debt curve, it is mostly healthcare. And, guess what. Technology is about to help us disrupt it if we could just make that technology legal, reimbursable, part of our plan. We can do some amazing things.

And, actually, in this hyperpartisan environment, this technology hasn't been made Republican or Democrat yet. I am sure we will find a way. What will happen is one of the corporate executives will write someone a check, and we will decide they are all left and right, and we will beat the crap out of each other, but right now, this is an actual solution.

There are other really amazing disruptions coming, and I think this one may have been shown at the consumer electronics show. I am not even sure I understand all the things it does, but this, in many ways, is a doctor visit in your pocket. It does about a dozen different things where it can actually do a number of different tests, and it is in your medicine cabinet.

How do we encourage this type of technology? Because, day after day, we will have individuals coming to us and saying: We have a crisis in the United States. We don't have enough primary care physicians.

They are absolutely right.

So, how do we help those primary care professionals? By saying we can have some technology where it is the type of thing where you can blow into it, you can prick your finger, or it can do this, this, this, this, and it is incredibly accurate. And it is available to you instantly because it is in your own home medicine cabinet.

Let me give you one. What would happen if you could have a major, highly accurate disease detection technology, and it doesn't have to be in your medicine cabinet, but it could be at your local CVS Pharmacy? It turns out this technology looks like it has been perfected.

Your lungs throw off—forgive me, I am going to try to get my technology right. Your lungs actually become part of your body that your blood circulates completely through, I think, every couple minutes. Your breath actually has thrown off proteins and other things that can be detected.

I showed this a couple months ago. Some researchers, I think, are actually working on it, an extension of that flu kazoo that can pick up 20 different types of dead cancer proteins and let you know you have them.

Well, it turns out this technology, actually, now exists today, and the ability of it to actually look for dozens of different types of ailments, a number of different types of cancers. What you do is you just breathe into it for a couple minutes.

Why aren't we running as fast as we can to make this part of our community?

We talk about access to care. The fact of the matter is that supercomputer you hold in your pocket you call your phone, its algorithm, tied in with these types of sensors, whether it be the oxygen sensor I played with last year—I am a severe asthmatic, and we just played with it, and it was helping me dial up and, for the most part, dial down my inhaled steroids. Now, tech-

nically, it was illegal because it is prescribing to me, and it hadn't been approved.

From that flu kazoo I just described to you that is unreimbursable and, ultimately, illegal because the algorithm is writing a prescription to something like this that can do a stunning number of diagnostics if you are just willing to breathe into it for 10 minutes, the miracle is here.

Is this Republican or Democrat? It is neither. It is the future. But, in so many ways, Congress has become the barrier, stopping, holding back the technology disruptions that actually could help us crash the price. And, instead, we seem so much more comfortable having debates about, "Well, who should get subsidized?" "Who should we finance?" "Who should be regulated?" "Who should be controlled?" instead of, "Let's set people free."

We have technology that can help you manage yourself, know what is going on, detect blood cancers through breathing. Why aren't we running as fast as we can to get these things to market to disrupt the price of healthcare?

And, look, it is not a complex premise. We can make the economy grow like crazy. We have seen the expansive effects of the tax reform and some of the regulatory reforms. We have to get the immigration system correct, moving more to a talent-based system. We have to do the incentives for labor force participation. There is a whole bunch of things we need to do, and we just know the economics there.

The hardest part is, as a society, none of that is going to matter unless we have a disruption in the price curve of healthcare delivery. And I am going to argue there is a path, and it is here.

Can I give you sort of a thought experiment? Should Congress have slowed down the internet a decade ago to protect Blockbuster Video?

Think about it. If Blockbuster Video had gone out and hired an army of lobbyists walking around the hallways here, Congress is somewhat in the protection bracket, should we have slowed down the internet to keep that Netflix from putting them out of business?

Of course not. That is absurd, isn't it? Yet Congress does that with all sorts of rules, whether it be reimbursement, the cynicism toward algorithmic health and sensors and these things that can help our medical community, because we will often get certain lobby groups and others who will come in the door and say: This will be really disruptive to our business model. Can you slow it down?

And every day we slow these things down, you are crushing my little girl's future, but you are also crushing the rest of this country because the debt curve is crashing down on us if you actually look at the debt that is going to come out this year.

There was a 4-month report from Treasury yesterday that basically said,

hey, receipts—and I am blessed to be on the Ways and Means Committee—receipts. We don't call them, actually, revenues, but receipts and tax are really healthy.

Last year, we grew over 4 percent, but we spent over 8 percent, and then we will beat up each other, saying: "Well, you wanted to expand this program," or, "You wanted to expand that program."

The fact of the matter is the expansion defense, the expansion of other programs is a fraction of that growth. Almost all that growth in spending is demographics. It is the reality. Those of us who are baby boomers are moving into our earned benefits and we never set aside the money for it, so, if you can keep the promises.

Are you willing to do the combination of things—and you have got to do them all because, it turns out, if you do the labor participation incentives to enter and stay and get involved in the labor force, to do that well, you actually need to be doing things over here in technology that make it available for those who may have certain barriers.

Over here, for certain people with barriers, you have to have regulations that actually work rationally with our brothers and sisters who may have those barriers. It all has to come together.

Can Congress do something that is complex, because it turns out there is no simple solution. There is a complex one, and there is a path.

And the scary part—understand, when we do the math, and this is something I have been doing for a couple years, we still think we hit about 95 percent of debt to GDP. My goal is just to hold us there and not blow through that. It is possible. Can Congress become creative?

So the next one I want to go through, and this is actually sort of fun for me. This is actually one of my older displays. It is from a year or so ago, because I have this fascination with something they call carbon capture.

So a couple years ago, they finally built an electric facility outside Texas, La Porte, Texas, wherever that is. I am sure it is a lovely place. But imagine—and there are two of them. There is a natural gas and a coal-fired power plant, and they don't have smokestacks.

On the natural gas one, they came up with this crazy idea. I think it is called the Allam cycle. You blow up the natural gas, and you actually use the carbon, the burnt, and slam that through the turbines, and then at the other side, you cool it and capture it.

□ 1315

You go, oh, God, we haven't been doing that?

We, last year, in the Ways and Means Committee, perfected, and now we are going to try to do it more, something they call 45Q, which is the incentive to capture and then, over here, to sequester that CO₂. Great.

You get some of those who are cynical saying, well, it can't work, or it is going to be too expensive. We are going to have a little fun with the "too expensive."

The best technology we had last year was a facility, I believe, that is going up in Canada. The Gates Foundation and others are investing in it. Their best number was about \$100 a ton. It is \$100 a ton for substantially pure carbon.

Everybody who geeks out on carbon change and those things, you know you can do lots of things with it. You can, through a chemical process, turn it back into clean-burning fuel. You can do what they do in Texas and other places, which is to pump it in the ground and use it for enhanced oil recovery. But \$100 a ton was sort of our best bet.

I beg of you, if you are someone who is interested in the technology of carbon capture, I want you to go grab your phone and look up the news stories from last October. I want you to put this into your search engine: MIT ambient carbon capture.

Some researchers at MIT last year had just this wonderfully elegant breakthrough. They have a really nice video, if you are not particularly technical, sort of showing how they did nanotubes and electric plates, where they can power them up, power them down, power them up, power them down. They can do this in an ambient environment, so on the roof of your home or on top of a smokestack.

In part of the articles, if I am reading it properly, it wasn't \$100 or \$150 a ton. It is down to \$50 a ton. Their model says it is down to \$50 a ton. You do realize that is almost the market price today?

It turns out, if you are someone who cares about the issue of CO₂ in the environment, we have just had a major breakthrough. And how much discussion does it get? This has been since October. How much joy have you seen in newspapers and articles, talking about a revolutionary breakthrough? And we can be doing mining, because we have to deal with this reality.

The United States has gotten dramatically cleaner in the last 15 years. Good. But a whole bunch of the rest of the world hasn't. Unless we are arrogant enough that we think we are going to turn around carbon-use policies in a bunch of the rest of the world, we are out of our minds.

It turns out we can grow our economy; we can continue to use hydrocarbons; and we have a technology that not only would mine our own CO₂ but would help us on everything else that is being generated in other places in the world.

I am going to digress for just a second. This isn't that same sort of theme. I have come here behind the microphone before and talked about plastic in the ocean.

Before I got this crazy job, I used to love to scuba dive, and we talk all the

time about plastic in the ocean. Here in Washington, D.C., we do lots of virtue signaling. We made paper straws. Of course, how much U.S. and North American plastic actually ends up in the ocean? Substantially none. Ninety percent of the plastic in the ocean comes from 10 rivers, 8 in Asia, 2 in Africa.

If you cared about plastic in the ocean, you would go to the 10 rivers that are 90 percent of the plastic—8 in Asia, 2 in Africa—and you would do something. You would create a value for the plastic.

As Republicans, we are trying to do that. But it blows up some of the folklore around here of, well, if we do paper straws in Washington, D.C., we make an effect. Come on.

Look, I understand we live in a world where everything is political, and the virtue signaling makes us feel better. Wouldn't you really prefer to do something that makes a difference?

Back to this concept, a major breakthrough in how you capture carbon, you can do it right out of the air. Now, that is one of the amazing things in this article. It works in ambient air. It doesn't have to be on top of a smokestack.

A couple of days ago, there is an article—one of my personal fascinations, as those of you who claim to pay attention to this know, is the math on methane. As you all know, a couple of years ago, we had to recalculate methane's half-life, so a lot of the old formulas were all wrong. Now, we think methane is about 9 years. But the accepted ratio right now is 1 ton of methane equals 84 tons of carbon.

Okay, so the picture alongside me, because it was the best picture I had, is a flare in remote Texas. They are doing their best to burn off that methane. Someone just came up with the idea: Why don't we just back up a truck, chill it, super-chill it like we do with liquefied gas? We get a valuable commodity, and we capture all of it. And remember the ratio 84-to-1? Well, we incentivize this.

We are already doing the 45Q to create a tax incentive to capture carbon and sequester it or use it in some other things. Wouldn't it make sense to do that same sort of model with methane?

We came behind these mikes a year or 2 ago and showed just the math possibility that a major pipeline to capture methane from oil country, just that single pipeline functioning, it got you just to the Paris accords, slightly below.

The blowback I got was crazy. "Oh, I don't like pipelines." You are saying: "But did you see the math that just this one thing actually had this huge"—"but I don't like pipelines." We need to stop dealing in absurdity.

It turns out, we may be able to do it without the pipeline. Now it is a truck, backing up, chilling it, capturing it. We need to understand things like this. If a portable LNG truck capturing the methane is a solution, is that Republican or Democrat?

Well, in this environment right now, maybe it is Republican, because some of my brothers and sisters on the left hate these technologies. Sorry, that is unfair. A number of them are skeptical of technologies that allow us to keep using hydrocarbons.

My argument is, embrace, love the science, love the technology. It will set you free. Because these things make a difference.

We live in the time of miracles, whether it be healthcare technology or whether it be the single-shot cure for hemophilia. You all saw the article a couple of days ago that we think we might also have a cure for hemophilia, not only A, but B also.

The cures, whether it be for curing people in the chronic population, technology for our environment, or technology to crash the price of healthcare, they are here.

You know, one of the biggest barriers to the disruption that could help us continue to grow the economy, could help us have enough robustness in that economy so we can keep our promises and at the same time get a cleaner environment and healthier economy is this body and its inability to stop the arrogance and thinking that we are so smart, that we think we know what tomorrow's technology is.

When I first got elected, we had a family joke. "When are the two times in life you think you know everything?" "When you are 13 years old and the day after you get elected to Congress." And the family would laugh and then make fun of me.

Now that I have been here a few years, I worry. We have lots of good people, lots of really smart people. And all day long, we are pounded by folks who are trying to protect their business models or their bureaucracy models.

I am begging us, we need to understand the tsunami of debt that is on the horizon, and it turns out, technology is about to provide us solutions that don't bankrupt us and actually provide the solution and don't put government in charge of every aspect of our lives.

This should be a story of incredible hope and excitement. But can we break through the politics of arrogance that we have around here and start being willing to push the envelope of the actual solutions?

Madam Speaker, thank you for tolerating me. I appreciate it. I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 14, 2020, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

3803. A letter from the Acting Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Streamlining and Aligning Formaldehyde Emission Control Standards for Certain Wood Products in Manufactured Home Construction With Title VI of the Toxic Substance Control Act [Docket No.: FR 6018-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AJ42) received February 11, 2020, 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.

3804. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Advisory — Prudent Management of Agricultural Lending During Economic Cycles received February 11, 2020, 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.

3805. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (18-1 and 18-4); Technical Correction [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2018-0627 and EPA-HQ-OPPT-2018-0697; FRL-10003-45] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received February 12, 2020, 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.

3806. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Stationary Combustion Turbines Residual Risk and Technology Review [EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0688; FRL-10005-14-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT00) received February 12, 2020, 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.

3807. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Salt Lake County, Utah County, and Ogden City PM10 Redesignation to Attainment, Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes and State Implementation Plan Revisions [EPA-R08-OAR-2019-0276; FRL-10004-94-Region 8] received February 12, 2020, 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.

3808. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Wyoming [EPA-R08-OAR-2019-0419; FRL-10004-97-Region 8] received February 12, 2020, 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.

3809. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Georgia: Final Approval and Incorporation by Reference of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions [EPA-R04-UST-2019-0310; FRL-10004-27-Region 4] received February 12, 2020, 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.

3810. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Iowa; Linn County; State Implementation Plan [EPA-R07-OAR-2019-0477; FRL-10005-35-Region 7] received February 12, 2020, 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.

3811. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Washington; Revised Public Notice Provisions and Other Miscellaneous Revisions [EPA-R10-OAR-2019-0635; FRL-10005-18-Region 10] received February 12, 2020, 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.

3812. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Allegheny County Administrative Revisions to Definitions, Remedies, and Enforcement Orders Sections and Incorporation by Reference of National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0483; FRL-10005-16-Region 3] received February 12, 2020, 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.

3813. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; 2019 Amendments to West Virginia's Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0553; FRL-10005-49-Region 3] received February 12, 2020, 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.

3814. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Revisions to NOx SIP Call and CAIR Rules [EPA-R05-OAR-2018-0634; FRL-10005-34-Region 5] received February 12, 2020, 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.

3815. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Transmission Planning Reliability Standard TPL-001-5 [Docket No.: RM19-10-000] received February 11, 2020, 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.

3816. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG — Final Safety Evaluation of Technical Specification Task Force Traveler TSTF-541, Revision 2, "Add Exceptions to Surveillance Requirements for Valves and Dampers Locked in Actuated Position" [NUREG-1430; NUREG-1431; NUREG-1432; NUREG-1433; NUREG-1434] received February 11, 2020, 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.

3817. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG — Final Safety Evaluation of Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler

TSTF-568, Revision 2, "Revise Applicability of BWR/4 TS 3.6.2.5 and TS 3.6.3.2" [NUREG-1433] received February 11, 2020, 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.

3818. 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.

3819. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Notice of Proposed Permanent Transfer of Major Defense Equipment Transmittal No. RSAT-2019MF004, pursuant to Section 3(d) of the Arms Control Act, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3820. A letter from the Acting Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Annual Performance Report for Fiscal Years 2019-2021, including the Annual Performance Plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3821. A letter from the Director, Presidential Appointments, Department of State, transmitting a notification of sixteen (16) notifications of a federal vacancy, designation of acting officer, nomination, action on nomination, or discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

3822. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's notice — Revised Jurisdictional Thresholds for Section 8 of the Clayton Act received February 11, 2020, 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.

3823. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's notice — Revised Jurisdictional Thresholds for Section 7A of the Clayton Act received February 11, 2020, 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.

3824. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Adjustments (RIN: 2900-AQ85) received February 11, 2020, 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.

3825. A letter from the Associate Administrator for OPA, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pipeline Safety: Safety of Underground Natural Gas Storage Facilities [Docket No. PHMSA-2016-0016; Amdt. Nos.: 191-27; 192-126; 195-103] (RIN: 2137-AF22) received February 12, 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.

3826. A letter from the Board Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's Fiscal Year 2021 Proposed Budget and Performance Plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1115(b); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 3; (124 Stat. 3867); jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Oversight and Reform.

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:

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 4990. A bill to direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the National Science Foundation to carry out research and other activities to promote the security and modernization of voting systems, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-396, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 4979. A bill to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support STEM education and workforce development research focused on rural areas, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on House Administration discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4990 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. KHANNA, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 5884. A bill to establish a grant program to provide legal assistance to eligible tenants at risk of or subject to eviction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BARR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. TURNER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 5885. A bill to make technical corrections relating to parental leave for Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Veterans' Affairs, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SCANLON, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 5886. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to develop resources to reduce e-cigarette use by students on campuses of institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KIM (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. RYAN, and Ms. SLOTKIN):

H.R. 5887. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to standardize payment of haz-

ardous duty incentive pay for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas:

H.R. 5888. A bill to increase effectiveness in the pursuit of United States interests and multilateral cooperation at the international financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. AXNE (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. HORSFORD):

H.R. 5889. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to set forth a method of determining maximum out-of-pocket limits and annual updates to premium tax credit eligibility; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 5890. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reorganize the Chaplain Service of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 5891. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect funding for certain safety projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 5892. A bill to amend section 9A of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require that local school wellness policies include a requirement that students receive 50 hours of school nutrition education per school year; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5893. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide certain purchasing authority for recipients or subrecipients of grants under chapter 53 of title 49 of such Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Ms. FINKENAUER):

H.R. 5894. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue guidance requiring the list prices of drugs to be included in advertisements for such drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 5895. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to eliminate the repatriation loan program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 5896. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to require the Coast Guard to conduct icebreaking operations in the Great Lakes to minimize commercial disruption in the winter months, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

H.R. 5897. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make certain information available on a public website relating to intermediate care facili-

ties for individuals with intellectual disabilities certified for participation under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas (for himself and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 5898. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to modify the exception from requirements for the operation of vehicles on certain highways in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. NORMAN):

H.R. 5899. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to make debts for student loans dischargeable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. LUJÁN):

H.R. 5900. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to streamline enrollment under the Medicaid program of certain providers across State lines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 5901. A bill to establish a program to facilitate the adoption of modern technology by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. MAST (for himself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 5902. A bill to establish a microplastics pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCADAMS (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

H.R. 5903. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to fixed guideway capital investment grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 5904. A bill to allow a period in which members of the clergy may revoke their exemption from Social Security coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Ms. SHERILL):

H.R. 5905. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a demonstration initiative focused on the development of long-duration energy storage technologies, including a joint program to be established in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. PHILLIPS (for himself and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 5906. 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; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 5907. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to prohibit administrative offsets of social security benefit payments and social security disability insurance benefit payments with respect to claims arising

from Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 5908. A bill to establish the National Freight Mobility Infrastructure Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. DEAN, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H.R. 5909. A bill to strengthen mental health collaboration in communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. COOK, and Mr. GALLEGOS):

H. Res. 857. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the amphibious landing on the Japanese island of Iwo Jima during World War II and the raisings of the flag of the United States on Mount Suribachi; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. BASS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. BEYER):

H. Res. 858. A resolution condemning Stephen Miller for his trafficking in bigotry, hatred, and divisive political rhetoric and policies that are inconsistent with the trust and confidence placed in him as a Senior Advisor to the President and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that he should immediately resign from office; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WILD, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 859. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the "International Year of the Nurse and the Midwife", as designated by the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KING OF NEW YORK:

H.R. 5910. A bill for the relief of Terence George; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5911. A bill to provide for the liquidation or reliquidation of certain entries of products of European Union member states exported on or before October 9, 2019, and en-

tered on or after October 18, 2019; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 5884.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 5885.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 5886.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 5887.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas:

H.R. 5888.

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

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

By Mrs. AXNE:

H.R. 5889.

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 Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 5890.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 5891.

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

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5892.

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. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5893.

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 Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 5894.

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. DINGELL:

H.R. 5895.

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

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 5896.

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

Article I Section 8

By Mr. GALLEGOS:

H.R. 5897.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas:

H.R. 5898.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 5899.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 5900.

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

Article I, Section 8—to provide for the general welfare and to regulate commerce among the states

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 5901.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to make laws that are necessary and proper to carry out its enumerated powers.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 5902.

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

The Necessary and Proper Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCADAMS:

H.R. 5903.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 5904.

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

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 5905.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 5906.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws "which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" any "other" powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 5907.

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

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this

legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 5908.

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

Article I Section 8 Clause 1—

“The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States”

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—

“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and within the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 5909.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5910.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5911.

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

Article 1, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 33: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 99: Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 101: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 141: Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 336: Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 485: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 587: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
H.R. 763: Mr. CROW.
H.R. 906: Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GALLEGGO.
H.R. 1025: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H.R. 1041: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1043: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1052: Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 1109: Ms. WILD and Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 1195: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1325: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 1364: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1383: Mr. GOODEN, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1454: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1468: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 1530: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1551: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 1629: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1646: Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 1680: Ms. CRAIG, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 1749: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1763: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. TRONE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1766: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1814: Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr.

STEWART, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1816: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1873: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1897: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 2086: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SIRES, Ms. WATERS, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. SPANO, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2117: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 2178: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2191: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 2214: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 2219: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. BACON, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2223: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2315: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 2339: Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 2344: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 2350: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2468: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2481: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 2491: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 2543: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 2573: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2581: Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 2653: Mr. CARBAJAL and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2782: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 2788: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 2848: Ms. PORTER and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 2891: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 2895: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2986: Ms. SHERRILL and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2999: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3076: Ms. HAALAND and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3119: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 3228: Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 3306: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 3316: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3394: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3414: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 3510: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 3565: Mr. CLOUD.
H.R. 3570: Mrs. TRAHAN and Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3598: Ms. SHERRILL and Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 3645: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 3735: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 3822: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3888: Mr. CURTIS.
H.R. 3929: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 3961: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3962: Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 3964: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 3967: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3973: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4078: Mrs. LURIA and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 4109: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 4117: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4189: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. LURIA, and Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 4215: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 4220: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 4221: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 4280: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 4301: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4386: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 4429: Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 4644: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 4764: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4820: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 4848: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 4898: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 4900: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 4995: Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 5041: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 5051: Mr. WALTZ.
H.R. 5166: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 5169: Mr. CURTIS and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 5172: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. CURTIS, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 5191: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 5229: Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SPANO, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 5243: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 5249: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 5254: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 5312: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SOTO, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. GALLEGGO.
H.R. 5376: Mr. BARR and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 5416: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 5434: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
H.R. 5494: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 5517: Ms. WEXTON and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 5534: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 5549: Mr. OLSON, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 5552: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 5567: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 5581: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CORREA, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 5592: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 5595: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 5602: Mr. TRONE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 5626: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 5702: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 5707: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 5708: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 5764: Ms. NORTON, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 5771: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 5775: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 5793: Mr. CLOUD.
H.R. 5811: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 5831: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. SPANO.
H.R. 5845: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5862: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 5863: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 5866: Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 5874: Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 408: Ms. WEXTON.
H. Res. 579: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 745: Ms. CRAIG.
H. Res. 825: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 827: Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 828: Ms. WILD.
H. Res. 851: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

84. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, TX, relative to requesting that Congress enact legislation to repeal from existing Federal law any statutory impediments to the Federal government—and State governments—availing themselves of their purchasing power to leverage and negotiate lower prices from pharmaceutical manufacturers for prescription drugs taken by recipients of the Medicare or Medicaid programs; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2020

No. 30

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable LAMAR ALEXANDER, a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, a light to a dark world, we honor and praise Your Name.

Lord, continue to guide our Senators. Use them to bring a little more light and truth to our Nation. Help them to remember that Your timing is not their timing, but Your providence will prevail. May they embrace the demands of a life of integrity, a life that refuses to give in to fear, hypocrisy, and hatred. Lord, You are our strength and shield, and we trust You to guide our steps.

We pray in Your strong 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 legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 13, 2020.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable LAMAR ALEXANDER, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALEXANDER thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S.J. Res. 68, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68) to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

Pending:

Cramer (for Cruz) Amendment No. 1301, to amend the findings.

Cramer (for Reed) Amendment No. 1322, to amend the findings.

Cramer (for Cotton) Amendment No. 1305, to exempt from the termination requirement United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at designated terrorist organizations.

Cramer (for Risch) Amendment No. 1314, to amend the findings.

Cramer (for Rubio/Risch) Amendment No. 1320, to amend the findings.

Cramer (for Sullivan) Amendment No. 1319, to amend the rule of construction.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The majority leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO BOB SWANNER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this week, I offered thanks to a long list of Senate officers and staff who helped this body fulfill our unique constitutional responsibilities in recent weeks, but we are soon saying goodbye to one of those distinguished servants of the U.S. Senate. So I would like to begin this morning by sharing my gratitude and the whole Senate's gratitude for Bob Swanner.

Bob first joined the staff of the Senate Recording Studio more than two decades ago. Back then, he was already somewhat of an expert in designing and constructing television and radio studios. In fact, I understand that his record was so impressive that he was offered the job on the spot, and as anyone knows who has worked with Bob for even a few minutes, he has spent every day since then demonstrating how lucky we were to have him on board.

By his second year on the job, Bob had already successfully spearheaded the transition of Senate broadcasts to high-definition TV, and he didn't stop there. Over the past two decades, Bob has guided the overhaul of the camera and audio systems in every Senate hearing room. He masterminded the design of the new Senate Recording Studio's facilities in the Capitol Visitor Center, and he has made sure that speeches here on the floor are delivered under only the best TV lighting.

Let's face it—Hollywood, this place is not. Frankly, capturing a U.S. Senator's "good side" is not always an easy assignment, but as Bob knows better than anyone, our audio-visual capabilities in this institution are not about glamor; they are about civics. They are about making sure the American people can look and listen to their government.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1051

Oh, and I haven't even gotten to the small fact that Presidential inaugurations take place here on the Capitol grounds as well. Not long after Bob was promoted to general manager of the Recording Studio came the 2017 inauguration—one big professional challenge after another and one success after another on behalf of the institution that Bob has served.

It is no surprise that Bob's colleagues at the Recording Studio are sorry to see him go. The Senate is better for his dedicated efforts over these many years, but he will begin his well-deserved retirement with our sincere thanks for a job well done.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. President, now on an entirely different matter, it has been 1 week since the Senate concluded the third Presidential trial in American history.

Things move quickly in Washington, as always, so it is natural that our focus is now shifting to the many policy subjects where we have more work to do for families all across our country.

But when the Senate acts, we do not only address the particular issue before us; we create lasting precedent. This is especially true during something as grave and uncommon as an impeachment trial. Just as citizens, scholars, and Senators ourselves studied the past precedents of 1868 and 1999, so will future generations examine what unfolded over the past few months.

So before we adjourn for the upcoming State work period and leave impeachment fully in the rearview mirror, I wanted to speak about it one more time—not about the particulars that have been so exhaustively discussed and debated but the deeper questions, to record some final observations for the future.

The Senate did its job. We protected the long-term future of our Republic. We kept the temporary fires of factionalism from burning through to the bedrock of our institutions. We acted as Madison wished—as an “impediment” against “improper acts.” The Framers’ firewall held the line.

But in this case, all is not well that ends well. We cannot forget the abuses that fueled this process. We cannot make light of the dangerous new precedents set by President Trump's opponents in their zeal to impeach at all costs. We need to remember what happened so we can avoid it ever happening again.

As we know, the leftwing drive to impeach President Trump predated—predated—any phone call to Ukraine—and, in fact, his inauguration. This isn't a Republican talking point; it is what was reported by outlets like *POLITICO* and the Washington Post. House Democrats barely tried to hide that they began with a guilty verdict and were simply shopping for a suitable crime.

So, unfortunately, it was predictable that the House majority would use the serious process of impeachment as a platform to politically attack the

President. It was less predictable that they would also attack our Nation's core institutions themselves. But that is what happened.

First, the House Democrats chose to degrade their body's own precedents. The majority sprinted through a slapdash investigation to meet arbitrary political deadlines. They trivialized the role of the House Judiciary Committee, the body traditionally charged with conducting impeachment inquiries. They sidelined their own Republican minority colleagues and the President's counsel to precedent-breaking degrees.

All of this was very regrettable, but from a purely practical perspective, breaking the House's own china was Speaker PELOSI's prerogative. What was truly outrageous is what came next—a rolling attack on the other institutions outside the House.

To begin with, the recklessly broad Articles of Impeachment were an attack not just on one President but on the Office of the Presidency itself.

Their first article criticized the alleged motivation behind a Presidential action but failed to frame their complaint as definable “high Crimes [or] Misdemeanors.” This House set out into uncharted constitutional waters by passing the first-ever Presidential impeachment that did not allege any violations of criminal statutes.

Clearly, they owed the Senate and the country a clear limiting principle to explain why removal on these grounds would be different from the malleable and subjective “maladministration” standard, which the Framers rejected as a ground for impeachment. But they offered no such thing.

And their second article sought to criminalize the normal and routine exercise of executive privileges that Presidents of both parties have rightly invoked throughout our history. This was, in effect, criminalizing the separation of powers themselves.

So the House articles would have sharply diminished the Presidency in our constitutional structure. To extract a pound of flesh from one particular President, House Democrats were willing to attack the office itself.

But it did not stop with the House and the Presidency. Next in the crosshairs came the Senate.

The very night the House passed the articles, the Speaker began an unprecedented effort to reach outside her own Chamber and dictate the contours of the Senate trial to Senators. The bizarre stunt of withholding the articles achieved, of course, nothing, but the irony was enormous.

The House had just spent weeks jealously guarding their “sole power” of impeachment and criticizing other branches for perceived interference. Indeed, this reasoning was the entire basis for their second Article of Impeachment, but their first act out of the gate was to try to bust constitutional guardrails and meddle in the Senate.

When that stunt went nowhere and the trial began, House Democrats brought their war on institutions over to this Chamber. From the very first evening, it was clear the House managers would not even try to persuade a supermajority of Senators but simply sought to degrade and smear the Senate itself before the Nation. Senators were called “treacherous” for not structuring our proceedings to the managers' liking.

Finally, when the trial neared its end and it became clear that bullying the Senate would not substitute for persuading it, the campaign against institutions took aim at yet another independent branch—the Supreme Court—in particular, the Chief Justice of the United States.

A far-left pressure group produced ads impugning him for presiding neutrally—neutrally—and not seizing control of the Senate. One Democratic Senator running for President made the Chief Justice read a pointless question gainsaying his own “legitimacy.”

So, in summary, the opponents of this President were willing to throw mud at the House, the Presidency, the Senate, and the Supreme Court—all for the sake of short-term partisan politics.

The irony would be rich if it were less sad. For years, this President's opponents have sought to cloak their rage in the high-minded trappings of institutionalism. The President's opponents profess great concern for the norms and traditions of our government. But when it really counted—when the rubber met the road—that talk proved cheap. It was they who proved willing to degrade public confidence in our government. It was they who indulged political bloodlust at the expense of our institutions: reckless—reckless—insinuations that our 2016 election was not legitimate; further insinuations—right here on the floor—that if the American people reelect this President in 2020, the result will be presumptively illegitimate as well; bizarre statements from the Speaker of the House that she may simply deny reality and refuse to accept the Senate's verdict as final.

There has been much discussion about the foreign adversaries who seek to reduce the American people's faith in our democracy and cause chaos and division in our country—rightly so—but we must also demand that our own political leaders exercise some self-restraint and not do the work of our adversaries for them.

The critics of our Constitution often say that because our Framers could not have imagined modern conditions, their work is outmoded. We hear that the First Amendment or the Second Amendment or the separation of powers must be changed to suit the times.

But the geniuses who founded this Nation were actually very prescient. Case in point: The reckless partisan crusade of recent weeks is something they predicted more than two centuries

ago. Hamilton predicted “the demon of faction will, at certain seasons, extend his scepter” over the House of Representatives. He predicted that partisan anger could produce “an intemperate or designing majority in the House of Representatives,” capable of destroying the separation of powers if left unchecked.

The Framers predicted overheated House majorities might lash out at their peer institutions and display “strong symptoms of impatience and disgust at the least sign of opposition from any other quarter; as if the exercise of . . . rights, by either the executive or judiciary, were a breach of their privilege and an outrage to their dignity.” They knew the popular legislature might be “disposed to exert an imperious control over the other departments.”

They predicted all of this. They predicted it all.

So they did something about it. They set up a firewall. They built the Senate.

This body performed admirably these past weeks. We did precisely the job we were made for.

We did precisely the job we were made for, but impeachment should never have come to the Senate like this. This most serious constitutional tool should never have been used so lightly—as a political weapon of first resort, as a tool to lash out at the basic bedrock of our institutions because one side did not get their way.

It should never have happened, and it should never happen again.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MARCH FOR LIFE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, on January 24, tens of thousands of pro-life Americans filled the streets of Washington, DC, for the annual March for Life. Unfortunately, I couldn't come down to the floor to talk about the march because the Senate was tied up with the impeachment trial, although I did get the opportunity to meet with some marchers from Rapid City, SD. Now that the floor is open again, I wanted to come down to recognize this year's marchers, including those from my home State of South Dakota, and talk about why they march.

Every year in this country, hundreds of thousands of babies are killed by abortion—hundreds of thousands. That is not some number the pro-life movement has cooked up. That is straight from the pro-abortion Guttmacher Institute, formerly affiliated with Planned Parenthood, which reports that “approximately 862,320 abortions

were performed in 2017.” That is 862,320. Most of us can't even fathom what a number that big looks like, but that is a lot of babies, because, of course, that is what we are talking about—babies, human beings.

Proponents of abortion try to deny the humanity of the unborn child, but science and ultrasound and common sense all make it very clear that when we talk about unborn children, we are talking about human beings, with their own fingerprints and their own DNA. Human beings deserve to be protected, even when they are small and weak and vulnerable—especially when they are small and weak and vulnerable.

Stick around politics long enough and you are sure to hear someone talking about the importance of being on the right side of history. It is a common trope, but it is no less true for that. The truth is, we should think about being on the right side of history. When people look back at us, we want to be remembered for standing up for what is right, not for going along with injustice.

Abortion repeats a tired pattern. One group of people or society decides that another group of people is less valuable. They advance plausible-sounding reasons why it is legitimate to deprive these people of their human rights, and for various reasons people in that society go along with it. It is a story that has been repeated too many times, and the judgment of history never looks kindly on these societies.

The United States was founded to safeguard human rights. We haven't always lived up to that promise, but we have never stopped trying. It is time for America to start standing up for the rights of unborn humans.

Last week, in his State of the Union Address, the President called for a ban on late-term abortions. In 2016, somewhere around 11,000 babies were aborted at or after the 21-week mark in pregnancy—11,000 in 1 year. That is a lot of babies.

As neonatal science advances, we have been able to save babies born at earlier and earlier stages of pregnancy. Babies have survived after being born at 25 weeks, at 24 weeks, at 23 weeks, and, like Ellie Schneider, who attended the State of the Union Address with her mom, at 21 weeks. Yet, in this country it is legal to kill babies at 40 weeks, right up until the very last moment of pregnancy. That makes no sense.

How can a child born at 23 weeks be regarded as a human being, deserving of care, and yet an unborn child who is that very same age be regarded as less than human? The moment of birth does not magically confer humanity, and yet our law acts like it does.

I would like to think that a bill to ban late-term abortions like the President proposed would be a no-brainer in Congress. At the very, very least, we should all be able to agree that we shouldn't be aborting babies who can live outside their mothers. But, unfor-

tunately, abortion extremism has grown to such an extent that leading Democrats, including a Democrat Presidential candidate, not only rule out banning late-term abortions, but they actually refused to rule out infanticide.

Last year, after the Democrat Governor of Virginia implicitly endorsed infanticide, the Senate took up legislation that simply stated that a baby born alive in an abortion clinic is entitled to the same protection and medical care that a baby born in a hospital is entitled to, and 44 Democrats, almost the entire Democrat caucus here in the Senate, voted against that legislation. It was a grim day for human decency and for human rights.

Although we have a long way to go to protect unborn babies in this country, I remain hopeful, and I am never more hopeful than when I see tens of thousands of Americans—so many of them young people—descend on our Nation's Capital every year to march for life. We may not win this battle today or tomorrow, but we are turning the tide. The arc of the moral universe is long, but I believe that it does bend toward justice and in the end right will prevail. I look forward to the day when every child born and unborn is protected in this country.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

S.J. RES. 68

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, today the Senate will vote on a bipartisan War Powers Resolution offered by Senator KAINE directing the President to terminate the use of U.S. Armed Forces for hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Constitution is clear: Congress has the power to declare war. The President has no authority to enter the United States into another endless conflict in the Middle East, but I fear that the President's erratic decision-making, his lack of strategy, his inability to control his impulses may bumble us into a war nonetheless, even if he doesn't intend it.

With this bipartisan resolution, the Senate will assert its constitutional authority and send a clear bipartisan message that the President—this President or any President—cannot sidestep Congress when it comes to matters of war and peace. It is important to do this now.

The President's actions in the Middle East have escalated the confrontation. Before the State of the Union, the President himself said that war with Iran was “closer than you thought”—

his words. Now, let me be clear, nobody in this Chamber will shed a single tear over the death of Iranian General Soleimani, but that doesn't mean that we disregard the potential consequences of the strike or any comparable action. It is more than appropriate for Congress to affirm that it has authority over any major long-term hostilities with Iran, as the Constitution prescribes.

Yet, still, some on the other side have claimed that this War Powers Resolution is nothing more than an attempt by Democrats to embarrass President Trump. The Founding Fathers would laugh at that assertion. One of the great powers they gave Congress—not the executive—was the power to declare war. This resolution is partisan? Well, then, why are a good number of Republicans supporting it?

Let me say this again. This resolution is going to pass with a bipartisan majority of Senators in support—a rarity these days. If this is purely an attempt to embarrass the President, well, it is going to be a bipartisan one.

We need to stop pretending as if both sides of the aisle aren't concerned about the President having too much leeway over matters of war and peace. That is why this resolution is bipartisan, because both sides of the aisle agree that for too long Congress has ceded our constitutional authority to the executive branch, and we are taking an important step today to claim that authority back.

Now, today there will be amendments offered that will seek to do one thing and one thing only: undermine what we are trying to achieve today and provide the President's lawyers with get-out-of-jail free cards. My colleague from Arkansas has an amendment that will create an exception for operations against foreign terrorist organizations. It sounds reasonable at first, but any enterprising lawyer in the administration could use this amendment to justify the type of unilateral escalation of hostilities that this legislation would prohibit. My colleague from Florida has an amendment that seeks a similar outcome. My friends on both sides who wish this resolution to pass should vote down these amendments. They cut against the core of the legislation. Senator KAINE told me that if this amendment passed, the Cotton amendment, he would be forced to vote against his own bill. What good would that do for those of us who want to pass it anyway?

One final point. With respect to the situation in Iran, we still don't have a clear picture from the administration about our strategy in the region. The only gesture of transparency that this administration has been able to muster was a classified all-Members briefing conducted more than a week after the strike. There were 97 Senators who attended, but only 15 Members got to ask questions before the administration, led by Secretary Pompeo, practically sprinted out the door with a less-than-

genuine commitment to return. Our demands for a followup briefing have been ignored by the White House, Secretary Esper, and Secretary Pompeo. Those briefings should have occurred before the action. I learned about what we were doing in the news, and 2 hours later got a call from the administration.

I fear that by keeping Congress and the American people in the dark, President Trump may be directing military operations in a manner that doesn't stand up to public scrutiny. When you are forced to consult with Congress and when Congress has the power to declare war, quick and sloppy thinking evaporates because people have to at least examine the issues in some detail, and the American public has some say.

That is why Senator KAINE's War Powers Resolution is a matter of necessity. I commend Senator KAINE and his colleagues on the job he has done, including my colleague from Illinois, sitting right here, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Madam President, now on the Department of Justice. In the short week since the conclusion of the President's impeachment trial, the President has reminded us of all the reasons why Congress must serve as the check on the Executive.

The President has dismissed members of his administration who testified in the House impeachment inquiry, including, for no reason, the twin brother of one of the witnesses. The administration has reportedly withdrawn the nomination of a senior Pentagon official who merely advised her colleagues about the legal implications of delaying assistance to Ukraine. Truth—when the President doesn't like the truth, it has no place in this administration, and people who speak truth to power are summarily dismissed.

On Tuesday, after career prosecutors made sentencing recommendations for Roger Stone, who was found guilty of witness tampering and lying to Congress, the President tweeted that his former colleague and confidant was being unfairly treated. Soon afterward, it appears the Attorney General or other political appointees at DOJ countermanded the sentencing recommendation and will instead advise a more lenient sentence for the President's friend. As a result, all four career prosecutors connected to the Stone case withdrew from the case or resigned from the Justice Department entirely—a clear signal they believed the revised sentencing conflicted with their professional and ethical obligations as prosecutors.

Of course, it was not enough for the President to just lean on the Justice Department to make it easy on his old pal. The President went on publicly to attack the judge who would decide Mr. Stone's fate—another example of the President's blatant contempt for the independence of the judiciary.

In the past, Chief Justice Roberts has spoken out in defense of the independ-

ence of the judicial branch. When the President, during his campaign, attacked Judge Curiel, the Chief Justice released a statement saying:

We do not have Obama judges or Trump judges, Bush judges or Clinton judges. We have an extraordinary group of dedicated judges doing their level best to do equal right to those appearing before them. The independent judiciary is something we should all be thankful for.

That is what Chief Justice Roberts said.

Well, President Trump is once again attacking a Federal judge—in this case, Judge Amy Berman Jackson, who is presiding over the Stone case. The Nation now looks again to Chief Justice Roberts to make clear to President Trump that these attacks are unacceptable. Speaking of the independence of the judiciary in broad and general terms is well and good. It is a good thing to do, but to not speak up now, when in the middle of this brouhaha a judge is being attacked by the President before she makes a sentencing decision, that is when we really need the Chief Justice to speak up. Now would be the time for Chief Justice Roberts to speak up. Now would be the time for the Chief Justice to directly and specifically defend the independence of this Federal judge. I hope he will see fit to do that and to do it today.

I have also called on the inspector general of the Justice Department to investigate the Roger Stone matter. The Judiciary Committee in the Senate should do the same, but even without formal investigation, it is abundantly clear that something is rotten in the Justice Department.

The President can corrupt our Justice Department in two major ways: pressuring it to investigate his opponents or using its power to reward his friends. The impeachment of the President concerned the first abuse: The President wanted a foreign power to announce an investigation into one of his political opponents or funnel allegedly incriminating information to our Justice Department. The President explicitly mentioned the Attorney General during his phone call with the Ukrainian President. More recently, Attorney General Barr has publicly said that the Justice Department has now set up a channel to receive information from the President's personal attorney, Rudy Giuliani, about the Ukraine scandal. It seems to be an attempt to accomplish the same goals the President was just impeached over.

The events surrounding Mr. Stone's more lenient sentencing recommendations are an example of the second way Presidents can corrupt the Justice Department: improperly rewarding the President's friends. In the wake of Watergate, Congress passed laws and made crucial reforms so this kind of abuse of the levers of power will not happen again, but here, right now, the President is using the hallowed Justice Department—the only Cabinet agency named for an ideal, Justice—as his personal law firm. He is using the Justice

Department named for an ideal, Justice, as his personal law firm.

What a shame. What a defamation of what the Constitution is all about.

My Senate colleagues who believed the President would be chastened by impeachment have been completely and disastrously wrong. The only lesson the President has learned is that there is nothing he can do that Senate Republicans will not forgive or rationalize or simply ignore. The lesson the President has learned is that the courts are unlikely to stop him, too, because the Senate Republican caucus has voted to confirm virtually every judge he has nominated, no matter how unqualified or ill-suited to the bench.

We are staring at a crisis of the rule of law. The institutions designed to check Executive power are crumbling before our very eyes. The crisis was the President's own making, but it was enabled and emboldened by every Senate Republican who has been too afraid to stand up to the President and say no.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 3 minutes in debate.

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

S.J. RES. 68

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 68. Senator Kaine, a distinguished member of the Foreign Relations Committee, has done an extraordinary job here in riveting our attention to a congressional responsibility that is paramount. It calls for the removal of U.S. troops from hostilities against Iran that Congress has not authorized.

One of the most consequential decisions we make as Members of Congress—I have been called on on more than one occasion between the House and the Senate—is whether to send our sons and daughters into battle. It is a decision that is about life and death and national security. The Constitution delegated that power to only one institution of the entire Federal Government—the Congress of the United States—to declare war, because of the severity of the consequences of the decision. It is up to the Congress to ensure that the executive branch, whoever sits there at any given time, utilizes all the tools of diplomacy it has to keep Americans safe and that there is an effective check on executive power before we send our children off to war.

I stand in strong support of the resolution. This body must assert its congressional privilege.

Of course, the President has the right to take action to defend against imminent threats to the homeland and to Americans abroad. No one disputes that. Senator Kaine doesn't dispute that. None of us do. But the President does not have the authority to engage in any military action he likes.

We have been hearing from this administration that there is a redline—

Iran cannot have a nuclear weapon. I agree. But if, at the end of the day, that means that to enforce your redline, you are going to take America to war, then you must come to the Congress of the United States and seek that authorization for war.

What I hear from the administration: Oh, no, we have article II powers. Oh, no, the 2002 resolution—which had nothing to do with Iran. Never envisioned. It is so tortured to suggest that is authorization for us. Can we sit back and contemplate that possibility? We cannot. We cannot.

So as someone who voted against the war in Iraq and served in Congress during the debate on whether to authorize military action, I can assure you that the 2002 resolution—that was not its intention, and it doesn't comport with the history, the use, or the plain reading of the text.

I am gravely concerned about the administration's efforts to build a shaky legal foundation for the explicit purpose of carrying us into ever-longer wars, including potentially against Iran.

Before we vote to ultimately decide that, it should be the Congress of the United States that should make that decision on behalf of the American people, looking our sons and daughters in the eyes and saying, yes, this is worthy of the national security of the United States.

I will vote to send my son and daughter if the cause is right, but if the cause is not right, I will not vote to send my son and daughter or anyone else's sons and daughters. That is the debate that should be had here. That is what Senator Kaine is trying to do with this resolution. I am concerned that some of the amendments being offered are simply to undermine that.

I look forward to joining with Senator Kaine to pass that resolution, as well as oppose some of the amendments.

I will submit a longer statement for the RECORD on this resolution, S.J. Res. 68, and the War Powers Resolution more broadly when we return on Monday, February 24. I urge my colleagues to read that statement.

With that, I yield back.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1301

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to Cruz amendment No. 1301.

Who yields time?

Mr. Kaine. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I rise to speak in opposition to the Cruz amendment.

The Cruz amendment is contrary to the purpose of the resolution before the body. The resolution before the body is to make sure that Congress is involved in decisions about war. The Cruz amendment is contrary to that purpose by praising the President for a military action taken not only without congress-

sional approval but without notification to Congress.

Second, we are all glad General Soleimani is dead. That is good for the world. But there are legitimate questions about the mission—particularly, should it have been taken out on Iraqi soil over the objection of the Iraqi Government? That has now led the Iraqi Parliament to ask U.S. troops to withdraw from the region, which would empower Iran and empower ISIS.

Finally, the Cruz amendment talks about President Trump. This resolution is not about President Trump. I had an original version of it that referenced activities of the administration, but my Republican colleagues—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. Kaine. Asked me to remove those.

I ask for a vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does anybody want to use time in favor of the amendment?

Mr. Risch. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. Risch. Madam President and fellow Senators, I rise in support of Senator Cruz's amendment.

This is just a continuation of this animosity toward this President. This President did a great service to the United States of America, to the people of America, and to the world by dispatching General Soleimani as he did.

All of us listened to the intelligence. We had the secret and top-secret briefings on this. In addition to that, those of us on the Intelligence Committee actually got information that was compartmented. They had very clear information, proof to a very high degree that he was imminently attacking—he was imminently planning to attack Americans and American forces.

This was the right thing to do. It rid the world of a person who really rose to the same level as Osama bin Laden and some of the other people who have done these awful things to Americans. We should congratulate this President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. Risch. Just as we did with President Obama.

Thank you. I urge an affirmative vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. Durbin. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Sanders) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Scott of Florida). Are there any other

Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 46 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Alexander	Graham	Portman
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hassan	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rosen
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Johnson	Sasse
Carper	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Collins	King	Shaheen
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cortez Masto	Lee	Sinema
Cotton	Loeffler	Stabenow
Cramer	Manchin	Sullivan
Crapo	McConnell	Thune
Cruz	McSally	Tillis
Daines	Moran	Toomey
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young
Fischer	Perdue	
Gardner	Peters	

NAYS—34

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Schatz
Bennet	Harris	Schumer
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Smith
Booker	Hirono	Tester
Brown	Kaine	Udall
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Van Hollen
Cardin	Leahy	Warner
Casey	Menendez	Warren
Coons	Merkley	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murphy	Wyden
Durbin	Murray	
Feinstein	Reed	

NOT VOTING—2

Markey Sanders

The amendment (No. 1301) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1322

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Reed amendment No. 1322.

The majority whip.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes in this series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Senator REED.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to offer my amendment noting that as a result of Iran's recent ballistic missile strike against U.S. air bases in Iraq, over 100 servicemembers have sustained traumatic brain injuries, or TBIs, as a result of their proximity to the blasts.

It is vitally important that all U.S. Government personnel—military and civilian—who incur such injuries be given the care they deserve and that their medical records be properly annotated to ensure they receive the care they are entitled to in the future.

My amendment recognizes the seriousness of these injuries and honors those who will now have to deal with these wounds, possibly for the rest of their lives.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, colleagues, I urge an affirmative vote on this. Just as we congratulated the President on the last amendment—the Commander in Chief, who made the very difficult decision to do what needed to be done to rein up the terrorists and the people who are operating out of Iran—we also need to recognize the people on the frontlines, our brave young men and women who are in Iraq, pushing back on Iran's attempt to influence and to infiltrate the country of Iraq. They are doing our work for us. We need to recognize that.

I urge an affirmative vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays appear to be in order.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 47 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Alexander	Gardner	Peters
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Reed
Bennet	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Harris	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hassan	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rosen
Booker	Heinrich	Rounds
Boozman	Hirono	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sanders
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson	Schumer
Capito	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kennedy	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Cassidy	Klobuchar	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	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Enzi	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murray	Wicker
Feinstein	Paul	Wyden
Fischer	Perdue	Young

NOT VOTING—1

Markey

The amendment (No. 1322) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1305

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to the vote in relation to Cotton amendment No. 1305.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment and will be making a motion to table it following Senator COTTON's presentation.

The Cotton amendment would establish a very dangerous precedent. I say that with all respect. It would basically allow military action against actors on the designated list of foreign terrorist organizations without there being a declaration of war against them.

There are currently 69 FTOs on the list, including the Basque Fatherland and Liberty, the Kurdistan Workers' Party, the Irish Republican Army, and the Communist Party of the Philippines.

The FTO list has never been a war authorization. The FTO list is created by the administration. It adds the names to it. This would suggest that, by being on the FTO, the U.S. military could take action against you even without there being congressional authorization. The list is so long, and it can be added to by a President. This would basically destroy the underlying bill by allowing a President to add to the FTO list rather than coming to Congress and then taking military action.

I know the speaker's intention is that this goes to the IRGC. If we need to defend ourselves under article II, we can or we can declare war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, this is not about the Basque, and this is not about the IRA. This resolution applies only to the Government of Iran. This is, indeed, only about the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

Let me tell you a story about the last 17 years in Iraq.

For 17 years, the most deadly weapon our troops have faced has been something called an explosively formed penetrator. It takes a slug of copper, superheats it into a ball of magma, and sends it hurtling through the air at 6,000 feet per second at our troops. I will spare you the graphic details of what a liquid ball of copper magma does when it travels at 6,000 feet per second into the human body, but I will tell you that those were smuggled into Iraq by, yes, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

The vote here is simple: Do you want to vote to stand with our troops, hundreds of whom have died at the hands of Iran, or do you want to vote to be a lawyer for Iranian terrorists?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I move to table Cotton amendment No. 1305, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 48 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Harris	Peters
Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Jones	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Lee	Stabenow
Cassidy	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Paul	Young

NAYS—46

Barrasso	Gardner	Risch
Blackburn	Graham	Roberts
Blunt	Grassley	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Loeffler	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Perdue	
Fischer	Portman	

The motion is agreed to; the amendment is tabled.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1314

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to the Risch amendment, No. 1314.

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I want to be very clear. I oppose this resolution, as it is misguided and it sends a terrible, confusing message to Iran and to our allies in the region.

The purpose of my amendment is to make clear to Iran and to our allies that, under the Constitution, the President of the United States has a constitutional responsibility to take actions to defend the United States, its Territories, possessions, citizens, servicemembers, and diplomats from attack.

Who could disagree with that?

Let's make this clear to Iran and to our allies that that is the state of play—notwithstanding the fact, of course, that this resolution will not become law. It is going to get vetoed, and the veto is going to be sustained.

The clear language of this is very short:

The President has a constitutional responsibility to take actions to defend the United States, its territories, possessions, citizens, servicemembers, and diplomats from attack.

Senators, make this clear. Vote yes on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, though my friend from Idaho opposes my resolution, I do not oppose his amendment. I view the Risch amendment as a basic restatement of constitutional law, and it is essentially the same concept as the rules of construction in the resolution, so I do not oppose it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1314.

Mr. RISCH. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 49 Leg.]

YEAS—93

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

NAYS—7

Gillibrand	Murphy	Warren
Leahy	Sanders	
Markey	Udall	

The amendment (No. 1314) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1320

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to the vote in relation to the Rubio amendment No. 1320.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, this amendment is a statement of three facts: No. 1, that we are not engaged at this moment in hostilities with Iran—we are not at war with Iran; No. 2, that the actions that were taken against Soleimani were, frankly, lesser in scope, nature, and duration than what the previous administration did and the way they behaved in their exercise of war powers, also a statement of fact; and No. 3, that the maximum pressure of strategy against Iran has reduced Iran's resources that they can use to sponsor terrorism and proxy groups, also a statement of fact. Whether you agree with maximum pressure or not, it is a fact that this year, and last year, Iran has billions of dollars less than they otherwise would have, had it not been for the maximum pressure campaign.

Those three things are statements of fact, and I think if we are going to have a resolution like this, it should

accurately describe the situation, and that is why I urge your support and a negative vote against any effort to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I ask my colleagues to vote to table the Rubio amendment No. 1320. Let me explain why. The gist of the amendment is basically to say that we are not in hostilities with Iran. If you read the newspaper, we now see that 100 American troops are suffering from concussions—closed-head injuries—that could potentially lead to other significant consequences because of the Iranian attack on the Al-Asad Air Base.

The United States sent the military strike that killed Iran's key military leader and Iraqi militia leader. The United States took a previous strike a week before that killed 25 Iranian-connected militia members in 5 sites in Iraq and Syria. The War Powers Act has a definition of what armed conflict and hostilities are, and it is clear that Congress was meant to be able to file this exact motion either during armed conflict or even before armed conflict if it were imminent.

I would argue that the 100 servicemembers who are suffering from head injuries and the American contractor who was killed is definitely proof that there are hostilities. I ask to table.

I now move that Rubio amendment No. 1320 be tabled, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 50 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Jones	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Sinema
Casey	Lee	Smith
Cassidy	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Harris	Paul	Young

NAYS—46

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Barrasso	Ernst	McSally
Blackburn	Fischer	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Braun	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hawley	Romney
Capito	Hoeven	Rounds
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cotton	Inhofe	Sasse
Cramer	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Crapo	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lankford	
Daines	Loeffler	

Shelby
Sullivan

Thune
Tillis

Toomey
Wicker

The motion is agreed to; the amendment is tabled.

AMENDMENT NO. 1319

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Sullivan amendment No. 1319.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, no one wants war with Iran, but while I respect Senator Kaine and my other colleagues who are supporting the broader AUMF, it has fatal flaws.

First, it says the United States should cease its hostilities against Iran. This is completely backward. The United States is not actively conducting hostilities against Iran, but Iran has been actively conducting hostilities against us and our troops for decades. Just look at the long, bloody list: thousands of Americans dead and wounded, Marine barracks in Lebanon, Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia, Soleimani, and deadly IEDs in Iraq.

Second, the broader AUMF of Senator Kaine dramatically limits our ability to protect these very forces from future attacks, which we know the Iranians are planning. Close to half of the forces in Iraq right now are Alaska-based military forces, our friends and neighbors in Alaska. I want to make sure they are protected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SULLIVAN. My amendment does that by making sure the President has clear authority to protect our troops.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Who requests time in opposition?

Mr. LEE. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I have great respect for my distinguished colleague from Alaska, and I appreciate his service to our country and his thoughts today.

I stand in opposition to his amendment because, if there is one thing we don't need right now, it is anything else that would give more authority to the military-industrial complex to start and finish wars without authorization from Congress.

Anytime we introduce additional ambiguity into a field that is already ripe with ambiguity, given the inherent tension between ambiguities surrounding the inherent article II Commander in Chief power and the article I power that Congress has to declare war, we run into problems. This would open up that ambiguity.

The legislation we are addressing here, this resolution, is bipartisan. It has as its object to clarify that, for future, offensive action, we need congressional authorization. We have been lied to by the Pentagon for years regarding a war that has gone on for two decades. That is long enough. We don't want to

create additional ambiguities. We don't want any more wars without the people's elected representatives being able to debate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I move to table the Sullivan amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 51 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Jones	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Sinema
Casey	Lee	Smith
Collins	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Moran	Warner
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Harris	Paul	Wyden

NAYS—49

Alexander	Fischer	Risch
Barrasso	Gardner	Roberts
Blackburn	Graham	Romney
Blunt	Grassley	Rounds
Boozman	Hawley	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Cramer	Loeffler	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Toomey
Cruz	McSally	Wicker
Daines	Murkowski	Young
Enzi	Perdue	
Ernst	Portman	

The motion is agreed to; the amendment is tabled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I think President Trump's decision to take out General Soleimani was the boldest defense policy decision of his Presidency to date. Even in a single strike, the President defended American lives and showed Iran that terrorism and, most importantly, spilling American blood is something that will come at a price, unlike what we have gone through with the predecessor, when the redline didn't mean anything. It means something now. Everybody knows it.

The result is that we are now in the best negotiating position with Iran since 1979, and Iran's escalation, which includes attacks on tankers, Saudi Arabia's oil facilities, and the killing of an American citizen, has ended, at least for now.

Yet some Democrats would have you believe in a vote for a War Powers Resolution, pretending as though the President is rushing to war. It is just

not happening. The facts are not there. There is no war with Iran. An airstrike is not a war. Punishing Iran for killing an American citizen is not a war, nor has the Soleimani strike started a new war, as Democrats would have you believe. It just hasn't happened.

It has been 3 weeks now since the Democrats first tried to vote on this resolution, and during those 3 weeks, nothing has happened. Let me just repeat that. Nothing has happened. There have been no new Iranian attacks against us, and we have not attacked them. How can anyone claim that we are at some kind of a war?

Moreover, nobody wants war with Iran. The President has made it very clear that he doesn't want war with Iran. In fact, the President's decision to eliminate Soleimani has made war much less likely because it showed Iran that its terrorism would come at a price. That wasn't the case before.

Despite this success, today we are debating whether we want to tie the hands of our Commander in Chief—or any Commander in Chief—to respond when American lives are put at risk, as the Constitution gives them the authority to do.

I want to be sure that all of my colleagues are crystal clear on what exactly this War Powers Resolution means, what it will actually do. The resolution calls on the President to terminate the use of American Armed Forces for hostilities against Iran. But there are no hostilities against Iran. There is no war with Iran.

The resolution calling for the termination of hostilities against California would have the same effect. Practically speaking, this vote will do nothing. It is nonsense, but we should be very concerned about the symbolic effect this vote will have.

This will send a very damaging message to Iran. The Iranians will interpret a vote in favor of this resolution as tying the President's hands, and that would lead Iran to believe, once again, that it can get by with anything.

Remember, it wasn't that long ago that they really believed that. Nobody wants that. Congress doesn't want it. The White House doesn't want it and certainly not the American people. So I don't know why we are even debating a resolution that could make war more likely, when we are trying to do just the opposite.

If the Democrats insist on tying the President's hands, the least we can do is minimize the damage. While I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution, I also urge them to support amendments to minimize the damage.

I want to comment briefly on the amendment offered by the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, my friend the Senator from Rhode Island. He is correct to highlight the traumatic brain injuries that a number of our troops suffered during the January 8 Iranian strike on Iraq. We understand that.

However, I would like to clarify: I believe we were not misled in this at all. Mild TBIs can only be confirmed through MRI scans. The Department of Defense implemented its screening procedure properly and made sure that all troops in the vicinity of the strike were screened. I think we need to understand that. All of this was done, and it is as if that wasn't done at all.

Once those results were made available, the Department of Defense notified the public in a press release. It then briefed our committee, the committee that I chair. I therefore want to commend the Department of Defense for taking all the right measures to protect our forces during the Iranian strikes and for appropriately screening our forces for aftereffects.

This is why I think it is extremely important that we vote this resolution down. Even as it is amended now, it will signal to the Iranians that there is no price for aggression. It will undermine deterrence, and it will leave our troops, diplomats, and citizens vulnerable. Nobody wants that.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to speak with respect to final passage of S.J. Res. 68, which will be the next item of business before us. I will speak briefly because I have been on the floor about this a few times in the last week or two.

First, I want to thank my colleagues for this process, including the President. It has been a very collaborative process, with a lot of dialogue, a lot of listening, a lot of changes in amendments, and back and forth since early January. My colleagues, however they voted on things that I hoped they might support me on, were very willing to dialogue and ask hard questions. I understood why people were where they were. I just want to thank the body for it.

I also note what a cool thing it is to actually have a bunch of amendment votes on the floor. I hope we might do more on other items.

This is an issue that is extremely important to this body, and it is extremely important to me. Of the variety of issues—I didn't serve in the military—why would it be important to me? Having a child in the military and coming from a State that is so connected to the military, I have been nearly obsessed with this issue since about 2002.

I never knew I would have an opportunity to work on it as a U.S. Senator, but when I came here in 2012, I started to look for colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses who would stand for the proposition that war is the most solemn responsibility we have, and it cannot be outsourced to anyone.

I was willing to stand up to a friend—a Democratic President—and challenge him when he was undertaking military action without coming to Congress. I

have done the same with President Trump, but with no disrespect to the office. I want an article II President who will inhabit fully the article II powers of the office of Commander in Chief. But what I have hoped for since I came is an article I branch that would fully inhabit the article I powers that are vested only in Congress.

For that reason, I put the resolution forward and worked with you and others to make sure the resolution was bipartisan. It is not only bipartisan, but folks from different parts of the political spectrum and from different parts of the country and new Members and veteran Members have come together to say—after many decades of abdicating responsibility, under Presidents of both parties and under majorities of both parties in both Houses—it is time for Congress to take this very seriously. That is why I will be voting in favor of the resolution and encouraging other colleagues to do the same.

The last thing I want to say is this. I talked about these two young men briefly yesterday on the floor. I am struck by their stories. The last two men who were killed in combat for the United States in the 19-yearlong war against terrorists that was sparked by America's righteous outrage over the attack of 9/11 were two sergeants first class, Javier Gutierrez and Antonio Rodriguez. They are both from the Southwest, one from San Antonio and one from Las Cruces, NM.

They were both killed last week in Afghanistan by an insider attack. It was somebody who was wearing a uniform—potentially, a member of the Afghan National Security Forces or posing as one. These are the security forces that we have invested billions and billions of dollars in training and equipping—\$45 billion this year alone. Someone wearing that uniform of an ally of the United States turned a weapon on these two gentlemen and killed them.

I read their bios, and I was just so struck by their stories. They were 28 years old, which means they were 9 years old when 9/11 happened and when Congress passed the war authorization under whose terms they were then serving when they lost their lives in Afghanistan. They really never knew in their life anything but war.

By the time they were 9 years old the Nation was at war. Nineteen years later, we are still in the same war, and that authorization has been used now all over the globe to engage in military activity virtually in so many countries and so many continents. They never knew anything but war.

I just want to say a word about each of them.

Sergeant Gutierrez was a young man, a 28-year-old from San Antonio. Sergeant Gutierrez's grandfather was an aviator in World War II who was shot down and imprisoned in a POW camp in Germany. His name was Mr. Ortiz. He was then liberated when the Russians liberated that POW camp. That was the

grandfather. Sergeant Gutierrez's dad was a marine during the Vietnam era.

Sergeant Gutierrez was born in Jacksonville, NC, near the Lejeune base in North Carolina. All he wanted to do was serve his country. He joined the Junior ROTC Program at his local high school because, he said, "I want to be like my grandfather and I want to be like my dad." By all accounts, he served in such a wonderful way.

This was his third deployment. He had one in Iraq and one in Afghanistan previously. This was his third deployment.

He leaves behind a wife, Gabby, and four children ages 2 to 7.

Sergeant Rodriguez was from Las Cruces, NM. He also leaves behind a wife, Ronaleen, no children, but a lot of devoted family.

When I read this in the news, I thought it was a misprint. This was Sergeant Rodriguez's 11th deployment to Afghanistan. He was only 28 years old. He probably didn't go into the military until he was 18, but he was Special Forces. Those deployments tend to be often, more frequent and maybe not as long in duration. But think about it—10 times in Afghanistan, and on the 11th deployment, he gave his life. The sacrifices are just kind of staggering for me to contemplate.

I will just conclude and say this: I know that everybody in this Chamber goes to VA hospitals to visit. I have three VA hospitals in Virginia. I was in one in Hampton last Friday. We do this because we want to see our great care providers. We talk to our veterans. We get inspired by stories of resilience and see cutting-edge treatments and technologies.

Often, those visits are empowering and inspiring. One thing you will always feel when you leave after a visit to a VA hospital—and I felt this way when I left the VA in Hampton last Friday afternoon—is the enduring consequences of war. When I was visiting a mental health unit, when I was visiting the women's clinic that now deals with the increasing number of women veterans, what you grapple with are the enduring consequences of war.

Under the best of circumstances, when we get it right and we win, there are still horrible consequences of war—people's health and people's lives and then the lives and health of the caregivers and friends of those who serve. Because those consequences are so momentous and so enduring, those of us in this body—and maybe especially those of us in this body who didn't wear the uniform and didn't serve—we have a special obligation to make sure that we deliberate and deliberate carefully before we send troops into harm's way.

The President of the United States—this President and every President—always needs the ability to defend the United States against imminent attack without asking for anybody's permission. I think the world knows we will do that. This body, though, is a body

that needs to decide if we go on offense and engage in military action. Guess what. The world knows we will do that too.

We took that vote on the war authorization in 2001, and 18 years later, we have tens of thousands of troops deployed and people still losing their lives. We are spending \$45 billion a year in Afghanistan to preserve the gains that we won. No one can question America's resolve. But this resolution is about a level of deliberation to match the sacrifice that we expect. The sacrifice is momentous, so our deliberation should be careful. That is what this bill is designed to do. That is why I am so proud to have worked on it with my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, fellow Senators, we are about to vote on an important piece of legislation. Of course, it is a piece of legislation that will never become law, but nonetheless it deserves our attention, and certainly it deserves serious consideration.

We know two things as we approach this. No. 1, under the Constitution, it is absolutely crystal clear that only Congress can declare war. No. 2, which is crystal clear, we know the President of the United States has the authority to defend the country. Finally, No. 3—and this is very important, as it relates to this—no one wants war with Iran. No one agrees that we should proceed to war with Iran. That is simply not the situation here today.

There are constitutional questions here that we know we have to wrestle with, and they are difficult ones.

It is important to note here, first of all, that the dispute that has been going on with Iran for a long, long time has really nothing to do with the Iranian people. We support the Iranian people. They have a long history, a proud tradition, and they deserve substantially better than what they are getting in leadership today.

This is an important debate we are going to have today about war powers and the use of military force.

One thing also that is clear but that muddies the water is that there is no clear line of delineation between actual war and the use of kinetic force.

As I said, it is important to have this debate. I really believe it should not be held in this context. It should be a policy that we are debating that is useable in all contexts. I have sat through dozens of hours of debate on war powers, the war powers of the President. It is an age-old debate that has gone on since George Washington was President. It is a hard debate because all these words were written in the 18th century, and things were a lot clearer then. Things are much less clear today. These debates were long. There were many lawyers involved. Indeed, no conclusion can be reached.

It is one of those areas where I have come to the conclusion that the words

that need to be written in order to clearly specify the place that the President occupies and the place that the Congress occupies is a very, very difficult one.

There are things on this Earth—and I really believe this may be one of them—where we know it when we see it, but we can't define it. We know war when we see it. We also know what kinetic action is, in order to protect the people of the United States, that is more isolated in the hands of the President doing the defensive measure. We know that when we see it. But defining the distinction between the two when one blurs into the other is very, very difficult.

The President needs the authority that he has to defend the United States, and it is clear that authority comes from three buckets: No. 1, it comes from article II of the U.S. Constitution; No. 2, it comes from the War Powers Act; and No. 3, it comes from the AUMFs that have been passed by this body for some time.

Iran, as you are listening, understand that the President has that authority. He has specific authority from all of those buckets. Notwithstanding the arguments that have been made here by some Members of this body, the President unquestionably has those powers. This power has been used very sparingly by this President. Compared to the last administration, the numbers are really, indeed, striking. The drone action, drone strikes that have been taken then and now—during the Obama administration, there were 540 of them over 8 years. In this particular administration, they are very, very few and far between and can only be described as a handful.

This is a President who abhors the use of military force. I have had the opportunity to discuss it with him at length. I have actually been in the room when he has been confronted with these questions and had to make the decisions. He is deeply moved by these kinds of questions and understands how difficult they are. When he talks about how he has to write letters to the families of the men and women who didn't come home, about having to make those phone calls, about having to go to Dover to receive the remains of our brave men and women who didn't make it home alive, he is deeply, deeply disturbed by these matters. I can tell you, as I said, having been there, when he has had to make these decisions, they weigh heavily on him.

So what are we doing here today? It certainly isn't to rein in this President. He has not used his power willy-nilly, as I have indicated. It has been used very, very sparingly, and it has been used in great contrast to the previous administration.

Well, what we are doing here today is we are trying to get our arms around the question of, when is it appropriate for the President to use military force? We all have our ideas on that. We have the words that the Founding Fathers

left us, so we are going to debate it here today. And it is important.

The unfortunate part about this is that we are also sending a message to Iran. Iran is listening. There is no question that they are listening to this debate. They are listening to what people are saying here on the floor of the Senate.

One of the messages that will come out of this and the way this is drawn is that the drafters of this want to send a message of appeasement to Iran. This has been tried. It hasn't worked. The last administration bent over backward to offer appeasement to Iran. They were greatly betrayed by it. It was tried with the JCPOA, and it didn't work. The reason it didn't work is that we are not dealing with people here who are acting in good faith.

What we need to do is to send a message of firmness and not weakness. At the end of the day, when we are all done with this, there will be such a message. It needs to be a consistent and a uniform message when it comes to messaging to Iran and when it comes to the messaging of our foreign policy as it relates to Iran. It will not be this law that is before us, because it is going to be vetoed. We all know it is going to be vetoed. It takes a two-thirds majority to override that. It is not going to happen.

So the mixed message is there. Iran will listen to it. The hard-liners will take it one way, and other people will take it the other. That is not a good situation. Hopefully, we will be able to lay this out in a way in which they can read between the lines and get the message that is important.

The President took an action that people have criticized here that was difficult. It was a tough decision. He was a really bad guy—a guy who was worse than Osama bin Laden. He was the person who was executing Iran's malign policies in the world and in the region. His killings and loss of limbs have become legendary in the world today. Whenever I see one of our young men or women who is missing an arm or a leg, he or she owes that to General Soleimani. He killed hundreds of people. He was responsible for the IED program that took the lives of so many and maimed so many of our men and women who were fighting in the Middle East. It got to the point at which he was wandering around, really, with impunity and was not worried about what he was doing or that anybody was going to take any action against him.

Let's look at the timeline over the last year.

The Iranians started by blowing up oil tankers, and nothing was done about it. They attacked the Saudi oil fields, where 100 Americans were working, and nothing was done about it. They took down a drone of ours over international space, and nothing was done about it. Finally, over the fall, they ratcheted it up with 13 attacks on U.S. soldiers at U.S. bases in Iraq. These were our men and our women

whom we had asked to go over there and push back against Iran's attempt at infiltration into Iraq. They took 13 attacks. Finally, on one of those attacks, somebody was killed. The President laid down a redline that, if an American were killed, there was going to be a price to pay. They finally killed that person. They attacked our Embassy in Baghdad and attempted to set it on fire.

Eventually, the President made the choice to do what he did. This was in response to Iran's continual pushing of the envelope and the miscalculations that Iran made. General Soleimani had been traveling from place to place, putting in place the final plans of coordination for the execution of an attack against the American people. It was imminent.

You have heard my friends here say: Oh, no. It was not imminent. We listened to the intelligence.

I sit on the Intelligence Committee. I sat through all of the briefings that were given that were at the secret level and at the top secret level that were given to the people who are here in the body. I also sat through the ones that were given to the Intelligence Committee, which were compartmented and much more granular. There was no doubt that this man was planning an imminent attack to kill Americans. He didn't get the chance.

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you for what you did.

We have heard the argument here that it was not imminent. This person was substantially more of an imminent danger to the United States of America and to Americans than Osama bin Laden was. Yet, when the President of the United States, Barack Obama, took out Osama bin Laden, we all cheered it. In fact, we passed a resolution here—100 to 0—commending the President of the United States for what he did.

Mr. President, you heard us today pass such a resolution that thanks you. Thank you, Mr. President, and farewell, General Soleimani.

Iran, do not miscalculate and read what is happening here as being capitulation or weakness or appeasement. It is not. It is a disagreement between this branch of government, the legislative branch, and our second branch of government, the executive branch, as to how we should defend ourselves. Make no mistake about it: We will defend ourselves.

In America, we operate under the rule of law. This joint resolution that is in front of us that we are debating today will not become law. It will not be part of the body of law by which we live. It will be vetoed.

Iran, take note: If you continue on the path that you are on with your malign activities, it is going to take you to a very bad place.

I urge a "no" vote. I understand how it is going to come out. I will be standing here again to sustain the President's veto, and it will be sustained.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the scheduled 1:45 p.m. vote commence now.

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

The clerk will read the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution, as amended, pass?

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 bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 52 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Hassan	Reed
Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Blumenthal	Jones	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cardin	Leahy	Smith
Carper	Lee	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Cassidy	Markey	Udall
Collins	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cooms	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Moran	Warren
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	Young
Gillibrand	Paul	
Harris	Peters	

NAYS—45

Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blackburn	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Graham	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Romney
Braun	Hawley	Rounds
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Kennedy	Shelby
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Loeffler	Thune
Daines	McConnell	Tillis
Enzi	McSally	Toomey
Ernst	Perdue	Wicker

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 68

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress has the sole power to declare war under article I, section 8, clause 11 of the United States Constitution.

(2) The President has a constitutional responsibility to take actions to defend the United States, its territories, possessions, citizens, service members, and diplomats from attack.

(3) Congress has not yet declared war upon, nor enacted a specific statutory authorization for use of military force against, the Islamic Republic of Iran. The 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law

107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) against the perpetrators of the 9/11 attack and the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) do not serve as a specific statutory authorization for the use of force against Iran.

(4) The conflict between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran constitutes, within the meaning of section 4(a) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543(a)), either hostilities or a situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances into which United States Armed Forces have been introduced.

(5) Members of the United States Armed Forces and intelligence community, and all those involved in the planning of the January 2, 2020, strike on Qasem Soleimani, including President Donald J. Trump, should be commended for their efforts in a successful mission.

(6) Section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)) states that "at any time that United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States, its possessions and territories without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs".

(7) More than 100 members of the United States Armed Forces sustained traumatic brain injuries in the Iranian retaliatory attack on the Ain al-Assad air base in Iraq despite initial reports that no casualties were sustained in the attack.

(8) Section 8(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(c)) defines the introduction of the United States Armed Forces to include "the assignment of members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged in, hostilities".

(9) The United States Armed Forces have been introduced into hostilities, as defined by the War Powers Resolution, against Iran.

(10) The question of whether United States forces should be engaged in hostilities against Iran should be answered following a full briefing to Congress and the American public of the issues at stake, a public debate in Congress, and a congressional vote as contemplated by the Constitution.

(11) Section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a) provides that any joint resolution or bill to require the removal of United States Armed Forces engaged in hostilities without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization shall be considered in accordance with the expedited procedures of section 601(b) of the International Security and Arms Export Control Act of 1976.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF THE USE OF UNITED STATES FORCES FOR HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN.

(a) TERMINATION.—Pursuant to section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a), and in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976, Congress hereby directs the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces for hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran or any part of its government or military, unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or specific authorization for use of military force against Iran.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the United States from defending itself from imminent attack.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS—S.J. RES. 68

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks be allowed to make technical corrections to the engrossing of the amendments to S.J. Res. 68.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 384.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Rob Portman, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Todd Young, John Cornyn.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 491.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Rob Portman, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Todd Young, John Cornyn.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

AMENDING TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PROTECT PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILDREN—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 420.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 420, S. 3275, an act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 420, S. 3275, an act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Tim Scott, Joni Ernst, Roy Blunt, Tom Cotton, Kevin Cramer, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Chuck Grassley, Marsha Blackburn, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, Mike Lee, John Hoeven, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Braun, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 17, S. 311, an act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 17, S. 311, an act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

Ben Sasse, John Boozman, Cindy Hyde-Smith, David Perdue, Tim Scott, Joni Ernst, Lindsey Graham, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Mike Rounds, John Hoeven, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Mike Braun, Mitch McConnell.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. I withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 569.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Kevin Cramer, Tim Scott, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, John Barrasso, John Hoeven, Todd Young, Pat Roberts, John Thune, David Perdue, Lisa Murkowski.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session and consider Calendar No. 416.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination. The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

Mitch McConnell, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Thom Tillis, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Kevin Cramer, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Shelley Moore Capito, Todd Young, John Boozman, David Perdue, James E. Risch, Lindsey Graham, Roger F. Wicker.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls with respect to the cloture motions be waived.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 420 was not agreed to; it was only made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

5G

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to talk for a few minutes today about 5G, the Federal Communications Commission, and swamp creatures.

We have all heard a lot about 5G, and 5G is just incredibly fast internet. It will make possible things like driverless cars, telemedicine, and the internet of things.

I want to caution all of us that these things are not going to happen overnight. In fact, some parts of our country already have 5G, and we don't have driverless cars and the internet of things and long-distance surgery.

These innovations are going to happen over a long period of time, and in the meantime, there is going to be a lot of hype from the telecommunications companies. Why? Because they want to sell you 5G. They are going to tell you that 5G can do all these incredible things. They are going to tell you that 5G can grow hair, that 5G can cure erectile dysfunction, that 5G can do this and it can do that.

Look, I want to be on record as saying 5G is going to be extraordinary, but it is not going to happen overnight. The emergency that some of our telecommunications companies are trying to create is not nearly the emergency that really exists because they have something they want to sell you. I am not putting them down. That is free enterprise.

How does 5G work? Well, it is wireless technology. When I have 5G on my phone and you have 5G on your phone, we communicate—whether it is 5G wireless technology or otherwise—through radio waves. Radio waves go from my phone to your phone, and they carry data. It is called electromagnetic radiation, but all it is, is really radio waves. And there are all different kinds of radio waves. It depends on the frequency.

Do you know who owns those radio waves? The FCC doesn't. The telecommunications companies, which use those radio waves, don't. The Federal Government doesn't, except in this sense: You own those radio waves. The American taxpayer owns those radio waves. And they are incredibly valuable because telecommunications companies line up when the FCC has new radio waves available for them. They line up to bid on those radio waves, which they can use. We call that spectrum.

There is a certain type of radio wave going through the air—or spectrum, if you will—that is perfect for 5G. It is like Goldilocks' porridge—it is not too hot; it is not too cold; it is just right. The telecommunications companies want to use that C band, we call it, or midrange spectrum. I am going to call it C band. They want the FCC to license it to them.

Well, right now, using that spectrum, that C band—remember, these are the radio waves, the spectrum, that are just perfect for 5G. Right now, using this C band spectrum are a number of satellite companies, most of which are foreign-owned. The major satellite companies that are using it right now happen to be domiciled in Luxembourg—wonderful country and wonder-

ful people. Do you know what they pay to the American taxpayer to use that spectrum? Nothing. Zero. Nada.

You say: Well, how did that happen, KENNEDY? You just told me that these radio waves are very valuable and that the telecommunications companies are lined up to lease them. How did the foreign satellite companies get the C band for nothing if they are using it right now?

I don't know. It wasn't this FCC, but some FCC just gave it to them and said: Here, use it for free.

I wasn't there. I am not necessarily criticizing them. I am just telling you they got it for nothing. But they didn't get a license. They don't have a lease. They have a privilege to use it. In the fine print of the document that gives them this privilege, at any time, the FCC can take it back because the foreign satellite companies don't have a property interest. They don't own it. They don't have a lease. They didn't pay anything for it. They just have the privilege to use it until the FCC wants to take it back.

Now, the foreign satellite companies—and I am not criticizing them. God bless them. They are making a lot of money using this spectrum that belongs to the American taxpayer for free. Well, that is the way it has been for a while. Now, some telecommunications companies like Verizon and others—good companies—they say: We need that C band, FCC. We need that C band to use for 5G.

Well, the satellite companies—I will call them the Luxembourg satellite companies—once again, good people. Luxembourg is a good country. They said: Well, we are using the C band right now. We don't want to give it up to the telecommunications companies, but we will make you a deal.

They went to the FCC. The satellite companies said to the FCC: We are using the C band right now, and even though we didn't pay a single solitary dime for it, we know the telecommunications companies want it to implement 5G, so here is what we will do. You, FCC, give us the C band. Give it to us, and we will turn around and make sure that the telecommunications companies get to use it. We will lease it to them.

The amount of money that the foreign satellite companies would have made was about \$70 billion. I call it "The Bank Job" robbery. Remember that movie that came out in 2008, "The Bank Job"? It was a 2008 heist movie. It was about the 1971 Baker Street robbery in London. I call this proposal "The Bank Job" robbery. I don't see how the foreign satellite companies made the proposal with a straight face. Give us this C band that belongs to the American people. Just give it to us, and we are going to sell it to the telecommunications companies and pocket the \$70 billion.

Do you know what? Our FCC almost did it. They were this close. They said: Oh, we have to do this because we have

to get this C band to the telecommunications companies because it is an emergency. We have to get 5G tomorrow, so let's just give the satellite companies that are using it now—didn't pay a red dime for it—let's give them the spectrum that belongs to the American people and let them sell it to the telecommunications companies and pocket the \$70 billion because our hair is on fire and we have to do it.

Swamp creatures. They came this close to stealing \$70 billion from the American people, but they didn't pull it off because a number of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives started raising fresh hell—fresh hell.

I went to see the President of the United States.

I said: Mr. President, do you know what is going on here? Here you are every day saying "Buy American. We have to take care of America first." It doesn't mean we don't care about the rest of the world, but we have to buy American, and your FCC over here is giving away this C band to Luxembourg satellite companies.

He said: What in God's name?

He was like Rocketman. He got mad. I don't speak for the President, but I am just telling you what happened.

So the FCC, to its credit, backed off. They said: No, we are not going to give it away. We are going to do what we should have done in the first place; that is, auction it off.

They are going to hold an auction like on eBay, and these satellite companies—rather, these telecommunication companies can come in and bid. If the FCC would do it right, we would take in \$70 billion for the American taxpayer, and we could use that money to implement rural broadband, and then everybody would be happy.

It would have been great, but no, here comes the "Baby Driver" heist. Did you see that movie, "Baby Driver"? Now there is a new proposal on the table. The Chairman of our FCC—who is a good man, by the way; I am going to come back to him—he has come up with a new proposal. To his credit, the Chairman says: We are going to bid it out, but we are going to take \$15 billion of the money that comes in, and we are going to give it to the foreign satellite companies.

For what? They don't own it. They don't have a license; they just have a privilege. He is going to give \$5 billion to them to relocate to different spectrum, and then he is going to give them \$10 billion—that is nine zeros—in walking-around money just to go away. That is why I call it the "Baby Driver" heist. That was a great movie. Did you see that, starring Jamie Foxx? Wonderful movie.

Let me say this about the FCC Chairman: He is a friend of mine, and he is smart as a whip. He went to Harvard undergrad, honors degree, Chicago Law School, Chicago Law Review, and worked as an executive at Verizon Communications for a while. I consider

him a friend, and I have the utmost respect for him, and I thank him for finally agreeing to do a public auction and not give the C band away to the foreign satellite companies. But as much as I respect the Chairman, I wouldn't take him with me if I was going to buy a car because he would pay the full sticker price. If I needed somebody to explain string theory to me or the Doppler effect or quantum engineering or genome sequencing, I would probably go to the Chairman of the FCC because he is that smart. But I don't agree with him that he has made a good deal to give \$10 billion away to these foreign satellite companies—\$10 billion of American taxpayer money that ought to be going to things like rural broadband.

The Chairman is going to present that to the FCC to vote on it on February 28. He says he has the votes to pass it. I can tell you this, it is not going to be unanimous, and it is not going to be noncontroversial to give away \$15 billion to somebody who doesn't have a property interest.

He says: We have to do it because we are in a race with China.

OK. I agree with that. And your point is?

He says: Well, if we don't do it, the satellite companies are going to sue us.

That is another straw man. Let me tell you something. The FCC gets sued every day. Do you know what the FCC Chairman needs to tell the satellite companies? He needs to tell them: Hey, do you need me to draw you a map to the courthouse? Go sue. We get sued every day, but I am not going to give you \$15 billion of taxpayer money to go away because it is wrong.

I am not sure the FCC has any authority to do this. Last time I checked, it was Congress that appropriates money, not the Federal Communications Commission.

I told you that the FCC Chairman's proposal is to give the foreign satellite companies \$5 billion to buy new satellites and to move to a new spectrum, and \$10 billion just to go away because they say: Oh, we are scared of a lawsuit. We are scared of a lawsuit.

I don't know how he arrived at \$10 billion to give to them. I wish somebody would give me \$10 billion. Why not \$11 billion? Why not \$8 billion? Why not \$7 billion? There is no explanation. We are just going to give them \$10 billion of taxpayer money, and they are going to go away.

Of course, the satellite companies, they are happy as clams. They are as happy as a gopher in soft dirt because they are getting \$10 billion for nothing. And they are also getting \$5 billion to buy new satellites, but if you check, all the satellites now are worn out, so they would have to buy new satellites anyway—5G or not.

The FCC needs to wait. On February 28, they need to announce and vote to have the public auction as they had promised. It will be held in December of this year. There is absolutely not a

single solitary reason why the Chairman of the FCC has to put a vote in front of the FCC to give away \$15 billion of taxpayer money. We can negotiate a better deal. We can negotiate a better deal.

The Chairman of the FCC does not need to become known as the \$15 billion man. He needs to hold up and let us talk to the satellite companies and negotiate a better deal.

Now, if he is not willing to do that, he needs to at least tell President Trump because do you know who is going to get blamed for this? The President. It will not be his fault, but he is going to get blamed for it because it happened on his watch.

Here he is, out there talking about the American economy, we have to protect our economy, and we have to buy American first. It doesn't mean we don't love the rest of the world, but his FCC is just giving away \$15 billion of taxpayer money—of taxpayer money—to our friends and foreign satellite companies, and the President will get blamed. So I am hoping the FCC at least goes to see him and tell him what they are going to do.

When the American public finds out about this, you are not going to be able to find the FCC members who came up with this idea. You are not going to be able to find them with a flashlight, with a map, or with a search party. You will not be able to find them with Google. They are going to be hiding. It is an embarrassment.

They may have the votes to do this, but I am not giving up. I have a bill, along with Senator SCHUMER—yes, CHUCK and I are working on a bill together—Senator CANTWELL, Senator SCHATZ, and we are going to have some others on the bill, that says: Look, this is Congress's decision, not FCC's decision. It would allocate a much more modest sum to these foreign satellite companies. I would like the FCC, if it would, to step back, continue on with its auction planning and give us a chance to negotiate on behalf of the American taxpayer.

I am going to close with this point: Not a single day passes in this Chamber that I don't hear one of us, Democrats and Republicans, talking about the deficits, and, boy, are they high—\$22 trillion and climbing. We borrow \$1 million a minute to run this place. So \$1.4 billion a day, that is how much more we spend than we take in. We are mortgaging our kids' future. Everybody talks about it and says we have to do something about it.

We are like a problem gambler chasing his losses. Some say we are like a drunk sailor, but we are worse than a drunk sailor. A drunk sailor stops spending when he runs out of money. We don't. We just borrow it.

Here we are, in the middle of all of this, and our Federal Communications Commission is going to give away \$15 billion. Our Chairman, henceforth, will be known as the \$15 billion man.

If they do this without telling the President, without consulting with

Congress, and without trying to negotiate a better deal for the American taxpayer, then we ought to change their name from the Federal Communications Commission to the "Federal Sucker Commission" because that is all they are.

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

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

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, in 1924, when Oklahoma was a very young State, a young lady named Ada was born in Chickasha. Now, you would get that joke if you are from Oklahoma because we have a town in Oklahoma called Ada and a town in Oklahoma called Chickasha. This is a young lady named Ada born in Chickasha.

She thrived. She was an excellent student. In fact, she was the valedictorian of her high school, Lincoln High School. She left that and went to college. She stayed 1 year at one college, then transferred to another college and graduated with honors in 1945.

She dreamed of being a lawyer. She had graduated with honors. She had graduated valedictorian. She had all the credentials and all the capabilities to do it, but she had one big problem: She was Black. In Oklahoma in the 1940s, there were no law schools that would allow a Black student to attend. So, in Oklahoma, the policy was to help Black students who wanted to be a lawyer leave the State to study somewhere else.

She really didn't want to do that. She had graduated from the great Langston University and had a great education there and had every ability to do that. She interviewed with the University of Oklahoma—interviewed, actually, with the president of the school at that time—to go through the process to get into the University of Oklahoma law school.

She was found to be fully qualified, but the problem was, again, she was Black. And it wasn't just a problem with the University of Oklahoma. At that time, there was State law that did not allow Black students and White students to study together—and certainly not to study law together.

So she did a radical thing. On April 6, 1946, she filed a lawsuit against the State of Oklahoma saying that she wanted to study law at the very good University of Oklahoma law school. A young lawyer took up her case, a gentleman named Thurgood Marshall, a young lawyer who later became Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall. Young Thurgood Marshall took up her case to argue in front of Oklahoma district court, where they lost, arguing it all the way to the State supreme court, where they lost, lost, lost.

Then they took it into Federal court, saying that, constitutionally, neither the United States of America nor any State in the United States could block a student from studying law simply because they were Black. They won that case.

Probably returning back to Oklahoma to study, the Oklahoma Legislature hurriedly put together a new law school and called it Langston Law School and opened up a room in the State capitol and put a few books there and said: There is your law school.

Thurgood Marshall and Ada Fisher did not accept that—nor should they have—and started the process again of saying: We can't have a separate but "equal" law school in Oklahoma. They argued again in State courts, eventually ending up again heading all the way back to the Supreme Court.

Before it got to the Supreme Court and Oklahoma would lose again in front of the same nine Justices, they determined that they would break, and they would give. On June 18, 1949, more than 3 years after she started the process of getting into law school, she was admitted into the University of Oklahoma College of Law, where she was given a seat in the back of the room with a sign directly in front of her that read "coloreds only," and she could sit in that row in the back of the room.

In 1950, just the next year, those barriers would come down, and in August of 1952, Ada Fisher graduated from the University of Oklahoma law school and became a lawyer. She set the pace for thousands and thousands of others who are lawyers behind her now and get the chance of having that same joy.

Interestingly enough, if you were to visit the courthouse in Oklahoma City, the Federal district court there—if you were there a couple years of ago, you would have bumped into Vicki Miles-LaGrange. That African-American judge, the pace was set for her by Ada Fisher. If you drop by and visit it today, you would bump into Bernard Jones, that African-American judge who serves there for the Western District of Oklahoma. The pace was set for him by Ada Fisher decades before.

Quite frankly, we can't even fathom, in this current time period, how different things really are, but it is interesting to notice that time period and that generation and some ladies who really stood up and made a difference in Oklahoma because at the same time that Ada was at Langston University, another lady named Clara was at Langston University.

We know her affectionately in Oklahoma as Clara Luper. Now, some folks may not know Clara Luper's name, but they know what she did. Clara Luper was at Langston University as well in the early 1940s. She finished her study, got her bachelor's degree there, went and got a master's degree, and continued on through the process. She became the Youth Council leader for the NAACP in 1957, and in 1958 she helped her students—her youth whom she

worked with—do a really, really radical thing to deal with segregation in Oklahoma. She talked about non-violence, and she talked about how to step out and take a stand. She and a group of kids went to Katz Drug Store in Oklahoma City and sat down at the counter and ordered Cokes. And they sat there all day, never being served—all day. It was the birth nationwide of what we know of as the sit-in movement, where young men and women who were African American would go and sit down at a place and just wait to be served. It started a movement that shook the Nation into this issue of segregation. Those two ladies made a remarkable change for the better in our history: Clara Luper and what she did; Ada Fisher and what she did.

As we look back on tomorrow, Frederick Douglass's birthday, and we celebrate February as Black History Month, we realize how much history has really happened around us—just in the past 100 years even. We can go back as far as we want to and talk about the great Frederick Douglass and the influence he had on Abraham Lincoln and the influence he had on the Nation.

Quite frankly, in Oklahoma, there are Black leaders today who are making history, and 50 years from now and 100 years from now we will be talking about them like we talk about Clara Luper and like we talk about Ada Fisher.

We will be, 100 years from now, still talking about Russell Perry and the business work that he and his son Kevin have done in radio, what they have done in real estate, and what they have done in leadership in our State. Russell Perry was a barrier breaker. He was a cabinet member for a Governor. He has been a great leader and is a great leader in our State.

We will still be talking, years and years from now, of Dr. Kent Smith, the current president of Langston University, and what he has done at Langston and the leadership model that he has in our State.

For years, we will be talking about the members of the 1921 Race Massacre Commission and those individuals around Tulsa who have gathered around to say: What are we doing to help bring a community together and break down the barriers of segregation and of racism that still exist?

We will be talking for years about Hannibal Johnson. He is a lawyer and a brilliant man, a historian, and a leader in his community.

We will be talking for years about Wayland Cuban, an Oklahoma City police officer and a person who has spent a tremendous amount of time helping those around him and helping youth, especially those in trouble, to have a radical turnaround.

We will talk for years about Terry Munday and what he has done on the radio.

We will talk for years about pastors scattered all over our State that, in the African-American community,

have made a very real difference in the lives of a lot of families.

We will talk for years, quite frankly, about Dr. Lester Shaw and what he has done at A Pocket Full of Hope and how he has helped so many kids. He has, for years, mentored students and has had a 100-percent success rate, year after year after year, of just loving on kids and helping them in every way he can. Dr. Shaw has made a remarkable difference in our State.

We will talk for years about Clarence Hill and about what he has done for race relations in our State and how he is quietly bringing people together to sit down around a dinner table and develop friendships that should have existed long ago.

We will talk for years about Stephan Moore and his family, what they have done in the inner city, what they have done to pull kids out and look at them eyeball to eyeball and give them a sense of hope and a sense of joy.

See, in our State and around my city, Oklahoma City, where Frederick Douglass High School is, February is not just another month. We understand what Black history really means because we are living it with legacy-leavers like Ada Fisher and Clara Luper and so many others who have left such a mark.

I am proud to say I have neighbors and friends all around me who continue to make history in what they continue to do in our State. I am grateful to call them friends, and I am grateful we have the opportunity to celebrate Frederick Douglass's birthday together.

I yield back.

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.

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

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

MAKE CENTS ACT

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, there is really no way to sugarcoat it. Washington's budget process is broken. Every year, it is like clockwork. First, the President submits his budget, like we saw this past Monday. Then the House tears it up—no pun intended, really. They ultimately fail to pass their own budget, and then Congress kicks the can down the road before finally cramming through a budget-busting bill at the eleventh hour.

There is no question this process is dysfunctional, but maybe, more importantly, its lack of transparency allows for wasteful spending to continue year after year—unchecked.

Folks, this cycle has to end. We have to start chipping away at this ballooning debt, and we have to work toward cutting our government's most wasteful spending.

One of the best ways to do this is to call it out when we see it. As some of

you may know, every month, I give out my Squeal Award to call out the parts of our government that are wasting hard-working Americans' tax dollars. I highlight the most egregious waste found within the bowels of Washington, and then I put it forward and offer up a solution to stop it.

Take, for example, what I like to call the binge buying bureaucrats. Every year at the end of September, the bureaucrats charge billions of dollars to taxpayers during Washington's annual use-it-or-lose-it spending spree. We have seen the compulsive buying include items like millions and millions of dollars of lobster and crab. We have even seen spending on games and toys or even on something like a \$12,000 foosball table. Is that what we need in Washington, DC—foosball?

I have also called out Washington's boondoggles that are just bottomless money pits for projects that never really even get off the ground. As for the contractors who are working on these boondoggles, the ones who are failing at their jobs, guess what—they are getting big, fat bonuses.

A primary example of this egregious misuse of tax dollars is what I like to call the moondoggle. Right there. There you have it. Look at that—the moondoggle. I am talking about the rockets that are being developed for NASA's next Moon mission. This project is billions of dollars over budget and years—folks, not months but years—behind schedule due to poor performance. Yet NASA still handed out generous bonuses that totaled over \$300 million to the contractor who is working on the project.

Folks, it is absurd. This is absurd. We have to put an end to it, and thankfully I believe we might actually be on a path that will do that.

Taxpayers should be encouraged that all of this "squealing" has finally been heard at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Both of these Squeal Award recipients—the binge buying bureaucrats and the infamous moondoggle—have been targeted by President Trump in his latest budget proposal.

Within its pages, the President states that his administration is committed to stopping improper end-of-year spending and will begin closely scrutinizing how money is being spent at the end of the fiscal year to curtail waste. The President's budget also calls out the poor performance of the NASA contractor and proposes management improvements that would shave \$300 million off the cost of the mission. This is encouraging, no doubt about it.

In order to codify these efforts, I am putting forward a package of common-sense reforms to join the President in urging Congress to actually address Washington's spending addiction, get our budget process back on track, and ensure Iowans understand exactly how their hard-earned dollars are being spent.

In order to force Congress to do its job and become a better steward of tax-

payers' money, I have introduced the MAKE CENTS Act. This comprehensive package combines five simple ideas I have previously introduced.

First off, it requires an annual report listing every government-funded project that is \$1 billion or more over budget or 5 years or more behind schedule.

Second, it requires every project supported with Federal funds to include a pricetag that is easily available for taxpayers.

Third, it eliminates use-it-or-lose-it impulse purchases by limiting an agency's spending in the last 2 months of the fiscal year to no more than the average spent in the other months.

Fourth, it prohibits Congress from going on recess without passing a budget on time.

Fifth and lastly, it prohibits Congress from getting paid without its passing a budget on time.

Folks, these are not new or radical reforms. Many folks in the Senate and in the House have proposed various versions of these items, recognizing the serious problem we face. Like the bill title reads, these ideas just make sense. If hard-working Iowa families have to manage their budgets, we really should expect Washington to do the same. So let's get at it.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. 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.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF LEE COUNTY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today it is a privilege for me to join Kentuckians in Lee County in marking 150 years of their distinguished history. Found in Eastern Kentucky, where tall hills meet dense forests, Lee County is home to a special rural heritage. I would like to spend a few moments today to look back at the area's wonderful traditions and to celebrate its great potential for the future.

To fully understand Lee County's history, we must appreciate its geography. The county seat, Beattyville, sits at the birthplace of the beautiful Kentucky River. The Commonwealth's

namesake waterway has historically provided Lee County residents a ship-ping avenue and a scenic venue for out-door recreation. Lush valleys led local farmers to grow a wide range of crops, including tobacco, corn, and apples. The Daniel Boone National Forest, which covers thousands of acres of the county, provides an abundant source of hardwood. Taking advantage of the beautiful Appalachian Mountains, coal operations in the county have been a historic aspect of this region.

Formed in the years following the Civil War, Lee County did not take long to become a center of regional ground and water transportation. At the beginning of the 20th century, the Louisville and Atlantic Railroad extended its line to Beattyville, encouraging new opportunities for local growth. The following decades saw a strengthening economy and growing population.

As the county developed, so did its rural traditions. One of them, the local Woolly Worm Festival, celebrates Lee County's mountain culture. Each October, the community gathers for a variety of events, including a pet show, a parade, and a pageant. The most interesting day is the Woolly Worm Races, where young people see whose banded woolly worm is the fastest to climb a string. The winning worm is given the responsibility of predicting that year's upcoming winter based on its body's coloration. This is just one example of the pride every Lee County resident can enjoy in their home county.

I frequently get the chance to visit with families in Lee County and consistently work to advance their priorities in the Senate. For example, I have partnered with local officials to secure millions of Federal dollars to upgrade their water infrastructure and to build a hiking and mountain biking trail. It has also been a privilege to support the brave drug eradication efforts of law enforcement and the Kentucky National Guard in the Daniel Boone National Forest. Answering the call of Kentuckians is one of the best aspects of my service in the Senate, and I look forward to continuing to deliver for communities in Lee County and across Kentucky.

Lee County will kick off its year of festivities on March 1, the same day the county was established in 1870. In addition to many community events, the county is also presenting an oral history project, featuring community members discussing local artifacts and historical events. There is certainly a lot to celebrate about the last 150 years. I am delighted to join all the families throughout Lee County in marking this impressive milestone, and I urge my Senate colleagues to join me in paying tribute to this wonderful Eastern Kentucky community.

S.J. RES. 68

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier today, we voted on an amendment to

S.J. Res. 68 that was offered by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator RISCH. That amendment consisted of one sentence, as follows: "The President has a constitutional responsibility to take actions to defend the United States, its territories, possessions, citizens, servicemembers and diplomats from attack."

On its face, the Risch amendment seems reasonable. The President does have a responsibility to defend the country. But, as is so often the case, the devil is in the details, or the absence of details, and when it involves engaging U.S. Armed Forces in hostilities, we should pay particularly close attention. I was among those who opposed the amendment and I want to explain why.

First, it is important to note that the underlying resolution already states that "[nothing] in this section shall be construed to prevent the United States from defending itself from imminent attack." So there is no question about the President's authority to defend the country. But the central purpose of the resolution is to give meaning to the Congress's constitutional authority—the Congress's sole power—to declare war. For far too long this body has surrendered that duty to the executive branch.

In 2002, when the Senate considered whether or not to authorize President George W. Bush to invade Iraq, many in this body argued that providing the President with that authority was needed to convince Saddam Hussein to back down. I, instead, saw it as Congress abdiquating its constitutional duty by providing the President with open-ended authority to use military force against Iraq. For that reason, among others, I voted no.

In fact, my worst fears were realized. Not only was the justification for that war based on lies, but thousands of Americans died, trillions of dollars were wasted that could have been used to fix what's broken in this country, and the American people are no safer. Today that authority is being used in ways that no one envisioned or intended to justify an attack against another country, Iran, nearly two decades later.

We should learn from that costly mistake. The obvious implication of the Risch amendment is that any President is authorized, and has an affirmative responsibility, to use military force at anytime, anywhere, indefinitely, to prevent an unspecified attack that might occur sometime in the future. There is no requirement that it be "imminent". There is no requirement that such an attack be anything other than speculative or imagined.

Given the way this and past administrations have expansively interpreted past authorizations for the use of force, the Risch amendment could be interpreted to further erode Congress's ability to prevent a President from unilat-

erally sending U.S. forces into hostilities without prior consultation with, or further authorization from, the Congress. Such an endorsement—even if unintended—of unchecked Executive power undermines the purpose of the underlying joint resolution, and it makes a mockery of the Congress's sole power to declare war. That is not something any of us should condone.

THE CLEAN ECONOMY ACT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I rise to discuss solutions to the climate crisis, which threatens the health and well-being of my constituents in Maryland and Americans across the Nation.

The urgency of climate change asks us to be our most cooperative and collaborative selves and to seek policy solutions that far outlast our legacies in office. As the threat of climate change becomes more and more visible to the American public, people are demanding action from their Federal Government. This year, we have seen an unprecedented level of interest from Americans of all ages and walks of life on real solutions to this complex problem. A variety of comprehensive solutions have been proposed, some that represent a departure from how the Federal Government has addressed climate change in the past, while others utilize existing Federal frameworks to drive climate action.

History tells us that our Federal agencies have an incredible capacity to evolve to meet the threats of their time. In previous administrations, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has been a dynamic steward of domestic environmental law throughout the last half-century and is well-practiced in addressing environmental concerns as they emerge. Unfortunately, Congress and the President have failed to provide the EPA with the direction and funding it needs to address the issue of climate change in earnest. I support Senator CARPER's Clean Economy Act for this very reason. The Clean Economy Act understands that the EPA lies at the center of America's climate future and empowers it to address climate change proactively.

The Clean Economy Act provides the agency with the clear goal of net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 to match the urgency to reduce warming global temperatures. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's—IPCC—October 2018 Special Report on climate warns that warming above 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels will have a catastrophic impact on our global systems. The United States reaching net-zero is an essential component to keep global temperature warming below the 1.5 degrees Celsius cap.

Many of this administration's nominees are fond of pointing out that they are not scientists, implying that they are not qualified to make decisions related to climate change. I will point out that most of us are not economists

either, but that doesn't stop us from making decisions that affect the economy. We have a responsibility to make informed decisions affecting our climate, environment, and natural resources, which are at the heart of our ability to maintain a healthy sustainable economy. There are some tough decisions to make in the face of climate change that reasonable people will disagree about, but the basic science should not be ignored. Whether to accept the facts of the matter should not be a partisan debate.

Fortunately, the IPCC, to which the U.S. Government and scientific community is a leading contributor, continues to provide a well-documented guide for what we need to do to respond to the climate crisis. According to the IPCC's landmark Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C, the model pathways that would enable us to limit global warming to the critical benchmark of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels reach net zero global net anthropogenic CO₂ emissions by approximately 2050. This bill is based on the science that demonstrates the importance and value of reaching net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by not later than 2050.

We can do this, and making the necessary investments to do so will strengthen our economy, create jobs, and protect our public health and national security. The most expensive and unrealistic course of action is to ignore the mounting costs of climate change and fail to respond.

The legislation ensures that the EPA's plan incorporates greenhouse gas reduction, while expanding opportunities for the U.S. labor force. After all, any conversation about a new U.S. energy future without the participation of working people is incomplete. The Clean Economy Act ensures the EPA has the power to invest in the development and deployment of low- and zero-greenhouse gas emitting technologies and that the U.S. workforce reaps the benefits of an equitable transition away from fossil fuels. The support of the Blue Green Alliance, a coalition of labor unions like the United Steelworkers and the Utility Workers Union of America and environmental organizations like the League of Conservation Voters and Natural Resources Defense Council demonstrates that a diverse collection of interests see a net-zero future for our country.

This legislation builds off bipartisan progress we have made this Congress using existing Federal frameworks to reduce emissions and prepare for the effects of climate change that are already here. In November 2018, the Fourth National Climate Assessment concluded that climate change is affecting the natural environment, agriculture, energy production and use, land and water resources, transportation, and human health and welfare across the U.S. and its territories." The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee favorably reported the American's Transportation Infra-

structure Act in July 2019 that for the first time included a Climate Title. The Federal assistance in it will help the transportation sector lower emissions through infrastructure for electric and alternatively fueled vehicles. The bill also supports States and local agencies preparing our Nation's roads and bridges to withstand climate impacts.

I encourage my colleagues across committees to work together to enact both pieces of legislation to prepare all sectors of the clean economy for the climate reality before us today.

One of the most critical climate change impacts that we must take immediate action on is the threat to our water infrastructure. This week, GAO is releasing a report on water infrastructure and climate change in response to a request I made with my colleague Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island. We asked the GAO to study what is known about the effects of climate change on the Nation's domestic water systems and the potential fiscal risks posed by those effects and evaluate Federal actions that may be taken to reduce such risks.

Therein, EPA estimates that drinking water and wastewater utilities need to invest almost \$744 billion to repair and replace their existing infrastructure over the next 20 years. GAO finds climate change is increasing these costs. In 2017, it cost the Federal Government over \$300 billion to repair damage resulting from climate- and weather-related events, including damage to drinking water and wastewater infrastructure, according to NOAA.

The faster we act to make our water infrastructure resilient to climate change impacts, as well as address the root cause of climate change through legislation such as the Clean Economy Act, the better we can reduce the risks and control the costs. Our drinking water and wastewater treatment systems are at great risk from climate change impacts such as heavy rainfall, sea level rise, and flooding that local managers are experiencing today.

The GAO report shows a path toward minimizing future damage. This study documents the need for the Federal Government to work with States and local utilities to strengthen the resilience of water infrastructure to climate impacts and makes practical suggestions that we should implement immediately through incorporating climate effects into infrastructure planning and providing enhanced technical and financial assistance.

My colleague Senator SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO of West Virginia and I introduced S. 2636, the Clean Water Infrastructure Resilience and Sustainability Act to prepare our publicly owned wastewater treatment facilities for the impacts of climate change. These efforts will work in tandem with the goals of the Clean Economy Act to seek net-zero emissions while preventing further damage to our national infrastructure by the extreme weather events we are already seeing.

The Clean Economy Act directs the EPA to coordinate with other Federal agencies to encourage the restoration of ecosystems such as forests and wetlands that sequester carbon and improve climate resilience, particularly on Federal and Tribal land.

The fight to reduce the greenhouse gases that cause climate change is not unlike the challenge we face in cleaning up and restoring water quality in the Chesapeake Bay and its rivers and streams. Many of the solutions, such as restoring natural carbon sinks like wetlands, are the same. Wetlands act like natural sponges, storing excess carbon in soils, as well as soaking up stormwater and trapping pollutants before they reach rivers, streams, and the Chesapeake Bay.

The original Chesapeake Bay Agreement was a simple, one-page pledge signed in 1983 recognizing that a cooperative approach was necessary to address the bay's pollution problems. The 1987 Chesapeake Bay Agreement set the first numeric goals to reduce pollution and restore the bay ecosystem. Today, the EPA-led Chesapeake Bay Program partnership engages dozens of agencies and organizations in the effort to restore the bay and its rivers. I am encouraged to see a number of the agencies named in section 2 of the Clean Economy Act are Federal agency partners, including the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—U.S. Department of Defense—DOD—and U.S. Department of the Interior—DOI.

This body recently unanimously passed proposals I authored that will benefit the Chesapeake Bay watershed and wetlands nationwide. Foremost was a provision increasing the EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Reauthorization to a historic \$92 million. The bills were part of a bipartisan package of wildlife conservation legislation, the America's Conservation Enhancement—ACE—Act. The ACE Act served as a substitute amendment for the North America Wetlands Conservation Extension Act—NAWCA—which provides grants to protect wetlands.

We have demonstrated our ability to respond legislatively to challenges that seemed insurmountable 30 years ago. I urge all of my colleagues to cosponsor this new consensus bill.

SOUTH SUDAN

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to express strong concern about the situation in South Sudan and to call on the administration to step up its diplomatic efforts to avert a return to conflict and help achieve a lasting peace. For 6 years, the people of South Sudan have suffered the effects of a brutal civil war. International efforts to find a diplomatic solution have failed, and the humanitarian situation in South Sudan remains one of the worst in the world.

In September 2018, President Salva Kiir and his main political opponent,

former Vice President Riek Machar, agreed to form a unity government in the capital, Juba, by March of 2019. Though this so called “revitalized agreement” is not perfect, it is what we have to work with. The ceasefire between Kiir and Machar that was part of it has largely held, sparing the South Sudanese from the violence and brutality so many experienced at the height of the civil war. I am also encouraged that the government and political opposition groups that had refused to sign the 2018 revitalized peace deal reached an accord last month.

However, two successive delays in the establishment of the unity government have made me skeptical about the chances that the latest deadline, February 22, will be met. While both parties have stated their commitment to it, they have yet to effectively address two fundamental sticking points: the boundaries of South Sudan’s states, and the formation of an inclusive national army. Absent an agreement on these two issues, lasting peace may prove elusive.

At the end of the day, Kiir, Machar, and others who claim to represent the South Sudanese people are responsible for peace in their country. However, given our historical role in South Sudan, the United States has a significant role to play. I would like to remind my colleagues that the United States was heavily involved in brokering the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement which helped create the conditions for South Sudan’s independence. Since independence, the United States has provided nearly \$3.8 billion in emergency humanitarian assistance since the outbreak of civil war. We have supported the UN peacekeeping force in South Sudan, UNMISS, which is protecting 200,000 civilians sheltering in or near its bases, investing more than \$342 million last fiscal year. These dollars are and have contributed to keeping thousands of people alive. But the South Sudanese deserve more than mere life support. They deserve to live in peace. We have influence with all of the key actors in the region, yet the administration has failed to use it. The administration must effectively use its influence to help the millions of South Sudanese who aspired to liberty but found misery instead.

Previous administrations made South Sudan a priority in their foreign policy. The Bush administration helped negotiate the aforementioned Comprehensive Peace Agreement. The Obama administration help shepherd the country to independence and remained actively engaged as the security and humanitarian situation developed.

At his confirmation hearing, Assistant Secretary of State for Africa Tibor Nagy promised that under his leadership, “The South Sudanese will realize just how involved the United States is.”

However, administration engagement has been weak and inconsistent, and it

is not guided by a clearly articulated strategy. In May 2018, the White House announced it was conducting a review of our assistance programs to South Sudan. In a statement, it expressed frustration that, “the leaders of this country have squandered this partnership, pilfered the wealth of South Sudan, killed their own people, and repeatedly demonstrated their inability and unwillingness to live up to their commitments to end the country’s civil war”—a bold statement but it has been more than a year and a half since the review was announced, and it remains incomplete. Since that time, what has the administration done? Well, 3 years into the administration, it has finally designated a special envoy, something for which I have been advocating for years, but the envoy will not answer directly to the President or the Secretary of State, which I fear may limit his stature and, therefore, his effectiveness.

Additionally, the administration has imposed targeted sanctions. Last year, the Treasury Department sanctioned two Cabinet ministers, Elia Lomuro and Kuol Manyang Juuk. Last month, they also sanctioned South Sudan’s First Vice President Taban Deng Gai. Deng is credibly accused of influencing the government to execute to dissidents; he should be sanctioned for human rights abuses. But, as I have said many times before, sanctions are not a strategy. Sanctions are a tool to be used selectively to apply pressure towards a specific political goal. In this case, support for a comprehensive and durable peace agreement.

Last month, a year and a half since his confirmation, Ambassador Nagy visited Juba. While I applaud Ambassador Nagy’s trip—I believe that the U.S. should be increasing its diplomatic engagement—one visit does not a policy make. It is unclear what the trip was meant to accomplish in the absence of a comprehensive strategy.

At this critical juncture, I am still hard pressed to understand the administration’s approach towards South Sudan, and I am worried that we do not have a plan of action should this latest deadline not be met. Time is of the essence; I urge the administration to take several actions.

First, ensure that Special Envoy Symington has the appropriate staff and resources to effectively undertake his responsibilities. The administration has moved from no envoys for Sudan and South Sudan to two envoys. While the challenges in the two countries are different, the fates of the two countries remain intertwined. Coordination is critical, as is support for both of their offices.

Second, we must have a sound strategy for supporting a viable peace agreement. I call upon Special Envoy Symington to take immediate steps to develop an interagency strategy, in consultation with our Ambassadors in the region, aimed at uniting the region to apply pressure to the parties to ad-

dress outstanding obstacles to the formation of a unity government. In the short term, the strategy should focus on developing benchmarks and milestones towards formation of a unity government, and steps—to include punitive measures—the United States will take to encourage regional partners to apply consistent pressure on the parties to the conflict to move towards peace. Longer term, it should lead towards supporting conditions that support a sustainable peace and credible elections. The strategy should also include actions to support grassroots reconciliation and restorative justice, as well as accountability for war crimes and human rights abuses.

Finally, the administration must conclude its review of assistance to South Sudan and be transparent to the South Sudanese, members of the diplomatic community, and the American people about exactly what the next steps will be relative to its findings and how those steps fit into a broader strategy. Whatever these steps are, they should be aimed towards cementing peace, and continuing strong support for development and humanitarian assistance to the people of South Sudan.

If past is prologue, South Sudan’s leaders may well once again fail their people. The stakes for the formation of a unity government—one that can implement a durable peace—are perilously high. If the current negotiations collapse, millions will suffer. We must do all we can to ensure that the South Sudanese are able to move forward with this agreement, flawed though it may well be, and we must be prepared to help it succeed.

TRIBUTE TO IYAD SHIHADDEH

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to a valued and long-standing member of my staff, Iyad Shihadeh. After nearly 9 years of serving the people of California in my San Francisco office, tomorrow will be Iyad’s last day.

Iyad first joined my team in 2011 as a staff assistant and quickly made an impression through his diligent efforts on behalf of the Californians calling or visiting our office. Iyad was quickly promoted to the position of constituent services representative, where he managed as many as 200 casework requests simultaneously between the Departments of State, Justice, and Homeland Security.

Iyad demonstrated an aptitude for problem solving on behalf of individuals and organizations needing help navigating the Federal bureaucracy. Additionally, Iyad took charge of the office’s intern program, guiding the dozens of students each year working in the San Francisco office. Many of our former State interns and staff are indebted to him for his thoughtful career advice as they made their first forays into the field of public service.

In 2017, Iyad was promoted again to be the director of constituent services,

in charge of a team of staff who receive, process, and advocate for the casework needs of Californians seeking assistance from Federal agencies. I have depended on Iyad's sound judgment, management capabilities, and cool head in this critical function.

As all Senators know, your casework director needs to be a special person. They represent you to constituents who are in need and often have nowhere else to turn. I have been particularly lucky to have Iyad in this role; he has performed with skill and with a deft personal touch.

I am proud of our casework successes under Iyad's management in recovering millions of dollars in benefits for those needing help with Social Security checks, student loans, tax refunds, veterans' benefits, and other payments from the Federal Government. He has worked on behalf of countless constituents seeking visas or other immigration benefits. When a constituent is in a foreign jail or has lost their passport overseas, Iyad has been on the case, immediately, professionally, and successfully.

I am particularly thankful for Iyad's help with Maria Mendoza, a nurse from Oakland who is back in the United States with her children after Iyad's work in securing an H1-B visa; also Maria Isabel Bueso, a young woman from Guatemala who has lived in the United States for most of her life in order to receive lifesaving medication, but who was threatened last year with removal. Iyad worked with the family and with Judiciary Committee staff, and now, Isabel has been given a stay from deportation.

In addition to his casework efforts, Iyad has provided guidance in my San Francisco office. His steady presence has been indispensable for three State directors and four chiefs of staff.

Before joining my team, Iyad graduated from Purdue University with a double major in history and political science in 2009. He received academic honors, graduating in the top 10 percent of his class. Following his lifelong passion of international issues, he dedicated himself to his studies and wrote a dissertation titled, "They Also Served: The Untold Story of the Egyptian Labour Corps in World War One." In 2010, he graduated from the London School of Economics, where he received a master of science in the history of empires. His efforts afforded him a deeper knowledge of economics and globalization, and once again, he centered his academic curiosities on foreign affairs by writing his thesis on "Money, Arms, and Superpowers: British Foreign Policy towards the War of Attrition."

While I am sad to see him go, I am thrilled for Iyad's family as he will join them in the day-to-day management of their restaurant in south San Francisco. His energy, ideas, and ability to connect with people will undoubtedly serve his family and community well for many years to come. I am deeply

grateful for the wisdom and dedication that Iyad Shihadeh has brought to our office and his dedication on behalf of the people of California. I thank Iyad and wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO BETH BURKE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am here today to recognize a loss for the Murray office and a major victory for Wisconsin and that is the return of Beth Burke, a longtime and deeply trusted aide of mine, to her home State after 8 years with my office.

Over her time with us, Beth saw me through office move after office move, countless hectic days of running to and from the Capitol all without missing a vote, I should say and more rebooked flights back to Washington State than sure she would like to remember.

All of that would be enough to keep a team of ordinary people busy, but it doesn't even scratch the surface of what Beth has meant to me, to our team, and to our country because, during those same years of Beth's service, she helped lead our team as we grew from scrappy and small to still scrappy, but spanning three different office buildings in the Senate, in addition to our two coast, as I negotiated a bipartisan budget agreement no one thought we could get done and through the negotiations between Chairman Alexander and me on reforming K-12 education to end No Child Left Behind.

She was up at all hours, all week, every week, doing everything she could to advance our efforts to fight for patients' healthcare, for women's reproductive rights and equality, and always, always for our servicemembers, veterans, and their families.

It is a bit of a truism that the loudest voice in the room is not always the one having the biggest impact. Now, Beth will be the first to admit that she has a loud voice. But she used it and her expertise at navigating every logistic and obstacle imaginable to ensure we were in the best possible position to succeed in whatever we set out to do. She is a true public servant with the biggest heart you can imagine, and I know families and communities in Washington State and nationwide are better for her time here.

I would also be remiss if I didn't note that Beth met her wonderful husband Dan, got married, and had her adorable, fierce baby girl Lillian all while she worked in our office.

It has been a true joy seeing her family grow, so before I close I want to thank Beth's family—Dan, Lillian, their dog Karl—the most important Burke and everyone who's excited to welcome her home to Wisconsin, for sharing Beth with us.

I know it is not always easy having a Senate staffer as a spouse or a family member or a close friend, especially one who works as hard and cares as much as Beth, so I want to recognize all your loved ones for their service as well.

Beth, thank you again from my State and my family to yours. We are so deeply grateful for you and so excited to hear about everything you have in store.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING MARIE GREENWOOD

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Marie Greenwood, who passed away late last year at the age of 106 years old. Marie, a teacher by trade, spent her life dedicated to the idea that each child—regardless of their race, gender, or class—deserves a quality education. Her intellect, compassion, and vigor propelled countless children through the Denver Public School system and towards lives of purpose. Marie's work as Denver's first tenured Black teacher and an integration pioneer increased educational equity in our schools and helped shape Denver into the great city that it is today.

An only child, Marie was born in Los Angeles in 1912 before she and her family relocated to Denver in 1925. As a Black family in segregated Denver, they faced no shortage of obstacles. Despite being a star student who time and again overcame the bigotry leveled against her, Marie was told by her high school guidance counselor not to apply to college because it would be a waste of her parents' money. Thank goodness Marie did not heed this wrongheaded advice. She went on to graduate third in her class and earned a scholarship to Colorado Teachers College. Marie had set out on a path that would eventually lead to touching the lives of generations of Colorado's students.

Marie was a trailblazer in civil rights and the ideal teacher. In 1938, she earned tenure in the Denver Public Schools, the first Black teacher to do so. Throughout the 1940s, Marie was involved in local activism that challenged discriminatory policies. In 1955, Marie made history again when she became the first African American in Denver to teach at a segregated school. In the 1960s, she served on a Denver Public Schools committee tasked to study racial inequities in district funding and staffing. All the while, she was a kind and determined teacher who ensured that her students always tried their hardest.

In retirement, she authored two books, one outlining her philosophy on teaching children facing difficulties and the other her autobiography. In 2001, her legacy was further solidified as the school district named a new elementary school in her honor. She will continue to be remembered by students who participate in the Greenwood Scholars program, which teaches the history of Denver through her life story.

As the former superintendent of Denver Public Schools, I can confidently

say that our students would be well-served if Marie was the lodestar for our teachers. Her grace and passion for the profession made a tremendous difference in the lives of our young people, and we are all in her debt. Thank you, Marie. May she rest in peace.●

TRIBUTE TO ASHLEY KEMMIS AND BRIANNA PAGE

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Ashley Kemmis and Brianna Page for their entrepreneurial spirit in Valley County.

Ashley and Brianna saw a need in the community for more options for women's clothing after Shopko closed in Glasgow in 2019.

They teamed up together to launch Thistle and Thread, an online women's clothing boutique. Since they launched their website one year ago, Ashley and Brianna's project flourished into a successful operation out of Eastern Montana.

Women across the country can purchase the boutique's clothing online and those in eastern Montana can visit their storefront in Glasgow.

It is my honor to recognize Ashley and Brianna for taking the initiative to successfully launch Thistle and Thread. Thistle and Thread is a now a proud part of the Glasgow community, and I am grateful for Ashley and Brianna's entrepreneurship.●

TRIBUTE TO JERRIANNE BOGGIS AND VALERIE CUNNINGHAM

● Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I am proud to recognize JerriAnne Boggis of Milford and Valerie Cunningham of Portsmouth as February's Granite Staters of the Month for their work to bring to light New Hampshire's too often forgotten Black history and engage communities across our State in conversations about New Hampshire's full past.

JerriAnne has said that it took 25 years after emigrating from Jamaica to New Hampshire for her to discover that New Hampshire had a Black history. JerriAnne was surprised to learn that the town she lived in, Milford, was home to Harriet E. Wilson, one of the first African Americans in North America to publish a novel. To commemorate Harriet's incredible achievement, JerriAnne established a non-profit organization to erect a statue of Harriet, which also marked the first statue in New Hampshire to honor a person of color.

Valerie grew up in Portsmouth, where her parents were leaders of the local civil rights movement and encouraged their daughter to explore New Hampshire's Black history. Valerie followed her parents' encouragement and spent years documenting African and African-American history in New Hampshire. Valerie would later go on to create a physical embodiment of her decades of research by establishing the

Portsmouth Black Heritage Trail in 1995, with the intent of bringing public awareness to Portsmouth's Black history.

Today, the Portsmouth Black Heritage Trail has expanded to become the Black Heritage Trail of New Hampshire. The foundation that Valerie founded is now led by JerriAnne, the trail's executive director. JerriAnne is working to expand the organization's mission to other towns across New Hampshire with the hope of growing public awareness of the Black history that exists in every region of the State.

The Black Heritage Trail plays an important role in engaging Granite Staters about the complex topic of race in America. To help jumpstart these necessary conversations, the organization hosts community dialogues, called Tea Talks, focused on discussing the intersection of race with different facets of American life, including health, education, and the arts. It also hosts a variety of events throughout the year, including the Black New England Conference, held last year at Southern New Hampshire University.

The Black Heritage Trail of New Hampshire brings a long overdue focus on our State's Black history. African Americans in New Hampshire have made profound contributions to our State, and thanks in part to the work of JerriAnne and Valerie, these stories and achievements will be remembered in history. It is a great honor to recognize the work of these women and their dedication to creating a more informed, inclusive, and just New Hampshire.●

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

● Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize and congratulate Stevens Institute of Technology in Hoboken, NJ on the 150th anniversary of its founding.

On February 15, 1870, Stevens Institute of Technology was founded as the first college of mechanical engineering in the United States, with a bequest from Edwin A. Stevens, a member of "America's first family of inventors." Over the past 150 years, the university has expanded to include comprehensive academic offerings in a wide array of engineering and science discipline, and has an accredited School of Business and a College of Arts and Letters.

From its earliest days, Stevens has honored its mission to inspire, nurture, and educate leaders in the technology-centric environment of the future, while equipping them with the tools to find innovative solutions to the most challenging problems of our time. Today Stevens is among the fastest growing universities in the Nation, attracting top students and faculty from New Jersey, the Nation, and across the globe.

Stevens is also one of the largest producers of science, technology, engineering and mathematics, STEM, de-

gree recipients in New Jersey and ranks first in the State and 15th in the Nation in the production of engineering graduate degrees. Students at Stevens benefit from the university's technology-centric education, which provides a unique and entrepreneurial approach to learning that encourages problem-solving and is a passport to success. Stevens has an outstanding 96 percent placement rate for its graduates, and its alumni have launched and led numerous companies and organizations.

Stevens faculty, student, and alumni have pioneered research and innovations in many diverse fields, including transportation, telecommunications, resiliency, sustainability, artificial intelligence, machine learning, healthcare, biomedicine, cybersecurity, maritime security, and systems engineering. It is no exaggeration to say that Stevens has changed and improved the way we live, work, and communicate, greatly benefiting society. Stevens has also contributed significantly to the community and local, State, and national economy.

It is my great honor to recognize Stevens for this significant milestone in the history of the university and to thank its leadership, faculty, students, and alumni for their profound and farreaching contributions to the communities of Hoboken, Hudson County, the State of New Jersey, and to the United States.●

REMEMBERING WESLEY AIKEN

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to recognize the life of Ugiagvik Wesley Aiken, who died January 6, 2020 at the age 93 years old, only 19 days shy of his 94th birthday.

With the passing of Native elder Wesley Aiken, Alaska has lost a highly respected Inupiat leader who dedicated his life to leadership in the Alaska Native community and ensuring that cultural and traditional knowledge will be passed down to younger generations.

Wesley Aiken was born in 1926 in Utqiagvik, to a completely subsistence lifestyle north of the Arctic Circle. He grew up in a small village, Isuk, which lays east of Utqiagvik, until the age of 12, moving for his education. As a teenager, he became a reindeer header for 3 years in order to help out his family. He was a man of many trades—he was a mechanic, laborer, member of the Alaska Territorial Guard, and later a member of the Alaska National Guard. He served as the land chief for Ukpeagvik Inupiat Corporation following its formation in 1973. He was a spiritual leader for the community and was always asked to pray. He would pray when the whale was caught, before big celebrations, the Nalukatak blanket toss, the Winter Games, and he prayed with the whaling captains. He loved the gatherings of the people and strived to see all the community's children participate. He was a hard worker

and would say, "If you have dreams to do something, you, yourself have to work hard to get to that goal."

Wesley grew up using dog teams in the wintertime to camp and hunt long before snow machines were prevalent and available in his region. His traditional knowledge of the subsistence lifestyle was extensive, and he enthusiastically shared with his community. He learned whaling from his grandfather and uncle and later became a whaling captain. He took it upon himself to teach the next generation whaling. His daughter's generation was sent off to boarding schools, and so many youth were not taught the traditional ways of hunting and needed to be re-taught when they returned. He taught many of his nephews traditional hunting methods and said it was his job to give back, just as his elders had taught him how to hunt whale and inland animals. He observed changes in sea ice and climate in his generation and shared with the world what he saw.

Wesley also served on the North Slope Borough's Inupiat History, Language and Culture Commission. He often stressed the importance of language, and his dream was an immersion camp in which only Inupiat was spoke. He reminded the youth about the hardships their ancestors experienced and that the whole community looked out for each other. And if you took care of animals and the land, they would take care of you.

In 2018, he served as the keynote speaker at the Elders and Youth Conference in Anchorage, during which he delivered a strong message on respect. He said it is all about respect. It is about respect for self and for one other, as well as a respect for the animals, which he said have spirits just like we do. In fact, when he took his daughter hunting, he taught her where to put a hole behind the neck to release the spirit of the caribou.

Wesley was also known for his Alaska Native rights activism. He participated in the 1961 Barrow Duck Sit-in, protesting the Federal Government's regulation of Native hunting rights, and this protest, among others, led to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. A respected leader, he also helped establish the Alaska Federal of Natives.

Elder Wesley's wisdom and kindness will be missed. He is survived and respected by his children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, friends, and his whole community.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United

States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN PROCLAMATION 9844 OF FEBRUARY 15, 2020, WITH RESPECT TO THE SOUTHERN BORDER OF THE UNITED STATES—PM 46

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the southern border of the United States declared in Proclamation 9844 of February 15, 2019, is to continue in effect beyond February 15, 2020.

The ongoing border security and humanitarian crisis at the southern border of the United States continues to threaten our national security, including the security of the American people. The executive branch has taken steps to address the crisis, but further action is needed to address the humanitarian crisis and to control unlawful migration and the flow of narcotics and criminals across the southern border. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Proclamation 9844 concerning the southern border of the United States.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 2020.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:16 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2546. An act to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2546. An act to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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-3992. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Bank's Annual Performance Plan for fiscal year 2021, and the Annual Performance Report for fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3993. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Advisory: Prudent Management of Agricultural Lending During Economic Cycles" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 11, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3994. 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-2020-0005)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3995. A communication from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Credit Union Administration's 2020 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3996. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Safety Evaluation of Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler TSTF-541, Revision 2, 'Add Exceptions to Surveillance Requirements for Valves and Dampers Locked in the Actuated Position'" (NUREG-1430, 1431, 1432, 1433, and 1434) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 11, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3997. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Safety Evaluation of Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler TSTF-568, Revision 2, Revise Applicability of BWR/4 TS 3.6.2.5 and TS 3.6.3.2" (NUREG-1433) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 11, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3998. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries off West

Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Electronic Monitoring Program" (RIN0648-BF52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3999. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Recreational Management Measures for the Summer Flounder Fishery; Fishing Year 2019" (RIN0648-BI92) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4000. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Monkfish Fishery; 2018 Monkfish Specifications" (RIN0648-XG168) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4001. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Blacktip Sharks, Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks, and Hammerhead Sharks in the Gulf of Mexico Region; Retention Limit Adjustment" (RIN0648-XT005) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 910. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-216).

S. 2299. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to enhance the safety and reliability of pipeline transportation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-217).

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 123. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into a contract or other agreement with a third party to review appointees in the Veterans Health Administration who had a license terminated for cause by a State licensing board for care or services rendered at a non-Veterans Health Administration facility and to provide individuals treated by such an appointee with notice if it is determined that an episode of care or services to which they received was below the standard of care, and for other purposes.

S. 2336. A bill to improve the management of information technology projects and investments of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2594. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify certain requirements with respect to service and retirement for the purposes of veterans' preference for Federal hiring.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3110. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a

study on disability and pension benefits provided to members of the National Guard and members of reserve components of the Armed Forces by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Charles Williams, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

*James E. McPherson, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Thomas A. Bussiere, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Joseph R. Harris II and ending with Col. Gent Welsh, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Billy M. Nabors, to be Major General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. AnnMarie K. Anthony and ending with Col. Brian E. Vaughn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Dann S. Carlson and ending with Col. Lisa K. Snyder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Steven J. deMilliano and ending with Brig. Gen. Russell L. Ponder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Andrew J. MacDonald, to be Major General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Todd M. Audet and ending with Brig. Gen. Gregory T. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020. (minus 1 nominee: Brig. Gen. Jon S. Safstrom)

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Christopher E. Finerty, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Joseph B. Wilson, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Col. Ronald F. Taylor, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Aaron R. Dean II, to be Major General.

Marine Corps nomination of Brig. Gen. Michael S. Martin, to be Major General.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Col. Douglas K. Clark and ending with Col. John F. Kelliher III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Jacqueline D. Van Ovost, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Joshua E. Erlandsen and ending with Tosha M. Vann, which nominations were received

by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Matthew G. Adkins and ending with Catherine M. Ware, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jenara L. Allen and ending with Sarah M. Wheeler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Daniel J. Adams and ending with Zachary E. Wright, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jennifer R. Bein and ending with Angela K. Stanton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Wesley M. Abadie and ending with Scott A. Zakaluzny, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Lior Aljadeff and ending with Hyun J. Yoon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jason K. Adams and ending with Danielle N. Ziehl, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Victoria M. Aglewilson and ending with Deborah L. Willis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Junelene M. Bungay and ending with Alexandra L. Mccrary-Dennis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Christopher J. Nastal, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Alexander Khutoryan, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Daniel S. Kim, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Marilyn L. Smith, to be Major.

Army nomination of Zachary J. Conly, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Audrey J. Dean, to be Major.

Army nomination of Michael W. Brancamp, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Tracy J. Brown, to be Major.

Army nomination of Kenneth A. Wieder, to be Major.

Army nomination of Chong K. Yi, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with John C. Benson and ending with Sean M. Vieira, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Army nomination of Ross C. Puffer, to be Major.

Army nomination of Amanda G. Luschinski, to be Major.

Army nomination of June E. Osavio, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Yasmin J. Alter and ending with Debby L. Polozock, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Otha J. Holmes and ending with Jonathan W. Murphy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Army nomination of Shaun P. Miller, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Krista H. Clarke, to be Major.

Army nomination of Peter K. Marlin, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Angela I. Iyanobor, to be Major.

Army nomination of John J. Landers, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of David P. Frommer, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Mario A. Ortega, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Keith A. Stevenson, to be Major.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Joseph P. Ball and ending with Ramon F. Vasquez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Donald K. Brown and ending with Keith R. Wilkinson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Christina L. Hudson and ending with Brent J. Patterson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with James M. Shipman and ending with Philip S. Spencer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Marine Corps nomination of Christopher L. Kaiser, to be Major.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Peter T. Graham and ending with Travis W. Storie, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Daniel E. Fuson and ending with Jesus T. Rodriguez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Navy nomination of Colin R. Young, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Catherine M. Dickinson, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Donald A. Sinitiere, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Stephen W. Aldridge and ending with Gregory C. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Navy nomination of Paul J. Kaylor, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Andrew S. Jackson, to be Lieutenant Commander.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. COONS):

S. 3289. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish an Innovation Voucher Grant Pro-

gram; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 3290. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to verify whether a health care provider is licensed in good standing before issuing the provider a unique health identifier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 3291. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to expand tax credit education and training for small businesses that engage in research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 3292. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to reduce Federal spending on crop insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 3293. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish the Food and Nutrition Education in Schools Pilot Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 3294. A bill to require U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to facilitate naturalization services for noncitizen veterans who have been removed from the United States or are inadmissible; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 3295. A bill to amend the Act of August 18, 1941 (commonly known as the "Flood Control Act of 1941") to authorize the Secretary to provide reimbursement to non-Federal sponsors for emergency response repair and restoration work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 3296. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently allow a tax deduction at the time an investment in qualified property is made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3297. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make certain information available on a public website relating to intermediate care facilities for individuals with intellectual disabilities certified for participation under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COTTON, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 3298. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to permit the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to terminate the insured status of a depository institution that refuses to provide services to certain Federal contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3299. A bill to repeal certain impediments to the administration of the firearms laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 3300. A bill to establish a Federal data protection agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 3301. A bill to promote the empowerment, development, and prosperity of women globally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KING:

S. 3302. A bill to improve global health security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. GARDNER, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 3303. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to promote transportation career opportunities and improve diversity in the workforce; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3304. A bill to encourage and facilitate efforts by States and other stakeholders to conserve and sustain the western population of monarch butterflies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 3305. A bill to establish a grant program to provide legal assistance to eligible tenants at risk of or subject to eviction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. COONS, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 3306. A bill to establish a microplastics pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TESTER, Mr. JONES, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 3307. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the implementation of curricula for training students, teachers, parents, and school personnel to understand, recognize, prevent, and respond to signs of human trafficking and exploitation in children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 3308. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to standardize payment of hazardous duty incentive pay for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. KING):

S. 3309. A bill to provide for a Public Health Emergency Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. SASSE, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 3310. A bill to permit visiting dignitaries and service members from Taiwan to display the flag of the Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 3311. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce 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; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3312. A bill to establish a crisis stabilization and community reentry grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3313. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to limit the exemption from the registration requirements of such Act for persons engaging in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or the fine arts to activities which do not promote the political agenda of a foreign government, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the disclosures of foreign gifts by institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 3314. A bill to seek a diplomatic resolution to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 3315. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 3316. A bill to require a license for the reexport to an entity on the entity list of certain foreign-made items incorporating more than 10 percent of controlled United States-origin content; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 3317. A bill to improve the operation of the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 3318. A bill to promote transparency in health care pricing; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 3319. A bill to reauthorize comprehensive research and statistical review and analysis of trafficking in persons and commercial sex acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 3320. A bill to designate as wilderness certain National Forest System land in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3321. A bill to authorize 4 additional judgeships and to convert a temporary judgeship for the district of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 3322. A bill to prevent the unlawful use of financial instruments in the United States for online slot machines, lotteries, table games, and similar offerings, including games and applications that are deceptively marketed or designed to be attractive to children, and for other purposes; to the Com-

mittee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S.J. Res. 70. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the voting threshold for impeachment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 498. A resolution condemning Stephen Miller for trafficking in bigotry, hatred, and divisive political rhetoric and for promoting policies that are inconsistent with the trust and confidence placed in him as a Senior Advisor to the President, and expressing the sense of the Senate that Stephen Miller should immediately resign from office; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 499. A resolution acknowledging the reprehensible policy of the United States regarding the forced relocation of the Potawatomi people from their homeland east of the Mississippi River to Kansas and Oklahoma and the devastating hardships the Potawatomi people endured during the march west, known as the "Potawatomi Trail of Death"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 500. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the "International Year of the Nurse and the Midwife", as designated by the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. Res. 501. A resolution amending the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials to ensure adequate access to witnesses and documents in impeachment trials of a President or Vice President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. BURR, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. Res. 502. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the amphibious landing on the Japanese island of Iwo Jima during World War II and the raisings of the flag of the United States on Mount Suribachi; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 503. A resolution commending the University of West Florida Argonauts football team for its National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II national championship victory; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 504. A resolution honoring the memories of the victims of the senseless attack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High

School on February 14, 2018; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. Res. 505. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States will continue to provide support to international partners to help prevent and stop the spread of coronavirus; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 206

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 206, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the "Hello Girls".

S. 296

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 633, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women's Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the "Six Triple Eight".

S. 634

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 634, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students through eligible scholarship-granting organizations and eligible workforce training organizations, and for other purposes.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick "Roddie" Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II.

S. 651

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 651, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 655

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 655, a bill to impose additional restrictions on tobacco flavors for use in e-cigarettes.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 888

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 888, a bill to require a standard financial aid offer form, and for other purposes.

S. 997

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 997, a bill to recognize and honor the service of individuals who served in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1122

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1122, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs.

S. 1355

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1355, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for AmeriCorps educational awards.

S. 1473

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 1473, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to set maximum contaminant levels for certain chemicals, and for other purposes.

S. 1843

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1843, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the disclosure of the total number of domestic and foreign employees of certain public companies, and for other purposes.

S. 1908

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) 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. 2085

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2085, a bill to authorize the Secretary

of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out educational programs about the Holocaust, and for other purposes.

S. 2267

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2267, a bill for the relief of Cesar Carlos Silva Rodriguez.

S. 2274

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2274, a bill to establish a voluntary program that strengthens the economy, public health, and environment of the United States by reducing emissions from wood heaters, and for other purposes.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2417, a bill to provide for payment of proceeds from savings bonds to a State with title to such bonds pursuant to the judgment of a court.

S. 2627

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2627, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an above-the-line deduction for attorney fees and costs in connection with civil claim awards.

S. 2628

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2628, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove a limitation on an individual's eligibility for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan while the individual is in custody pending disposition of charges.

S. 2711

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2711, a bill to require institutions of higher education to disclose hazing-related misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 2765

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2765, a bill to improve Federal fiscal controls and the congressional budget process.

S. 2931

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2931, a bill to establish a process for obtaining a Federal certificate of rehabilitation, and for other purposes.

S. 2980

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 2980, a bill to require the promulgation of certain standards for perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2982

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2982, a bill to expand eligibility for certain housing programs for qualified volunteer first responders.

S. 3004

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3004, a bill to protect human rights and enhance opportunities for LGBTI people around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 3007

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3007, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require a provider of a report to the CyberTipline related to online sexual exploitation of children to preserve the contents of such report for 180 days, and for other purposes.

S. 3020

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3020, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with States or to award grants to States to promote health and wellness, prevent suicide, and improve outreach to veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 3098

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3098, a bill to redesignate the Jimmy Carter National Historic Site as the "Jimmy Carter National Historical Park".

S. 3139

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3139, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to more comprehensively address the interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition.

S. 3155

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3155, a bill to establish a rural postsecondary and economic development grant program.

S. 3167

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3167, a bill to prohibit discrimination based on an individual's texture or style of hair.

S. 3217

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3217, a bill to standardize the designation of National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes.

S. 3242

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3242, a bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to protect privacy rights, and for other purposes.

S. 3246

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3246, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to direct the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a public auction of the C-band, and for other purposes.

S. 3273

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3273, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a community college and career training grant program.

S. 3286

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 3286, a bill to restrict certain Federal grants for States that grant driver licenses to illegal immigrants and fail to share information about criminal aliens with the Federal Government.

S.J. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 6, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S.J. RES. 68

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 68, 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. CON. RES. 36

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 36, a concurrent resolution supporting the Farmers Bill of Rights.

S. RES. 481

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 481, a resolution commemorating

the 75th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland.

AMENDMENT NO. 1305

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1305 proposed to S.J. Res. 68, 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1311

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1311 intended to be proposed to S.J. Res. 68, 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.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 498—CONDEMNING STEPHEN MILLER FOR TRAFFICKING IN BIGOTRY, HATRED, AND DIVISIVE POLITICAL RHETORIC AND FOR PROMOTING POLICIES THAT ARE INCONSISTENT WITH THE TRUST AND CONFIDENCE PLACED IN HIM AS A SENIOR ADVISOR TO THE PRESIDENT, AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT STEPHEN MILLER SHOULD IMMEDIATELY RESIGN FROM OFFICE

Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 498

Whereas Public Law 115-58, a joint resolution signed into law on September 14, 2017—

(1) rejects white nationalists, white supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups; and

(2) states that in August 2017, white nationalists, white supremacists, Klansmen, and neo-Nazis gathered and demonstrated in Charlottesville, Virginia, chanting racist, anti-Semitic, and anti-immigrant slogans and causing violence, from which the Charlottesville community is still healing;

Whereas Stephen Miller is a Senior Advisor to President Trump and has long cultivated relationships and correspondence with individuals who adhere to white nationalist ideology;

Whereas recently published emails of Stephen Miller primarily address the subjects of race and immigration, exclusively focus on offenses committed by nonwhite individuals, and promote policies to severely limit or end immigration to the United States by nonwhite individuals;

Whereas, in such emails, Stephen Miller—

(1) directly and repeatedly suggests story ideas for the website Breitbart, encouraging Breitbart to incorporate white supremacist, racist, and eugenics ideologies in its news coverage;

(2) adheres to white supremacist ideologies in his opposition to Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (commonly known as “DACA”), a policy that protects from deportation young people, many of whom know no other home than the United States, and permits such individuals to make valuable contributions to their communities and the United States; and

(3) repeatedly recommends that Breitbart publish favorable articles relating to President Calvin Coolidge and the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153, chapter 190), a law based on eugenics ideology that established a national origin quota system to restrict immigration from areas other than Northern and Western Europe;

Whereas a former Breitbart editor has acknowledged that Stephen Miller’s suggestions have been used by Breitbart to “spin a narrative where immigrants of color were not only dangerous, violent individuals but also posed an existential threat to America”;

Whereas eugenics encompasses the racist belief that the human population can be improved by promoting groups considered genetically superior and eliminating or excluding groups considered genetically inferior, a belief that was strongly embraced by Adolf Hitler;

Whereas the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153, chapter 190) prohibited all immigration from Asia, severely restricted immigration from Africa, and used outdated census data to exclude many other individuals whom the proponents of the law considered inferior or undesirable, including Southern and Eastern Europeans;

Whereas the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153, chapter 190) was strongly supported by eugenicists and reflected the pervasiveness of anti-immigrant and nativist sentiment in the early twentieth century;

Whereas President Coolidge wrote, “Our country must cease to be regarded as a dumping ground [for new immigrants] . . . Biological laws tell us that certain divergent people will not mix or blend”;

Whereas, in his manifesto entitled “Mein Kampf”, Adolf Hitler described the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153, chapter 190) as a model for Nazi Germany to make his eugenics ideology a reality;

Whereas the national origin quotas and the eugenics ideology embodied in the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153, chapter 190) governed United States immigration policy until the passage of the Act entitled “An Act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes”, approved October 3, 1965 (commonly known as the “Immigration Act of 1965”) (79 Stat. 911), which replaced the national origin quota system with a preference system based on family ties and professional and skilled employment opportunities;

Whereas Stephen Miller is widely understood to direct immigration policy for the Trump Administration, including by supporting legislative and administrative proposals that would severely reduce immigration to the United States and disproportionately reduce immigration from Africa, Asia, and Latin America; and

Whereas Stephen Miller’s leadership position brings discredit upon the White House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate condemns Stephen Miller for—

(A) trafficking in bigotry, hatred, and divisive political rhetoric; and

(B) promoting policies that are inconsistent with the trust and confidence placed in him as a Senior Advisor to the President; and

(2) it is the sense of the Senate that Stephen Miller, Senior Advisor to the President,

should immediately resign from office, and if he does not resign, the President should remove him from office.

SENATE RESOLUTION 499—ACKNOWLEDGING THE REPREENSIBLE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES REGARDING THE FORCED RELOCATION OF THE POTAWATOMI PEOPLE FROM THEIR HOMELAND EAST OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO KANSAS AND OKLAHOMA AND THE DEVASTATING HARDSHIPS THE POTAWATOMI PEOPLE ENDURED DURING THE MARCH WEST, KNOWN AS THE “POTAWATOMI TRAIL OF DEATH”

Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. RES. 499

Whereas the Potawatomi people, collectively known as the “Potawatomi Nation”, are comprised of members of the many villages, communities, and bands that resided for millennia in their homeland in the southern Great Lakes region of the present day States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin;

Whereas the advanced farming techniques, extensive trade and commerce networks, and well-established transportation routes of the Potawatomi Nation had a significant influence on the early history of North America;

Whereas Potawatomi leaders entered into 44 treaties with the United States, including a series of treaties the Potawatomi people were pressured to sign between 1818 and 1828, under which the Potawatomi people ceded vast areas of the homeland of the Potawatomi people in exchange for annuities, small reservations in the States of Indiana and Illinois, and scattered individual allotments;

Whereas, in 1830, President Andrew Jackson signed the Act of May 28, 1830 (4 Stat. 411, chapter 148) (commonly known as the “Indian Removal Act”), into law, which authorized the President to provide land in the so-called Indian territory in the western United States “for the reception of such tribes or nations of Indians as may choose to exchange the lands where they now reside, and remove there. . .”;

Whereas 3 treaties signed by Potawatomi leaders in October 1832 further reduced the remaining homeland of the Potawatomi people in the States of Indiana and Illinois to several small reservations and individual allotments, including a reservation at a village on the Yellow River in Twin Lakes, Indiana (referred to in this preamble as the “Twin Lakes Reservation”), under a Potawatomi leader named Menominee;

Whereas pressure from United States negotiators resulted in Potawatomi leaders signing a number of treaties between 1834 and 1837, known as the “Whiskey Treaties”, which ceded the remaining Potawatomi land in the State of Indiana and included a commitment to move to reservations in the West within 2 years;

Whereas Menominee and a number of other Potawatomi leaders—

(1) refused to participate in the negotiations that produced the Treaty of August 5, 1836 (7 Stat. 505) (commonly known as the “Yellow River Treaty”), which purported to relinquish the rights of the Yellow River Band of the Potawatomi people (referred to

in this preamble as the “Yellow River Band”) to the Twin Lakes Reservation; and (2) later submitted a petition to United States General John Tipton that challenged the validity of the Yellow River Treaty;

Whereas, after the 2-year period for the Yellow River Band to move west expired, White settlers who wanted to occupy the lands of the Twin Lakes Reservation petitioned Indiana Governor David Wallace for protection, and, in response, Governor Wallace authorized General Tipton to mobilize a militia of 100 volunteers to forcibly remove the Yellow River Band from the reservation;

Whereas, on August 30, 1838, General Tipton and a volunteer militia surprised the Yellow River Band at the Twin Lakes Reservation, and, over the next several days, the soldiers burned the crops and destroyed the village of the Yellow River Band to discourage anyone from trying to return;

Whereas on September 4, 1838, the forced relocation of 859 members of the Yellow River Band proceeded from Twin Lakes, Indiana, under the armed escort of the militia, including the Potawatomi leaders Menominee, Makkatahmoway, and Pepinawa, who were treated as prisoners of war and rode along in a wagon under armed guard;

Whereas, over the course of 61 days, through deprivation and often brutal heat along the march west, known as the “Trail of Death”, that extended from Twin Lakes, Indiana, through the States of Illinois and Missouri to the eventual destination of the Yellow River Band some 660 miles away in Osawatomie, Kansas, some 42 Potawatomi individuals died, including 28 children; and

Whereas some of the Potawatomi Nation, including the Pokagon Band, the Nottawaseppi Huron Band, the Gun Lake Band, and the Hannahville Indian Community, evaded forced relocation and the devastating consequences of the Trail of Death by fleeing to other locations in the Great Lakes region, including to Canada, and elsewhere in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

The Senate—

(1) recognizes—

(A) the special legal and political relationship Indian Tribes have with the United States; and

(B) the solemn covenant that the Potawatomi people of the United States share with the land; and

(2) acknowledges the extreme hardship, violence, and maltreatment inflicted on the Potawatomi people by the United States through the cruel and ill-conceived policy of forcible removal of the Potawatomi people from their homeland east of the Mississippi River.

SEC. 2. DISCLAIMER.

Nothing in this resolution—

(1) authorizes or supports any claim against the United States; or

(2) serves as a settlement of any claim against the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 500—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE “INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE NURSE AND THE MIDWIFE”, AS DESIGNATED BY THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 500

Whereas the World Health Organization has designated 2020 as the “International Year of the Nurse and the Midwife”;

Whereas 2020—

(1) marks the 200th birthday of Florence Nightingale, the founder of modern nursing; and

(2) is an appropriate time to reflect on the high-quality health care that nurses and midwives provide in all settings across the United States;

Whereas, with approximately 4,000,000 registered nurses in the United States and 20,700,000 registered nurses worldwide, nurses and midwives—

(1) represent nearly 50 percent of the global health workforce; and

(2) comprise the largest component of the health care workforce in many countries;

Whereas investing in nurses and midwives provides great value to communities;

Whereas a report of the High-Level Commission on Health Employment and Economic Growth of the United Nations concluded that “investments in education and job creation in the health and social sectors result in a triple return of improved health outcomes, global health security, and inclusive economic growth”;

Whereas nurses and midwives have contributed to major achievements in global health, including—

(1) the eradication of smallpox; and

(2) reductions in maternal and child mortality;

Whereas nurses and midwives are known to be patient advocates, acting to protect the lives of the individuals under their care;

Whereas nurses and midwives, in caring for patients and their families in all stages of life, serve as vital members of the health care workforce who improve patient outcomes and safety;

Whereas better integration of nurses and midwives into health care systems is reducing primary and maternity care provider shortages and improving maternal health outcomes;

Whereas nurses promote healthy lifestyles and educate communities on disease prevention and health promotion;

Whereas nurses and midwives are well-positioned to address and reduce health care disparities that exist in the United States, including with respect to maternal health;

Whereas many nurses are experienced researchers, and the work of nurses encompasses a wide scope of scientific inquiry relating to clinical science, health systems and outcomes, and nursing education;

Whereas nurses provide care that is sensitive to the cultures and customs of individuals across the United States; and

Whereas many nurses can inform and work closely with legislators to improve the—

(1) recruitment, education, practice, and retention of nurses; and

(2) health and safety of the patients for whom nurses care in all communities, including rural and underserved communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the “International Year of the Nurse and the Midwife”, as designated by the World Health Organization;

(2) recognizes the significant contributions of nurses and midwives to the health care system in the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe the International Year of the Nurse and the Midwife with appropriate recognition, ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate the importance of nurses and midwives to patients.

SENATE RESOLUTION 501—AMENDING THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AND PRACTICE IN THE SENATE WHEN SITTING ON IMPEACHMENT TRIALS TO ENSURE ADEQUATE ACCESS TO WITNESSES AND DOCUMENTS IN IMPEACHMENT TRIALS OF A PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 501

Resolved,

SECTION 1. WITNESSES AND DOCUMENTS IN IMPEACHMENT TRIALS OF A PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials are amended by adding at the end the following:

“XXVII. In an impeachment trial of the President or the Vice President, upon whom the powers and duties of the Office of President shall have devolved, each party may move to issue 1 or more subpoenas to obtain testimony from witnesses. If the Presiding Officer determines the testimony of a witness for whom a subpoena is sought is material and relevant to the impeachment trial and not redundant, the Presiding Officer, through the Secretary of the Senate, shall issue a subpoena for the taking of testimony of the witness. A Senator may raise a point of order that a subpoena for the taking of testimony of a witness should not be issued. If a point of order is raised, the Presiding Officer shall submit the point of order to a vote of the Senate without debate. A vote under this Rule shall be taken in accordance with the Standing Rules of the Senate.

“XXVIII. In an impeachment trial of the President or the Vice President, upon whom the powers and duties of the Office of President shall have devolved, each party may move to issue 1 or more subpoenas to obtain documents. If the Presiding Officer determines the documents for which a subpoena is sought are material and relevant to the impeachment trial and not redundant, the Presiding Officer, through the Secretary of the Senate, shall issue a subpoena requiring production of the documents. A Senator may raise a point of order that a subpoena requiring production of the documents should not be issued. If a point of order is raised, the Presiding Officer shall submit the point of order to a vote of the Senate without debate. A vote under this Rule shall be taken in accordance with the Standing Rules of the Senate.

“XXIX. It shall not be in order to consider a resolution or motion establishing procedures for an impeachment trial, or an amendment thereto, that would modify, supersede, waive, or be inconsistent with any portion of Rule VII, XXVII, or XXVIII.”

(b) EVIDENTIARY QUESTIONS.—Rule VII of the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials is amended—

(1) in the second sentence—

(A) by striking “may rule” and inserting “shall rule”; and

(B) by inserting “, except in the impeachment trial of the President of Vice President, upon whom the powers and duties of the Office of President shall have devolved,” before “he may at his option”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “In an impeachment trial of the President or the Vice President, upon whom the powers and

the duties of the office of President shall have devolved, the Presiding Officer shall rule on any assertion of privilege or immunity in connection with the production of testimony, documents, or other evidence.”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 502—RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMPHIBIOUS LANDING ON THE JAPANESE ISLAND OF IWO JIMA DURING WORLD WAR II AND THE RAISINGS OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES ON MOUNT SURIBACHI

Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. BURR, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 502

Whereas, following the surprise attack by Japanese forces on December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, the United States formally declared war on the Imperial Government of Japan on December 8, 1941;

Whereas, during the 4 years that followed the attack, the United States and allied forces fought a prolonged counterattack against Japanese advances across the Pacific region;

Whereas the tactic of attacking, defeating, and controlling Japanese-held outposts through the use of amphibious assault landings against Japanese-held islands and territories (referred to in this preamble as “island hopping”) became crucial to successfully countering Japanese advances throughout the Pacific region;

Whereas the goal of island hopping was to secure airfields and supply bases—

(1) in order to launch aerial bombardment attacks against the mainland of Japan using the new Boeing B-29 Superfortress; and

(2) in preparation for, and in anticipation of, a United States invasion of Japan;

Whereas, by early 1945, the United States and allied forces bravely fought and advanced to the island of Iwo Jima, an 8-square-mile volcanic island with 3 strategic airfields, located between the Mariana Islands and Japan;

Whereas Iwo Jima was—

(1) a strategic island with airfields to support bombers of the United States with fighter escorts; and

(2) an essential base for emergency, refueling, and diversionary landings for B-29 bombers;

Whereas, under the command of Japanese Lieutenant General Tadamichi Kuribayashi, Iwo Jima was a heavily fortified island with nearly 11 miles of underground and networked tunnels, rooms, bunkers, artillery emplacements, ammunition dumps, and pillboxes supporting more than 21,000 Japanese soldiers;

Whereas, on February 19, 1945, under the leadership of United States Navy 5th Fleet Admiral Raymond A. Spruance, United States Marine Corps V Amphibious Corps Major General Harry Schmidt, 3rd Division Major General Graves B. Erskine, 4th Division Major General Clifton Cates, and 5th Division Major General Keller E. Rockey, the

United States launched an amphibious landing and assault on Iwo Jima that culminated with the engagement of more than 70,000 members of the United States Marine Corps, buttressed by thousands of members of the United States Navy and the United States Army serving as assault, garrison, and support forces (referred to in this preamble as the “Battle of Iwo Jima”);

Whereas the members of the United States Marine Corps who fought in the Battle of Iwo Jima overcame numerous disadvantages in the 36-day battle that included treacherous terrain, unfavorable weather conditions, and heavy enemy fire from an embedded, determined, and fierce Japanese fighting force in places immortalized by members of the United States Marine Corps, including the “Meat Grinder” and “Bloody Gorge”;

Whereas, on February 23, 1945, only 5 days into the Battle of Iwo Jima, members of the United States Marine Corps ascended the highest point on the island, Mount Suribachi, and raised the flag of the United States 2 times, the second of which resulted in the iconic, Pulitzer Prize-winning image that—

(1) was captured on film by photographer Joe Rosenthal;

(2) has become a recognized symbol of determination, perseverance, and struggle; and

(3) has been memorialized as the United States Marine Corps War Memorial in Arlington, Virginia;

Whereas the Battle of Iwo Jima, one of the bloodiest battles in the history of the United States Marine Corps, resulted in more than 26,000 casualties of the United States, more than 6,800 of whom were killed;

Whereas most of the more than 20,000 estimated Japanese soldiers who fought in the Battle of Iwo Jima were killed, with only 1,083 Japanese soldiers surviving at the conclusion of the campaign;

Whereas the Battle of Iwo Jima led to 22 members of the United States Marine Corps and 5 members of the United States Navy receiving the Medal of Honor, representing—

(1) the most members of the United States Marine Corps ever to receive the highest military decoration in the United States for a single battle; and

(2) more than ¼ of all members of the United States Marine Corps to receive the decoration during World War II;

Whereas the secured airfields on Iwo Jima became emergency landing locations for 2,400 B-29 Bombers, saving the lives of an estimated 24,000 flight crewmen;

Whereas, 160 days after the end and victory of the pivotal Battle of Iwo Jima, the United States received the unconditional surrender of Japan on September 2, 1945;

Whereas the world owes a debt of gratitude to the members of the United States Marine Corps who selflessly led the fight for the strategic island of Iwo Jima in the middle of the Pacific theater; and

Whereas, on March 28, 2020, the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Iwo Jima will be marked by commemorative events on the island of Iwo Jima organized by the people of the United States and Japan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 75th anniversary of the amphibious landing on the Japanese island of Iwo Jima that began on February 19, 1945 and ended on March 26, 1945;

(2) commemorates the iconic and historic raisings of the flag of the United States on Mount Suribachi that occurred on February 23, 1945;

(3) honors the marines, sailors, soldiers, army air crew, and coast guardsmen who fought bravely on Iwo Jima, including the thousands of Japanese soldiers who defended the island;

(4) remembers and venerates the service members who gave their last full measure of devotion on the battlefield;

(5) recognizes the Allied victory in the Battle of Iwo Jima, which—

(A) was led by the United States Marine Corps; and

(B) made the defeat of the Empire of Japan in World War II possible;

(6) affirms the immortal words of Admiral Chester Nimitz, who stated that “uncommon valor was a common virtue” among the service members of the United States who fought on Iwo Jima;

(7) reaffirms the bonds of friendship between the United States and Japan;

(8) encourages the people of the United States to honor the veterans of the Battle of Iwo Jima with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities; and

(9) honors the service and sacrifice of the men and women who serve the United States today, carrying on the proud tradition of the individuals who came before them.

SENATE RESOLUTION 503—COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA ARGONAUTS FOOTBALL TEAM FOR ITS NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION II NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP VICTORY

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 503

Whereas, on December 21, 2019, the University of West Florida Argonauts football team (referred to in this preamble as the “Argonauts”) defeated the Minnesota State University Mavericks by a score of 48 to 40 in the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II national championship game in McKinney, Texas;

Whereas the Argonauts returned to the national championship game in 2019 for the second time in the last 3 years;

Whereas the Argonauts won the first national football championship for the University of West Florida a mere 4 years after the football program was established at the university in 2015;

Whereas the Argonauts finished the 2019 football season with a 13–2 record; and

Whereas head coach Pete Shinnick and each player on the Argonauts’ team roster should be congratulated for a successful football season: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the University of West Florida Argonauts football team for its National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II national championship victory in football;

(2) recognizes the hard work, determination, and excellence exhibited by the players, coaches, support staff, and student body of the University of West Florida; and

(3) congratulates—

(A) the University of West Florida and the city of Pensacola, Florida;

(B) the fans of the University of West Florida Argonauts football team; and

(C) the alumni of the University of West Florida throughout the world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 504—HONORING THE MEMORIES OF THE VICTIMS OF THE SENSELESS ATTACK AT MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL ON FEBRUARY 14, 2018

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 504

Whereas, on February 14, 2018, a mass shooting that took the lives of 17 teachers and students took place at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida;

Whereas the people of the United States continue to pray for the individuals who were affected by this tragedy;

Whereas President Donald Trump stated, “no child, no teacher, should ever be in danger in an American school. No parent should ever have to fear for their sons and daughters when they kiss them goodbye in the morning.”;

Whereas the Parkland community has shown strength, compassion, and unity in the past 2 years; and

Whereas February 14, 2020, marks 2 years since the horrific attack: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the memories of the victims of the senseless attack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School on February 14, 2018, and offers heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathies to the families, loved ones, and friends of the victims;

(2) honors the survivors of the attack and pledges continued support for their recovery;

(3) recognizes the strength and resilience of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School community; and

(4) expresses gratitude to the emergency medical and health care professionals of the Parkland community for their efforts in responding to the attack and caring for the victims and survivors.

SENATE RESOLUTION 505—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL CONTINUE TO PROVIDE SUPPORT TO INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS TO HELP PREVENT AND STOP THE SPREAD OF CORONAVIRUS

Mr. CASSIDY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 505

Whereas an outbreak of the coronavirus, known as “COVID-19”, was first detected in Wuhan, China, and was reported by China to the World Health Organization on December 31, 2019;

Whereas the characteristics of the coronavirus, such as the way the virus is transmitted and the ability of the virus to rapidly spread, have raised concerns among experts that the virus may have the potential to become a pandemic;

Whereas the World Health Organization declared that the outbreak of the coronavirus constitutes a public health emergency of international concern;

Whereas the medical facilities in China have been overwhelmed;

Whereas the coronavirus has infected tens of thousands of people in China and hundreds more people worldwide;

Whereas the coronavirus has infected more than a dozen citizens of the United States;

Whereas the United States Government has pledged the support of the United States in combating the coronavirus;

Whereas experts in the United States Government, including public health experts from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, should join the World Health Organization in efforts to stop the spread of the coronavirus in China; and

Whereas ending the spread of the coronavirus is in the best interest of people at home in the United States and abroad: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) the United States will continue to provide support to international partners to help prevent and stop the spread of the coronavirus; and

(B) the United States stands in solidarity with the people of China and other countries around the world who are suffering from the coronavirus; and

(2) the Senate encourages the United States Government to continue to work together with the World Health Organization and other countries on the goal of preventing the coronavirus from taking more lives.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1324. Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1325. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. BLUNT) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 490, congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV in the successful 100th season of the National Football League.

SA 1326. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. BLUNT) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 490, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1324. Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2, amend subsection (b) to read as follows:

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to prevent the United States from defending itself, including its territories, citizens, troops, personnel, military bases, and diplomatic facilities from attack, including acting to prevent an imminent attack; or

(2) to restrict force protection measures used by United States aircraft, ships, or personnel.

SA 1325. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. BLUNT) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 490, congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV in the successful 100th season of the National Football League; as follows:

Insert after the second whereas clause of the preamble the following:

Whereas Super Bowl LIV was the culmination of the 100th season of the NFL, a season in which the league has promoted stars both past and present, served the community, and looked toward the next 100 years of football;

SA 1326. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BLUNT) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 490, congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV in the successful 100th season of the National Football League; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A resolution congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV in the successful 100th season of the National Football League."

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I have 3 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 ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 13, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 13, 2020, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 13, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMEMORATING UTAH WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I rise to mark the 150th anniversary of the first ballot cast by a woman in the United States under an equal suffrage law. I am proud that this remarkable milestone occurred in my home State of Utah.

The fight for the right to vote for all Americans, regardless of gender, race, or class, was achieved through efforts, large and small, and through great sacrifice.

Suffrage is the freedom to vote, to reaffirm the solemn duty of the citizen in a representative democracy. When I vote, I remember the sacrifice of men and women in uniform—of those who have won and preserved freedom for us in the past and of those who preserve it for us today. My vote is a recognition of that sacrifice. It is right and fitting that every American, male and female, has that same privilege.

Our great State of Utah was settled by pioneers like Brigham Young, who led his people to a new land in search of liberty and freedom from oppression. While the pioneers and settlers of Utah secured freedom of territory, religion, and thought, the voices of women were still not heard when it often mattered most—during the democratic selection of their government leaders.

Seraph Young, like her granduncle Brigham Young before her, endeavored to chart a different course. In the early morning of February 14, 1870, she became the first woman to vote in the United States of America. On that election day in Salt Lake City, 24 other women joined Seraph Young in casting their ballots. Then, in the next election, 2,000 more women followed their lead and exercised their equal suffrage rights. The voices of the few set in motion a monumental shift in our Nation's history.

Twenty-four years before the 19th Amendment to grant equal suffrage for women was ratified, Utah once again made history by electing the Nation's first female State senator, Martha Hughes Cannon. Cannon did not hesitate to pursue her own path. After receiving her undergraduate degree in chemistry, she went on to earn degrees in oration, medicine, and pharmacy at a time when few women pursued advanced education. As a physician, church leader, suffragist, and mother, she defeated her own husband at the ballot box to become the first female State senator in U.S. history.

Soon, we will honor the tremendous contributions Martha Hughes Cannon and all women suffragists have made as we welcome her as a new addition to Statuary Hall in the U.S. Capitol.

The symbols we choose to represent us and our State matter a great deal, and the bronze rendering of Cannon will serve as an enduring tribute to the efforts of all suffragists.

To all the women who have led and who continue to lead by example, we thank you.

RECOGNIZING THE LEADING ROLE OF UTAHNS IN THE FIGHT FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE AND CELEBRATING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE FIRST VOTES BY WOMEN UNDER THE EQUAL SUFFRAGE LAW OF UTAH ON FEBRUARY 14, 1870

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 475 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 475) recognizing the leading role of Utahns in the fight for women's suffrage and celebrating the sesquicentennial of the first votes by women under the equal suffrage law of Utah on February 14, 1870.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 475) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of January 16, 2020, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. ROMNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PROTECTING PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILDREN

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, earlier this week the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing to discuss the level of care babies who are born alive should receive. You heard me correctly. We had a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee to discuss the level of medical care a baby that is born alive should receive.

As heartbreaking as it is to even ask that question—as if there were more than one option—this is a real debate and something that needs to be paid attention to.

There are actually some folks who think it is appropriate for doctors to provide something less than the highest standard of care to babies who survive abortions, and there are those who believe babies who survive abortions should receive the same level of medical assistance as any other baby. That is certainly where I stand. I believe that all life is precious and that every baby deserves a fighting chance.

I can't imagine that there is a divergence of view on this topic. Of course, public opinion polling, for what that is worth, shows that the vast majority of Americans agree. Last year, a poll found that more than three-quarters of Americans support providing medical support for babies who survive abortions. It is hard for me to believe that there would be 25 percent on the other side of that, but, suffice it to say, the vast majority of people agree with the proposition that the same medical standard of care should apply.

Unfortunately, there are people who make up that 25 percent in government who are in high-ranking positions and who wield a great deal of influence on this question. Take, for example, Virginia's Governor Ralph Northam. About this time last year, he made

comments which were deeply disturbing about how to care—or rather, not care—for certain newborn babies.

He was caught during an interview. I would like to think he misspoke, but he certainly didn't claim that. This was actually his view. He said that after the baby was delivered, it would be kept comfortable. The baby "would be resuscitated if that's what the mother and the family desired, and then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother."

What would be the subject of that discussion, whether the baby would live or die? Presumably so. Instead of providing prompt care to save the baby, Governor Northam—who is, by the way, a pediatrician, of all things—believes that you should sit down and decide whether to let the child live or die. That is not healthcare. That is infanticide.

In response to Governor Northam's comments—which, apparently, he spoke not just for himself but for a significant segment, maybe the 25 percent in that poll I mentioned earlier—our colleague from Nebraska, Senator SASSE, introduced a bill called the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This legislation is very straightforward. It would require doctors who treat babies who survive an abortion with the same lifesaving care that other infants receive. It sounds like common sense, right? Well, common sense apparently is not all that common in some quarters.

You might think that surely there are already protections that exist for that newborn baby. That has to be the law already, right? Sadly not. There are no Federal laws requiring healthcare providers to care for these babies just as they would any other infant in their care.

Sadly, many of our Democratic colleagues in the Senate are just fine with that. When the Senate voted on this legislation last year, 44 Democrats voted against it—against it. But for those of us who are aligned more with the 75 percent of Americans who believe all babies deserve that care, we are not fine with that.

This legislation would build on the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002, which actually passed the Senate unanimously at the time. That bill clarified that any infant born alive at any stage of development is a person—again, a statement of the obvious—regardless of the manner in which they were born.

Now it is time to clarify that each person will receive appropriate medical care, no matter what their circumstances and how they happened to be delivered and born.

One of our witnesses in today's and Tuesday's hearings was Dr. Robin Pierucci, a neonatologist at Bronson Methodist Hospital. Dr. Pierucci discussed the medical standard of care for babies born alive and concluded that "we are always obligated to care, whether or not we have the ability to heal."

I agree with her. There should only be one side to this question—the side that advocates for equal medical care for newborns, the side that believes that all infants deserve a fighting chance, the side that believes that life is precious and must be protected.

When I attended this hearing, it reminded me of an article that was written back in 2004 by one of my favorite writers, Peggy Noonan. She was talking about a Presidential candidate, General Wesley Clark, running that year for the Democratic nomination for President. She quotes an interview that General Clark had with the publisher of the Manchester Union-Leader, Joseph McQuaid. Here is how the conversation went.

General Clark says: I don't think you should get the law involved in abortion.

McQuaid said: At all?

Clark said: Nope.

McQuaid said: Late-term abortion? No limits?

Clark said: Nope.

McQuaid said: Anything up to delivery?

Clark said: Nope, nope.

McQuaid: Anything up to the head coming out of the womb?

Clark said: I say it is up to the woman and her doctor, her conscience. You don't put the law in there.

Back when the Supreme Court decided *Roe v. Wade*, it made clear that at some point, once the fetus is viable, you are dealing with more than just the interest of the mother. I know the whole debate over abortion is divisive in this country, but at some point you have to realize you are not just talking about one person but two people, and each of those individuals has rights, and the State certainly has an interest in protecting a vulnerable child.

In my State of Texas—and I dare say in Florida and in every other State in the country—we have child protection laws in place which say if you witness child abuse or neglect, you have a legal duty to report it. Again, the law says, if you see a child that is being abused or neglected, you have a duty to report it, and if you don't do it, you are guilty of a crime.

How in the world we could reconcile these ideas that it is somehow OK to deliver a child, even though it is a botched abortion, and not have a legal, much less a moral, duty to care for that child is irreconcilable.

I think it is really important for the Senate to stand on the side of life. This is not an abortion issue. This is a matter of equal protection under the law and whether we are going to fulfill our duty to protect the most vulnerable among us—the children, who might otherwise be abused or, certainly, neglected.

I am proud to cosponsor this legislation and to stand up firmly on the side of our most vulnerable citizens.

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. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

USAID BRANDING MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 369, H.R. 2744.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2744) to authorize the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to prescribe the manner in which programs of the agency are identified overseas, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "USAID Branding Modernization Act".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR BRANDING.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (referred to in this section as "USAID"), in coordination with the Secretary of State, as appropriate, and with due consideration for the safety and security of implementing partners and beneficiaries, is authorized to prescribe, as appropriate, the use of logos or other insignia of the USAID Identity, or the use of additional or substitute markings, including the United States flag, to appropriately identify, including as required by section 641 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2401), overseas programs administered by USAID.

(b) *AUDIT.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of USAID shall submit to Congress an audit of compliance with relevant branding and marking requirements of USAID by implementing partners funded by USAID, including any requirements prescribed pursuant to the authorization under subsection (a).

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

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

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

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 2744), as amended, was passed.

WILLIAM T. COLEMAN, JR., DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION HEADQUARTERS ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the

immediate consideration of Calendar No. 419, S. 3239.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3239) to designate the headquarters building of the Department of Transportation located at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, in Washington, DC, as the "William T. Coleman, Jr., Federal Building".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 3239) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3239

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "William T. Coleman, Jr., Department of Transportation Headquarters Act".

SEC. 2. WILLIAM T. COLEMAN, JR., FEDERAL BUILDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The headquarters building of the Department of Transportation located at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, in Washington, DC, shall be known and designated as the "William T. Coleman, Jr., Federal Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the building referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "William T. Coleman, Jr., Federal Building".

CONGRATULATING THE KANSAS CITY CHIEFS ON THEIR VICTORY IN SUPER BOWL LIV

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 490.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 490) congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; that the Blunt amendment to the preamble be agreed to; that the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; that the Blunt amendment to the title be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 490) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1325) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

Insert after the second whereas clause of the preamble the following:

Whereas Super Bowl LIV was the culmination of the 100th season of the NFL, a season in which the league has promoted stars both past and present, served the community, and looked toward the next 100 years of football;

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1326) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: "A resolution congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV in the successful 100th season of the National Football League."

(The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, is printed in the Record of February 25, 2020.)

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA ARGONAUTS FOOTBALL TEAM FOR ITS NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION II NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP VICTORY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 503, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 503) commending the University of West Florida Argonauts football team for its National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II national championship victory.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 503) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

HONORING THE MEMORIES OF THE VICTIMS OF THE SENSELESS ATTACK AT MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL ON FEBRUARY 14, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 504, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 504) honoring the memories of the victims of the senseless at-

tack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School on February 14, 2018.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 504) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2020, THROUGH MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2020

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted, on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Monday, February 17, at 1:45 p.m., and Thursday, February 20, at 2:30 p.m. I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, February 20, it will next convene at 3 p.m. on Monday, February 24; further, following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Molloy nomination; and finally, I ask that the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday, February 24.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, Senator BALDWIN will be recognized on Monday, February 24, following the prayer and pledge, to deliver Washington's Farewell Address.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2020, AT 1:45 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:42 p.m., adjourned until Monday, February 17, 2020, at 1:45 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

ADAM L. BRAVERMAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE ROGER T. BENITEZ, RETIRED.

JOHN W. HOLCOMB, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE DEAN D. PREGERSON, RETIRED.

KNUT SVEINBJORN JOHNSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE JOHN A. HOUSTON, RETIRED.

STEVE KIM, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE BEVERLY REID O'CONNELL, DECEASED.

SANDY NUNES LEAL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE CHRISTINA A. SNYDER, RETIRED.

R. SHIREEN MATTHEWS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE BARRY TED MOSKOWITZ, RETIRED.

MICHELLE M. PETTIT, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE MICHAEL M. ANELLO, RETIRED.

RICK LLOYD RICHMOND, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE MANUEL L. REAL, RETIRED.

TODD WALLACE ROBINSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE MARILYN L. HUFF, RETIRED.

JEREMY B. ROSEN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE MARGARET M. MORROW, RETIRED.

JENNIFER P. TOGLIATTI, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA, VICE JAMES C. MAHAN, RETIRED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

L.T. GEN. EDWARD M. DALY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. GARY M. BRITO

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. RANDY B. CRITES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. SAMUEL J. PAPARO, JR.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

KEVIN L. RAWSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

NIREN ANGLE
OCLLA M. FLETCHER
RUTH A. GERMAN
RYAN P. HAWKS
PATRICK M. JOHANNES
PATRICK L. KELLER
JEFFREY S. LAROCHELLE
WILLIAM M. LUCAS
CHARLES C. MARTINEAU
CRAIG ALLAN SOLTIS
OLIVER J. WISCO
BRET JAMES WOOD
MARISSA V. YLAGAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

SANDRA L. CASTLE OH
TUCKER A. DRURY
PATRICK M. ELLISON
GREGORY A. ERICKSON
MICHAEL D. LANDES
JOEL ADLAI REYES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TRACEY G. ATHERTON
SUSAN C. BEYLOTTE
CAROLYN ANN DALE
PATRICIA A. HAYDEN

MEDORI S. HILL
NICOLE SUZANNE HURLEY
CHRISTINE C. JONES
VICTOR D. LAVIGNE
LISA M. LEHOCKY
JANENE M. LUFF
DAVID J. NOWAK
STEPHEN V. SECRAW
MABLE H. SMITH
SCOTT A. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

RAFAEL V. ANDINO
PATRICK D. BARGER
CURT AUSTIN CAPPS
THEODORE STANISLAUS LISZESKI
JAMES M. MCLEAN
FRANK R. PASCARELLI
LEROY A. RICHARDSON
MICHELLE E. VAN SICKLE
RICHARD E. YENKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ALEXANDER L. MILLMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KIMBERLY A. ADAMS
MICHAEL T. BAKER
KAY A. BEIGH
JENNIFER MARIE BERRY
JOHN C. BISSELL
JOHNSTEPHEN A. BOCCIERI
THOMAS P. BORREGO
MICHELE A. BOYKO
JOEL PATRICK BRANOSKY
DIANE M. BRASHEAR
PAUL RAYMOND BRENNER
MORGENSTARR K. D. BRIENZA
KRISTIN M. BROCKSHUS
DAVID M. BROWN
CHAD N. BURDICK
MARK W. BURNS
GEORGET T. CAMPOSANO
FRANCISCO CASANOVA
RICK A. CHADWICK
CHRISTOPHER L. CHANDLER
JACLYN A. CHATWICK
CONNIE L. CLAY
KELLY MARIE COLACICCO
BRYAN R. COLLINS
ERIN CHRISTINE COOK
SHANNA R. CORBETT
DANIEL W. COUNTS
SILAS V. DARDEN III
JEFFREY A. DERR
SHAWN D. DICKMAN
DAVID W. DIEHL
DIXIE A. DUKE
KELVIN D. DUMAS
JEROD I. DWYER
DARRIS S. EDGE
ANITA M. EDMONDS
JAMES L. EHRRIG
COLLEEN M. EWASKO
ANDREW P. FETH
JENNIFER A. FIEDERER
RYAN M. FREEMAN
KYLE H. GOLDSTEIN
JONATHAN S. GRATON
ROBERT A. GRIFFITH
LOUIS E. GUERRINI
RODNEY A. HAMMOND
DAVID B. HARDEN
BENJAMIN R. HARRISON
ELIZABETH JANE HARTZ
MATTHEW K. HEINTZELMAN
ANGELA J. HENDERSON
CLINT A. HENDERSON
SEAN COLLEEN HEUP
TODD S. HILL
ETHAN P. HINKINS
SEAN P. HOLAHAN
MARION L. HOLMES
KYLE W. HOSMAN
CARL ALEXANDER ISE
JAMIE LYNN HIMSL JAMIESON
CARL VIRGIL JONES III
CHRISTOPHER J. JORDAN
TARA LOUISE KEENE
DON M. KELLEY
BRANDON M. KELLY
DENISE A. KERR
BRADLEY G. KING
LAURA E. KOHAKE
JOHN A. LESH
STEVEN J. LEUTNER
RODNEY D. LYTKINS
ROBERT F. LYTLE
WILLIAM T. MACLIN
ISOBELLE LALIMARMO MAHONEY
RODNEY ERIC MCCRAINE
WILLIAM T. MCELHINNEY III
KEITH A. MECHEAM
MARK L. MEIER
ERICA J. MEYER
GREGORY S. MEYER

ROBERT N. MISHEV
RYAN RODRIGUEZ MONTANEZ
LOUIS E. MORGAN
MICHAEL A. MUNDY
JAMES M. NELSON
JOHN M. NEMECEK
TODD J. NERLIN
MATTHEW J. NICOLETTA
JAIME J. NORDIN
KEVIN M. PETERSON
AUGUST L. PFLUGER
CASEY N. POMBERT
KALLECE A. QUINN
PATRICK B. RAGAN
ADAM G. RESSLER
KERYA REYES
JAMES A. RIGSBEE
WILLIAM J. ROFF, JR.
PAULA G. ROSS
STUART M. RUBIO
EDWARD J. SCHIERBERL
MARK A. SCHULMAN
REBECCA SUB SCHULTZ
BEN P. SMALLWOOD
ROBERT J. SMOLICH
BETH A. STARGARDT
TREVOR T. STHULTZ
RODERICK R. STOUT
WILLIAM C. TATUM
JERADE W. TIPTON
ALAN M. TORNAV
JOSEPH W. TRINGE
JOSHUA L. TYLER
SEAN J. VANHOLTZ
VIANESA R. K. VARGAS
MARK A. VILLACIS
ELIAS I. VOCES III
ALAN H. WAGNER
BRETT A. WARING
KATRINE M. WATERMAN
BERNARD L. WILLIS II
MARY F. WILSON
WENDY A. WOODARD
JAMEY L. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CHRISTOPHER T. PROTT
YVONNDE M. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MARK ALAN BOWDITCH
STUART A. KING
DANIEL R. SWEENEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CURTIS J. HAYES
LAWRENCE VU NGUYEN
ROBERT B. SEMTNER
MARK R. SHEILS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DAVID P. BENNETT
CHRISTOPHER A. MONSEY
TRACY M. SILER
MICHAEL N. SPARGO
ANDREW K. STAMPER
JON B. STANLEY
ROBERT L. STOLZMAN
JOHN C. WIGGLESWORTH
TIWANA LATISE WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MARK S. BREIDENBAUGH
MICHAEL T. CARTWRIGHT
MARIO G. CORA-HERNANDEZ
KELLY A. RHODEN
SIERRA H. SUHAJDA
BARBARA ANN WUJCIAC

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CHARLES J. HOWELL

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ALEXANDER D. DOWDS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

PHILLIP W. MAZINGO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

BENJAMIN J. POWELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JULIO RIVERA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

PAUL HOLOYE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

AARON S. BROWN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CARLSON D. CHOW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

DEMETRIUS D. HOWARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be lieutenant colonel

LESLEY C. CALIX

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

DOUGLAS T. FRANK
ROBERT C. HORVATH
WILLIAM P. KELLY
GRANT C. MARKS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

FREEMAN W. DAVENPORT IV

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 605:

To be captain

JOHN P. BARRIENTOS
JOSEPH E. FALS
RYAN S. JACKSON
MATTHEW J. KISER
JOSEPH E. KLOPPER
DANIEL R. PROCHAZKA
ROBERT W. ROSE
STIG SANNESS
JEREMY A. SHAMBLEE
BRANDON E. TODD
MATTHEW T. VENTIMIGLIA

To be commander

KASEY W. CARTER
ROGER L. YOUNG

To be lieutenant commander

MATTHEW C. ABARE
JUAN E. ACOSTA
OSEI ASANTE
MICHAEL D. ASHLEY
MARK A. BAKER
KRISTOPHER W. BENNETT
BRIAN J. BIELINSKI
ROBERT L. BLAKE
STEPHEN E. BOGDANOWICZ
RYAN L. CONWAY
SEAN A. CRUZ
EMILY A. CURRAN
RYAN P. DONOHUE
JOHN S. DOWD
PAUL A. GALE
CARMEN M. GENTRY
DAVID R. GRZYWACZ
JAMES D. HALSELL
ANDREW M. HARRELL
JOSHUA M. HEANEY
JOSEPH F. HENKEL
CHRISTOPHER J. HOREL

STEVEN D. HUCKS
TRENTT E. JAMES
LICHEN J. KENTZ
SCOTT T. KILISZEWSKI
JOSHUA J. KROLL
CONRAD J. KUSEL
KEVIN T. LAMOTT
PATRICK K. LEAR
PHILIP S. LEE
WILLIAM M. LOVE
BRIAN C. LUCAS
BRYAN P. MCDONOUGH
MATHEW D. MCINTYRE
NICHOLAS G. MEHALIC
KYLE W. OLEARY
CHRISTOPHER C. REILLY
JOSHUA J. SALE
ALEXANDER K. SAMANIEGO
RYAN F. SCHAEDEL
MICHAEL J. SCHRUMP
KEVIN M. SCHWENK
ROBERT D. SEADER
CURTIS L. SHELTON III
MICHAEL G. SJOHOLMSIERCHIO
PERRY J. SOLOMON
FOSTER P. STENSON
AARON C. STOCKARD
ADAM C. TOEPP
VICTOR M. TRISCAS
JUSTIN W. VAGTS
JEANNE L. VANGILDER
EARL WATSON III
KEVIN J. WEEKS
RYAN T. WISZ
MICHAEL A. WREN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KATHERINE L. JAUDON

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10 U.S.C., SECTION 12203(A):

To be captain

JENNIFER J. CONKLIN
DIANE M. CROFF
KIMBERLY K. GUEDRY
KARL A. HANSEN
JAMES J. JOHNSON
BECKY K. JONES
MAUREN R. KALLGREN
BRUCE G. MACK
NATALIE M. MURPHY
GENNARO A. RUOCCO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14 U.S.C., SECTION 2121(E):

To be commander

RYAN G. ANGELO
STEVEN B. ARNWINE
BRIAN D. BACHTEL
ARMELL V. BALMACEDA
CHRISTIAN J. BARGER
ALEXANDER S. BARKER
TIMOTHY J. BERNADT
MICAH W. BONNER
KURT F. BRANDSTAETTER
ADAM T. CERNOVICH
BRIAN M. CHAPMAN
ALEXANDRA K. CHERRY
LEAH M. COLE
JUDSON A. COLEMAN
JAMES O. CONNER
NEAL A. CORBIN II
BROOKS C. CRAWFORD
BEN W. CROWELL
CHRISTOPHER K. CUMBERLAND
LEO T. DANAEHR
KELLY A. DEUTERMANN
RYAN P. DEVLIN
TODD R. DEVRIES
JESSE M. DIAZ
ADAM J. DISQUE
MICHAEL J. DOUGHERTY
TIFFANY A. DUFFY
BROCK S. ECKEL
STEVEN R. ELLIOTT
KRISTOPHER R. ENSLEY
MICHAEL G. FAULKNER
JOEL S. FERGUSON
ARI D. FITZWATER
CHRISTOPHER A. FLOYD
LAUREN U. FULLAM
ANGEL M. GALINANES
GAVIN V. GARCIA
JUSTIN H. GORDON
ANNA A. GRAFCHIKOVA
JOSEPH F. GRAHAM
DOUGLAS D. GRAUL II
SIMON C. GREENE
ANDREW T. GREENWOOD
JEREMY M. GREENWOOD
BENEDICT S. GULLO III
MATTHEW A. GULLY
KRISTEN A. HAHN

PETER K. HAHN
ANDREW T. HAWTHORNE
CORYDON F. HEARD
JAMES L. HELLER
ROBERTO R. HERRERA
DANA E. HIATT
SCOTT M. HIGBEE
GREGORY E. HIGGINS
MICHAEL A. HJERSTEDT
MATTHEW M. HOBIE
KENNETH E. HOGUE
GORDON A. HOOD
JUSTIN C. HUNT
THOMAS J. HUNTLEY
WILLIAM J. JACOBS
BEAU J. JAMES
JEFFREY G. JANARO
JEANITA A. JEFFERSON
ROXANNE B. JENSEN
LEE H. JONES II
RYAN P. KELLEY
KALEN M. KENNY
JEREMY A. KIME
JAMIE L. KOPPI
HEIDI L. KOSKI
AARON J. KOWALCZK
FRANK R. KULESA
MARK E. LABERT
JILLIAN M. LAMB
MARC J. LANORE
BRIAN S. LIED
TONYA M. LIM
ASHLEY F. LOVEJOY
RHIANNA N. MACON
JODY J. MAISANO
MARY E. MARTIN
THOMAS P. MARTIN
ROGER M. MASSON
CHARLES R. MATHIS
MARC R. MCDONNELL
MICHAEL S. MCGRAIL
GREGORY A. MCLAMB
CHRISTIAN T. MEDICK
JEANINE M. MENZE
GARRETT R. MEYER
MICHAEL J. MEYER
JAMES R. MILLER, JR
LAURA S. MILLER
PAUL J. MILLER
JODI J. MIN
DANIEL P. MOCHEN
JOSEPH W. MORGANS
ELLEN M. MOTOI
SEAN M. MURRAY
STEVEN MYERS
JUSTIN P. NADOLNY
MICHAEL J. NORDHAUSEN
ESTEVAN OLIVERA
CORRINA OTT
JAMES H. PAFFORD
ERIC C. PARE
MICHAEL A. PATTERSON
KRISTYN E. PECORA
PIERO A. PECORA
SEAN M. PETERSON
WALTER S. PIERCE
DAVID C. PIZZURRO
CHRISTIAN T. POLYAK
JONATHAN H. POTTERTON
DAWN N. PREBULA
MATTHEW J. PRESS
THOMAS E. PRZYBYLA
NICHOLAS O. RAMIREZ
LISA M. RODMAN
JOHNA N. ROSSETTI
BEN P. RUSSELL
KELLY A. SAWYER
DANA E. SCHULMAN
MAEGAN R. SCHWARTZ
BROOK I. SERBU
COURTNEY A. SERGENT
BONNIE M. SHANER
LISA M. SHARKEY
JOHN M. SINGLETARY
MATTHEW B. SMITH
BAXTER B. SMOAK
MATTHEW M. SPOLARICH
LAURA M. SPRINGER
JANNA M. STATON
KELLEY L. STEVENS
DONALD S. STIKER
JUSTIN W. STROCK
CHRISTINA D. SULLIVAN
DANIEL B. SWEIGART
BRYAN J. SWINTEK
MARIO B. TEIXEIRA
MAILE I. TESLER
PAUL D. TESSITORE
BRYAN D. TILEY
TIMOTHY S. TILGHMAN
KELLY J. TONGOL
JUSTIN O. VANDENHEUVEL
JEREMY A. WEISS
EUSTACIA Y. WEIST
KYLE A. WEIST
JENNIFER L. WESCOTT
BRIAN R. WHISLER
DUSTIN R. WILLIAMS
JOSHUA D. WINE
WARREN N. WRIGHT
KISMET R. WUNDER
ADAM K. YOUNG
JEFFREY S. ZAMARIN

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SERGEANT MICHAEL DELVISCIO

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mr. NORCROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and commend the valiant service of Magnolia, New Jersey resident Sergeant Michael DelViscio, Camden County Town Hall Honoree.

Sergeant Michael DelViscio was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1949 and two years later he and his family relocated to Barrington, New Jersey. In 1964 the DelViscios moved to Stratford, New Jersey and in 1967 Sergeant DelViscio graduated from Sterling High School. Following his graduation at the age of 19, Mr. DelViscio enlisted in the United States Army.

As a third-generation member of the United States Army, Sergeant DelViscio proudly followed in the footsteps of his grandfather and namesake Mike DelViscio who served in World War I, and his father Frank DelViscio who served in World War II. Sergeant Michael DelViscio honorably enlisted in the United States Army and was deployed during the height of the Vietnam War to South Vietnam on September 1, 1969. He served with the 361st Signal Battalion located in Phu Bai.

Upon returning from his one-year tour of duty, in 1970 Mr. DelViscio married his wife Fran and was reassigned to Fort Huachuca, Arizona. There he served out the remainder of his three-year enlistment in Arizona and was discharged on November 3, 1971 with the rank of Sergeant E-5. He received the Army Commendation Medal for his consistent acts of meritorious service during his time in the United States Army.

Thereafter, Michael began his Police career with the Borough of Magnolia in March 1973 and was promoted to Sergeant in 1976. In 1991 Michael and two other officers were awarded the Departmental Gallantry Star ribbon and a citation for apprehending an armed suspect that committed a robbery at a local service station. After more than two decades of service to his community on July 1, 2001 Michael retired from his distinguished career with the Magnolia Police Department.

On September 19, 2020 Michael and Fran will be celebrating their 50th wedding anniversary. They are proud parents of three daughters: Andrea, Karen, and Chrisy, who have all graduated from Sterling High School. He and his wife are the proud grandparents of Mandy, Johnny, Danny, Joey, Jacob, Ryan, Conner, Tyler, Katie, Michael, Ethan, and Sarah. Johnny is currently serving in the United States Marine Corps and has just completed his first year of active duty. Katie, Jacob, and Danny are volunteers at the Magnolia Fire Department.

Madam Speaker, Sergeant DelViscio is a great American who exemplifies the true meaning of a patriot. I ask you to join me in honoring the truly exceptional service of Mr. Michael DelViscio, of Magnolia, New Jersey.

TRIBUTE TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE MICHAEL "MIKE" MOORE

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great friend of America and a great leader of New Zealand. Former Prime Minister Michael "Mike" Moore has been called "a force of nature" and was a dedicated defender of working people. The Right Honorable Moore transitioned on February 2, 2020, but his legacy will live on.

Prime Minister Moore was born in Whakatane, New Zealand. He was educated at Bay of Islands College and Dilworth School, but left school at the age of 14. While working as a laborer and a printer, he became very active in the trade union movement and was elected to the Auckland Trades Council at the age of 17. Through his union work, he became active in politics and became the first youth representative on the Labour Party executive. He also served as vice president of the International Union of Socialist Youth for two terms.

In 1972, at the age of 23, he became the youngest person elected to the New Zealand Parliament. During his years of public service, he held various ministries in the Labour government, including Overseas Trade Minister, Minister of External Relations, and Deputy Minister of Finance. He served as Minister of Foreign Affairs from 1984 to 1990, when he won the post of Prime Minister after the resignation of Geoffrey Palmer. Yet his service as New Zealand's political leader lasted only eight weeks, ending when the Labour Party lost control of Parliament in the general election of 1990. He was defeated as the Labour Party leader three years later.

From 1999 to 2002, Moore served as director-general of the World Trade Organization, where his service was marked by his efforts to help poor countries effectively participate in multilateral trade. He then served as New Zealand's Ambassador to the United States from 2010 to 2015, where I was fortunate to get to know him. He was an avid supporter of my annual golf tournament and Scholarship Banquet in Santee, South Carolina, always sending a New Zealand team to participate.

Although he didn't have much formal education, Moore claimed, "the Labour Party has been my training college, Parliament my university." His keen intellect was well known and he was awarded honorary doctorates from Lincoln University, the Auckland University of Technology and the University of Canterbury, the People's University of China, and La Trobe University in Australia. He was also a prolific reader and wrote books on economics, politics and New Zealand history.

Moore was married to Yvonne Dereany, a teacher and host of the children's television program Romper Room, for 45 years.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and our colleagues to join me in celebrating the life of

New Zealand's Prime Minister Mike Moore. He was a distinguished public servant, who had a heart for the people and a love of history. He said in his final speech as a Member of Parliament that "a nation is the sum total of its history, its memories, and experiences. A nation without history is like a man without a memory." May we all remember this sentiment and honor his legacy.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, on February 10, 2020, I was unavoidably detained due to a flight delay and missed the first vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 55.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

HON. ALBIO SIRE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mr. SIRE. Madam Speaker, today, I recognize and congratulate Stevens Institute of Technology in Hoboken, New Jersey on its 150th anniversary.

Stevens Institute of Technology was founded as the United States' first college of mechanical engineering on February 15, 1870 with a bequest from Edwin A. Stevens, a member of one of America's great families of inventors. Over the past 150 years, the university has expanded to include all engineering and science disciplines, an accredited School of Business, and a College of Arts and Letters.

From its earliest days, Stevens has honored its mission to inspire, nurture, and educate leaders in tomorrow's technology driven environment while contributing to the solutions for the most challenging problems of our time. Today, Stevens is among the fastest-growing universities in the nation, attracting top students and faculty from New Jersey, the nation, and across the world.

Stevens is one of the largest producers of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) degree recipients in New Jersey and ranks first in New Jersey and fifteenth in the nation in the production of engineering graduate degrees. Students at Stevens benefit from the university's technology-centric education, which provides a unique, problem-solving, and entrepreneurial approach to learning and is a passport to success. Stevens has an outstanding 96 percent placement rate for its graduates and its alumni have launched

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

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

and led numerous companies and organizations.

Stevens faculty, students, and alumni have pioneered research and innovations in many diverse fields, including transportation, telecommunications, resiliency, sustainability, artificial intelligence, machine learning, health care, biomedicine, cybersecurity, maritime security, and systems engineering. It is not an exaggeration to say that Stevens has changed and improved the way we live, work, and communicate. Stevens has also contributed significantly to the community as well as the local, state, and national economy.

It is my great honor to recognize Stevens for this significant milestone in the history of the university and to thank its leadership, faculty, students, and alumni for their contributions to Hoboken, Hudson County, the State of New Jersey, and the United States.

GLOUCESTER TOWNSHIP, NEW JERSEY

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mr. NORCROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and commend Gloucester Township, New Jersey, First Place in the Nation—2019 National Night Out.

Gloucester Township is a community in the heart of Camden County, home to nearly 70,000 residents. In 2016, Gloucester Township won eighth nationally for National Night Out and in 2018 the town won seventh place in the nation. Each year the town's National Night Out event continues to grow more popular. This year, for the thirty seventh annual National Night Out, Gloucester Township won first place in the nation for their community event for a town with 50,000 to 100,000 residents.

National Night Out is an event focused on crime and drug prevention in coordination with building stronger police-community relations. Through strengthening community spirit and developing stronger programs like crime watch, Gloucester Township is being recognized on both a state and national scale for their safe and caring environment.

Gloucester Township is protected by the dedicated Gloucester Township Police Department which responds to nearly 60,000 calls for service each year, with an average of 5,000 calls per month. The department consists of over 133 full-time sworn law enforcement officers, 35 special law enforcement officers, 17 telecommunicators, and 16 civilian employees and we extend the sincerest appreciation for Gloucester Township Police Department and all law enforcement.

In rediscovering our own communities, it is no surprise that we see more people moving to Gloucester Township and "joining the excitement." During Mayor David Mayer's administration, the township has substantially expanded economically and grown as a community.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in honoring and congratulating Gloucester Township, as well as the Gloucester Township Police Department, on their achievement of earning first place in the United States of America for their 2019 National Night Out community celebration.

HONORING BONNIE LOWENTHAL'S CAREER OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Bonnie Lowenthal and her career of public service.

Ms. Lowenthal began her public service to the Long Beach, California community nearly five decades ago, serving as a licensed family counselor, mental health consultant, and as an educator.

Her work in the Long Beach community began a life-long focus on affordable housing and the problem of homelessness. She was appointed as Vice Chair of the Mayor's Task Force on Homelessness in 1987 and worked to find mechanisms to house people and prevent homelessness.

Her community work also led Ms. Lowenthal to a deep involvement with the Long Beach Cambodian community and in 1989 she was named Director of Planning for the United Cambodian Community organization while also serving as the Arts Manager representing a group of Cambodian musicians and founding the Cambodian Children's Orchestra. In 1991, Ms. Lowenthal traveled to Cambodia with a national Red Cross group to investigate the proliferation of landmines left behind during the decades of war that had engulfed the country. She also helped initiate a sister-city relationship between Long Beach and Phnom Penh and would go on to be an official observer during Cambodia's first municipal elections in more than 40 years. Ms. Lowenthal has also served as Clinical Director for the Cambodian Association of America and as a participant on the Cambodiatown Advisory Board.

In 1994, Ms. Lowenthal was elected to the first of two terms on the Long Beach Unified School District Board. Her dedication and commitment to students helped Long Beach earn a national reputation as one of the country's best urban school districts.

After winning a 2001 special election for the 1st District of the Long Beach City Council, Ms. Lowenthal would go on to win two full terms for the seat in 2002 and 2006. Selected by her colleagues as Vice Mayor in 2006, she was also elected by 27 regional cities to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board. She has stated that her mission on the Long Beach City Council was to make sure that the residents of her working-class district were as well represented at City Hall as residents of the city's wealthiest neighborhoods.

In 2008, Ms. Lowenthal was elected to her first of three terms in the California State Assembly. Her district, encompassing what is now the 70th Assembly District, remains one of the most ethnically diverse populations in the state.

During her three terms in the State Assembly, Ms. Lowenthal's district included the Long Beach/Los Angeles port complex—the busiest container complex in the Western Hemisphere. As an Assemblymember, she was instrumental in helping create more than 18,000 transportation-related jobs, while also protecting the employment rights of thousands of other port workers.

In addition to transportation issues, during her tenure in the State Assembly she focused on standing up for children, seniors, and the environment. She authored laws that protected coastal waters from invasive species; made it easier for older adults to stay in their homes; encouraged state workers to blow the whistle on wrongdoing; and made it easier for school districts to provide children with a safe ride to school. She also authored important legislation that brought additional federal funds to foster youth, protected injured workers from unjust medical bills, and reduced the cost of prison healthcare by millions of dollars a year.

Her leadership positions in the State Assembly included chairing the Legislative Women's Caucus, the Assembly Committee on Transportation, the Joint Committee on Emergency Management, and the Select Committee on Ports. She served as a member of the committees on Accountability and Administrative Review, Environmental Safety & Toxic Materials, Health, and other select committees.

For her service in the State Legislature, Ms. Lowenthal was named Legislator of the Year by the California Assisted Living Association, the California Association of Marriage and Family Therapists, and the California Chiropractic Association, among many others.

In 2017, Ms. Lowenthal was named to the Long Beach Board of Harbor Commissioners by Long Beach Mayor Robert Garcia, and elected President of the Board in July 2019, following a year of service as Vice President of the board.

As a member of the five-member board, Ms. Lowenthal is responsible for the management and oversight of City's Harbor Department which operates the Port of Long Beach, the nation's second-busiest port. She was unanimously confirmed by the City Council as the 68th appointee to the Board since the current Commission was established in 1925. Her appointment made her the seventh woman to serve on the Commission and marked the first time in the port's history that the five-member Board had four female members at the same time.

Besides serving on various Commission sub-committees, Ms. Lowenthal also represents the port on national and international trade missions and serves as the board representative or alternate to a variety of port-related leadership organizations.

In addition to her work on the Board of Harbor Commissioners, Ms. Lowenthal serves her community on the St. Mary's Medical Center Governing Board, the U.S. Vets Advisory Board, the Children Today Board of Directors, the LINC Housing Board of Directors, and the Jewish Family and Children's Service Board of Directors.

I want to thank Ms. Lowenthal for her nearly five decades of commitment to her community and for the dedication to public service that has allowed her to give so much to that community.

HONORING DR. WILLIAM CATON

HON. JUDY CHU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr.

William Caton, who passed away on February 6, 2020 at the age of 74. Dr. Caton was a lifelong leader in the field of neurosurgery and led a distinguished career that had lasting impacts on my district in the San Gabriel Valley and throughout California.

Dr. Caton was born in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania on July 7, 1945 and spent his childhood in Georgia and Massachusetts. He received his bachelor's degree from Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and then moved to California to attend medical school at the University of Southern California (USC) School of Medicine. He received his M.D. in 1971 and completed his residency in Neurosurgery at the Los Angeles County—USC Medical Center in 1977. After completing his residency, Dr. Caton began his practice in Pasadena, a community he would serve for the next forty years.

Dr. Caton's dedication to his patients earned him the reputation as one of the top neurosurgeons in California. He was a representative for the California Association of Neurological Surgery (CANS) at National State Council meetings for twenty-five years and served as President from 2009 to 2010. He also represented CANS in meetings with LA County that resulted in developing a county-wide system of trauma care centers in 1983. He was appointed to serve as Chairman of Neurosurgery at Huntington Memorial Hospital, the leading trauma center within the San Gabriel Valley, a position he would hold for over twenty years. His work was also well known around the globe. He collaborated on a project in Bangalore, India, where he advised the development of a brain cancer treatment center, and he created an international symposium on healthcare, also located in India.

He was a strong advocate for higher education and passed his knowledge on to multiple generations of students. For almost forty years, he was a Clinical Assistant Professor in the Neurological Surgery Department at USC. He was also a long-time faculty member at California Institute of Technology (Caltech) in the Department of Biology and Bioengineering. While there, he founded the Caltech Students Medical Mentor Program, served as director of the Caltech M.D.-Ph.D. Clinical Outreach Program, and became director of the Pasadena Neuroscience Fellowship. Because of his distinguished service and contributions to higher education, Dr. Caton received an honorary graduate degree from the Caltech Alumni Association in 2008. Additionally, he was a strong advocate for the education of women and served on the Board of Trustees for Mayfield Senior High School, an all-girls college preparatory high school, from 1986 to 1997.

Dr. Caton leaves behind an enduring legacy of service, patient advocacy, and leadership to the San Gabriel Valley, Los Angeles County, and California. He is an inspiration to all who knew him, and it is my distinct honor to commemorate his life.

HOMELAND SECURITY FOR CHILDREN ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior Member of Congress, I rise in support of

H.R. 2932, the "Homeland Security for Children Act," which would direct the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to identify and integrate the needs of children into activities to prepare for, protect against, respond to, recover from, and mitigate against the risk of natural disasters, acts of terrorism, and other man-made disasters.

The "Homeland Security for Children Act" would make children's needs a priority throughout the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), by directing the DHS Undersecretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans to incorporate feedback from children's organizations into Department-wide activities.

This legislation would require DHS to submit a report to Congress on the Department's efforts to integrate the needs of children into the policies, programs, and activities at DHS.

DHS will authorize a Children's Technical Expert position, ensuring that the Agency will adequately incorporate the needs of children into its emergency preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation activities.

Due to their general incapacity to protect and advocate for themselves, children are more likely to succumb to the negative outcomes associated with disasters and acts of terrorism.

FEMA has consistently missed the mark when it comes to acknowledging and prioritizing the unique needs of children in its disaster-related activities.

When disaster strikes, whether natural or manmade, the country has historically struggled to adequately prepare for children's unique needs.

For example, in Houston Hurricane Harvey made land fall in 2017 and proceeded to affect 13 million people, cause \$125 billion dollars in damages, and take the lives of 94 individuals.

Nearly 3 million children in Harris County alone were impacted by Hurricane Harvey.

Six months after the storm approximately 4,000 childcare programs, afterschool programs, and schools closed for weeks in the Greater Houston area.

Hurricane Harvey resulted in an increase to the number of economically disadvantaged children, cases of mental health issues and student homelessness.

The shortage of childcare throughout the impacted regions prevented many families from returning to their "normal" lives.

Traumatic experiences, such as a natural disaster, can negatively impact a child's mental health, cause an increase in irritability, aggression, anger, and physical ailments, such as headaches and stomach aches.

It is vital that FEMA makes it a priority to integrate the needs of children into their activities to prepare for, protect against and mitigate against the risk of natural disasters, acts of terrorism, and other man-made disasters.

I ask all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 2932, the "Homeland Security for Children Act."

CELEBRATING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF MONITEAU COUNTY, MISSOURI

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to congratulate Moniteau County, in

Missouri's Fourth Congressional District, on the 175th anniversary of its founding.

The territory that now makes up Moniteau County was originally part of the 1803 Louisiana Purchase. It was organized on February 14, 1845, carved out of territory from Cole and Morgan counties. The name of this county, taken from Moniteau Creek, is the French spelling of an Indian word meaning "spirit of God" or "Country of the Great Spirit." The county epitomizes its name as evidenced by the many vibrant churches today in the community.

Agriculture is our state's leading industry, and Moniteau County is one of our state's leading producers of agricultural goods, known particularly for its beef, ham, and turkey products.

Moniteau County is a wonderful place in which to live, work, and raise a family. As this historic anniversary is celebrated, I wish the county and its citizens well and many more years of peace and prosperity.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I was regrettably absent for votes on February 7, 2020.

Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 52, YEA on Roll Call No. 53 and NAY on Roll Call No. 54.

ACKNOWLEDGING THE STRONG STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND INDIA

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the strong strategic partnership between the United States and India. A relationship that is based on shared values of democracy. Our cooperation extends across many sectors including financial, defense and counterterrorism. The region of Kashmir has long been subjected to conflict and instability. I support Prime Minister Modi in his efforts to bring stability to the region.

RECOGNIZING MARINE FORCES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND

HON. GREGORY F. MURPHY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the heroic Marine Forces Special Operations Command (or MARSOC) which will celebrate its 14th anniversary on February 24th. MARSOC was activated in 2006 at Camp LeJeune, North Carolina and initially consisted of a small staff and the Foreign Military Training Unit which had

been formed to conduct foreign internal defense. MARSOC deployed its first units in August 2006, six months after initial activation, and since that time has deployed continuously. MARSOC's current missions include counterterrorism, counterinsurgency, foreign internal defense and security force assistance.

Since its inception, MARSOC has received numerous unit awards including: Meritorious Unit Commendation Streamer, Afghanistan Campaign Streamer with One Bronze Star, National Defense Service Streamer, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Streamer as well as Global War on Terrorism Service Streamer.

Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring the legacy of this brave and patriotic unit and their standard of *Spiritus Invictus*, an Unconquerable Spirit. May we always keep our dedicated service members treasured in our hearts and constantly in our prayers for their service to God and country.

MS. JEAN WILEY, CIVIL RIGHTS
LEADER AND ACTIVIST

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Ms. Jean Wiley, who transitioned from the world that she tirelessly fought to improve, on December 9, 2019.

Born on June 11, 1942 to Elizabeth Thelma Holland Boyer Wiley and Joseph Alphonsus Wiley, Jean Wiley was a proud daughter of Baltimore, Maryland, where she completed her undergraduate degree at Morgan State University. As a testament to her work and legacy, many parts of our country—Michigan, Alabama, California, Washington, D.C., and Georgia to name a few—claim this amazing woman.

In 1953, the Supreme Court integrated Washington, D.C., but a few miles up the road, Ms. Wiley grew up surrounded by the oppressive stench of segregation in Baltimore. In 1963, she and other students took matters into their own hands; police arrested Jean and her friends as they conducted a sit-in to desegregate Baltimore's theaters. Upon hearing that Howard University students were heading up the highway to reinforce their protest, Baltimore's Mayor released these brave young activists and integrated the facilities.

Madam Speaker, I believe that taste of success fueled Ms. Wiley's life-long passion for civil and human rights. A few years later, Jean completed graduate studies at Michigan State University and began to teach at Alabama's Tuskegee Institute (now University). Professor Wiley challenged her students to expand their minds and inspired many to join the national movement for civil rights.

I will forever cherish my memories from this period of our lives, when young people from all different walks of life became nonviolent foot soldiers in the fight for our freedom. After Hosea Williams and I attempted to lead a march from Selma to Montgomery on a day that became known as Bloody Sunday, Ms. Wiley and more than 500 Tuskegee students caravanned from Macon County to Montgomery, Alabama to protest in solidarity for our right to vote. At the end of the summer, Con-

gress passed, and President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act into law on August 6, 1965.

Madam Speaker, for many of us in the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Jean was and will always remain a sister. Time and time again, she put her life and livelihood on the line in her pursuit of truth and justice. Jean taught volunteers to canvass, offered her home as a refuge, and even became the voice and face of SNCC during the summer of 1965, when she served as our national media relations coordinator. In this role, Ms. Wiley played the integral, critical role of sharing our work in the Deep South with the nation and the world. Whether we were boycotting, protesting, or testing voter registration procedures, Jean made sure that our work was not ignored.

After serving on the front lines of the Civil Rights Movement, Ms. Wiley made her way to Washington, D.C. where she helped create the Center for Black Education. Throughout her life, Jean was committed to the betterment of the African Diaspora and refused to wait for oppressive forces to see the light on their own. Over the years, she shared her expertise with Howard University's WHUR radio station, Essence Magazine, and the Institute for the Black World, an Atlanta-based think-tank.

As a devoted educator, Jean also continued to teach at the University of the District of Columbia and the University of California at Berkeley. Whether in the classroom or in her home, Professor Wiley shared the lessons and tactics of the Civil Rights Movement with new generations—including her cousin, Ms. Kimberly W. Ross, who works closely with me and my office on Capitol Hill.

As loved ones gather to reflect upon Ms. Jean Wiley's good and great work, I would like to pay tribute to the unbreakable bond of her adoring family—son, Cabral Stuckey Wiley; granddaughter, Brejaneey Wiley; great-granddaughters, Shariyah Harris and Narii Parker; sisters, Joyce Dyson and Lois Wiley Benjamin; nieces, Shiree Dyson and Ayisha Dyson; and nephews, Keith Dyson, Touré Dyson, and Malcolm Wiley.

Madam Speaker, the record should be clear: Ms. Wiley dedicated every ounce of her energy to the fight for justice. For these reasons, I proudly join all who knew, loved, learned from, and cared for this great leader in celebrating her life's work to transform the face and soul of our nation.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY CLIMATE CHANGE RESEARCH ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 10, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of Congress, I rise in support of H.R. 4737, the "Department of Homeland Security Climate Change Research Act," which requires the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to evaluate existing federal research regarding approaches to mitigate climate change on homeland security, to identify areas for further research within the Department, and to research and develop approaches to mitigate

the consequences of climate change on homeland security.

This legislation directs DHS to assess and potentially expand existing federal research projects that examine ways to mitigate the effects of climate change on homeland security programs.

The development in research from DHS will explore the connection, if any, between climate change and homeland security, including how the resulting competition for resources, economic distress, and social discontent can contribute to acts of terrorism.

Climate change poses a direct threat to U.S. national security through its effects on critical infrastructure, the lives of citizens, the economy, and energy security.

The scarcer resources become, the more power is given to those who control them, especially in regions where people are particularly reliant on natural resources for their livelihoods.

Terrorist groups will exploit the natural disasters and water and food shortages expected to result from climate change and allow them to recruit more easily, operate more freely and control civilian populations.

H.R. 4737 will ensure that DHS is adequately structured to meet the demands of responding to and recovering from acts of terrorism and natural disasters that are aggravated by climate change.

Climate change is not just a global problem, but also a threat to domestic security.

More than 60 percent of the country has faced moderate to extreme drought conditions and massive heat waves which devastated corn crops, put pressure on food prices, and caused deaths around the country.

Climate change poses costly threats to our domestic installations and potentially destabilizing threats to our international installations that hold strategic importance to the United States.

The extreme weather events that we have witnessed in the past 5 years illustrate the impact of climate change in the U.S. is much more complicated than a simple rise in temperatures.

Each region of this country will be impacted differently; understanding these regional consequences is important to policymakers because it will allow planning for response and adaptation.

Studies show that Texas is among a string of "Deep South" states that will experience the worst effects of climate change.

For example, Hurricane Harvey was a 1,000 year storm that has to date claimed the lives of at least 30 persons.

Before it was finished, Hurricane Harvey dropped 21 trillion gallons of rainfall on Texas and Louisiana, most of it on the Houston Metroplex.

A record 4,323 days, which is nearly 12 years, elapsed since a major hurricane (Category 3 or above) made landfall in the United States prior to Hurricane Harvey; the last Category 3 hurricane to hit the United States was Hurricane Wilma in 2005, the same year Hurricane Katrina destroyed much of New Orleans.

To put in perspective the devastation wrought by Hurricane Harvey, the volume of water that fell on Houston and other affected areas of Texas and Louisiana could fill more than 24,000 Astrodomes or supply the water for the raging Niagara Falls for 15 days.

In the first three days of the storm, more than 49,000 homes that had suffered flood

damage and more than 1,000 homes were completely destroyed in the storm.

Local authorities closed major freeways, airports, and schools.

In the first three days of the storm, more than 49,000 homes that had suffered flood damage and more than 1,000 homes were completely destroyed in the storm.

More than 30,000 persons were forced out of their homes due to the storm.

Presently, Houston experiences about five days each year over 100° Fahrenheit and by 2100, the city could expect some 70 days over 100° Fahrenheit.

The major weather and climate disasters that Texas experienced each produced at least a billion dollars in losses.

As the climate continues to warm, more multi-year droughts are expected with devastating impacts to the state's agriculture sector and drinking water.

As climate change affects food security and the availability of water and land, affected people will become more vulnerable not only to negative climate impacts but also to recruitment by terrorist groups offering alternative livelihoods and economic incentives.

Climate change will directly affect America's homeland and the security of its citizens.

I ask all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 4737, the "Department of Homeland Security Climate Change Research Act."

STANDING IN SUPPORT OF SOCIAL SECURITY & MEDICARE

HON. CHARLIE CRIST

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mr. CRIST. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of Social Security and Medicare, programs that literally save the lives of millions of Americans every day and serve nearly 200,000 veterans, children, seniors, and persons with disabilities in my district, and over 69 million across the country. I was deeply disappointed this week to see that the President's budget included steep cuts to these life-sustaining programs. Cutting \$35 billion from Social Security and \$500 billion from Medicare, not only puts Pinellas families and their loved ones at risk of losing their healthcare and benefits but also places a huge undue burden on some of the most vulnerable in our communities. We should be lending a helping hand to those in need, not turning them away. These cuts and broken promises will hurt people. And we cannot stand idly by. Let's protect Social Security and Medicare, now and always.

HONORING JUDGE ROMONDA D. BELCHER AS IOWAN OF THE WEEK

HON. CYNTHIA AXNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Judge Romonda D. Belcher, a District Associate Judge at the Polk County Justice Center in Des Moines, Iowa as the

Iowan of the Week. Judge Belcher is the first African American female judge to serve in the state of Iowa. She was appointed to the bench on August 20, 2010 and serves our community with distinction.

Like many young girls across this country, she set her goals high at a young age. She grew up in North Carolina and moved to Iowa to attempt Drake Law School. Before she was selected to be a judge, she worked in the Polk County Attorney's Office for 15 years, serving in multiple different capacities including important work in juvenile justice. She's been a mentor to women and attorneys across Iowa—including mentoring those who move here from out of state about how to handle our winter.

As District Associate Judge, she continues to exemplify justice and equality by treating those who come before her fairly, with compassion and respect. The late Iowa Supreme Court Justice Mark Cady believed it was these qualities in Judge Belcher that makes her so valuable to our community. He said that Judge Belcher's "presence and her approach and the kindness she displays is very needed" by the those who come before her courtroom.

I have great respect and admiration for folks who stand up for people who can't always stand up for themselves. Judge Belcher has made it her mission to help and had a dedicated life of public service, and Iowans are better because of it. It is an honor to commemorate the outstanding achievements of Judge Belcher and celebrate her as our Iowan of the Week.

RECOGNIZING JOHN C. DORTCH FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

HON. JOE CUNNINGHAM

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who has held many titles throughout his life: scholar athlete, Howard University graduate, U.S. Army officer, decorated Vietnam veteran, professor, attorney, pastor, and—for fifteen years—inmate.

John C. Dortch was born in Beaufort, South Carolina, the son of a Baptist minister. He was a gifted musician at a young age, an impressive student athlete, and a distinguished Military Graduate from Howard University who volunteered to serve in Vietnam at the age of 22.

After returning home from war, a series of bad decisions led John to participate in a bank robbery where a police officer was killed. John took full responsibility of his past, enrolling in law school after he was released from prison and leading programs for first-time juvenile offenders and anti-violence initiatives.

John turned his biggest regret into a mission of servitude, founding the Circle of Hope Ministries for the homeless in the Lowcountry. Every day he asks himself, "Did I help someone today?" John's life of service is a testament to the truth that every person is more than the worst thing they have done. It is an honor to know him.

IN RECOGNITION OF MOLLY DOBSON AS SHE IS NAMED WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Molly Dobson as she is named Woman of the Year by the United Way of Washtenaw County's Women United group. Dobson's lifetime of community service and philanthropy is worthy of commendation, and we are proud to recognize her achievements today.

Molly Dobson is a pillar of Washtenaw County. After graduating from the University of Michigan in 1944, Dobson enlisted in the U.S. Navy where she worked in communications throughout World War II. After returning home to Ann Arbor, Michigan, Dobson embarked on a new era defined by giving, philanthropy, and community service. In the 1960s, Dobson began working with United Way and has been completely dedicated to furthering its community-building mission ever since. Throughout the years, Dobson has assisted the organization in several capacities, serving as a fundraiser, a member of the Budget Priorities Committee, and later sitting on the Board. Alongside numerous other achievements, Dobson will particularly be remembered for her efforts to develop the D-SIP internship program with the University of Michigan. Thanks to her work and generosity, 313 undergraduate students have completed the program since its inception.

Today, we celebrate Molly Dobson for her lifetime of service to her community, her state, and her country. Her years of philanthropy have impacted the lives of many, and her continued dedication provides a lasting example for what we should all endeavor to accomplish—to effect change, be compassionate community members, and do all we can to make a difference in the world.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Molly Dobson. Her decades of selfless service make her a deserving recipient of the Woman of the Year award. I am grateful for her lasting impact and wish her continued success in the years ahead.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT FIRST CLASS ANTONIO R. RODRIGUEZ

HON. GEORGE HOLDING

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Sergeant First Class Antonio R. Rodriguez, who gave his life on February 8, 2020 while serving our nation in Nangarhar Province, Afghanistan.

Sergeant First Class Rodriguez of A Company, 3rd Battalion, 7th Special Forces Group out of Eglin Air Force Base in Florida is a true American hero, one that honorably served the United States for over a decade as an elite Army Ranger. Sergeant First Class Rodriguez deployed ten times to Afghanistan in support of Operation Freedom's Sentinel.

During his tenure in the Army, Sergeant First Class Rodriguez received several awards and commendations. In addition to his Ranger tab, Combat Infantry badge, and Parachutist badge, Sergeant First Class Rodriguez earned the Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Joint Service Commendation Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, and NATO Medal.

Madam Speaker, please join me today in commemorating the life of Sergeant First Class Antonio R. Rodriguez and in offering our condolences and prayers to his wife, Sergeant Ronaleen H. Omega, and to the many family, friends, and comrades as they mourn the loss of this brave hero.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 13, 2020

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 100th

birthday of the League of Women Voters. For the past century, this non-partisan, women-led civic organization has worked diligently to promote citizens' active participation in our democracy by educating and informing the public about their government.

I am proud to recount that on February 14, 1920, shortly before the ratification of the 19th Amendment granted women their long sought-after right to vote, the National League of Women Voters was organized at the national convention held in Chicago, Illinois. The League merged the National Council of Women Voters and the National American Woman Suffrage Association, establishing one umbrella organization to encourage and assist women to exercise their newly-established right to vote. The organization considers Carrie Chapman Catt its founder, and Maud Wood Park served as the League's first President.

While the League's mission was initially focused upon engaging with and promoting the participation of women in our republic, the organization's scope has dramatically expanded over the years. Today, the League is hard at work expanding civic participation and promoting good government. The organization is heavily involved in voter registration efforts and sponsors candidate debates and forums across the country each election cycle, pro-

viding communities the opportunity to hear from candidates before they head to the ballot box.

While the League is non-partisan, the organization is not apolitical. The League of Women Voters has a long history of taking a stand on important issues. The League supported the creation of the United Nations, the passage of the National Voter Registration Act, and regularly stands up for what is fair and just. The organization supports efforts addressing climate change, counteracting gun violence in our communities, establishing humane immigration policies, and ensuring that all Americans have access to affordable health care, among other important issues.

In 1973 the League modified its charter and allowed men into its ranks. Today, men and women alike make up its over 500,000 members and supporters at over 700 state and local leagues. The organization is represented in all 50 states as well as Washington, DC, the Virgin Islands, and Hong Kong.

On behalf of the residents of the 9th Congressional District of Illinois, I wish a happy 100th birthday to the League of Women Voters. We are grateful for their service to the nation, and I hope the League will continue its efforts for the next century and beyond as they work to educate and promote civic participation.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed S.J. Res. 68, Iran War Powers, as amended.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1051–S1085

Measures Introduced: Thirty-four bills and nine resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3289–3322, S.J. Res. 70, and S. Res. 498–505.

Pages S1074–75

Measures Reported:

S. 910, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–216)

S. 2299, to amend title 49, United States Code, to enhance the safety and reliability of pipeline transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–217)

S. 123, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into a contract or other agreement with a third party to review appointees in the Veterans Health Administration who had a license terminated for cause by a State licensing board for care or services rendered at a non-Veterans Health Administration facility and to provide individuals treated by such an appointee with notice if it is determined that an episode of care or services to which they received was below the standard of care.

S. 2336, to improve the management of information technology projects and investments of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 2594, to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify certain requirements with respect to service and retirement for the purposes of veterans' preference for Federal hiring, with amendments.

S. 3110, to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on disability and pension benefits provided to members of the National Guard and members of reserve components of the Armed Forces by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Page S1073

Measures Passed:

Iran War Powers: By 55 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 52), Senate passed S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S1051–62

Adopted:

By 64 yeas to 34 nays (Vote No. 46), Cramer (for Cruz) Amendment No. 1301, to amend the findings.

Pages S1055–56

By a unanimous vote of 99 yeas (Vote No. 47), Cramer (for Reed) Amendment No. 1322, to amend the findings.

Page S1056

By 93 yeas to 7 nays (Vote No. 49), Cramer (for Risch) Amendment No. 1314, to amend the findings.

Page S1057

Rejected:

Cramer (for Cotton) Amendment No. 1305, to exempt from the termination requirement United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at designated terrorist organizations. (By 54 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 48), Senate tabled the amendment.)

Pages S1056–57

Cramer (for Rubio/Risch) Amendment No. 1320, to amend the findings. (By 54 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 50), Senate tabled the amendment.)

Pages S1057–58

Cramer (for Sullivan) Amendment No. 1319, to amend the rule of construction. (By 51 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 51), Senate tabled the amendment.)

Page S1058

Utah Women's Suffrage: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 475, recognizing the leading role of Utahns in the fight for women's suffrage and celebrating the sesquicentennial of the first votes by women under the equal suffrage law of Utah on February 14, 1870, and the resolution was then agreed to.

Page S1081

USAID Branding Modernization Act: Senate passed H.R. 2744, to authorize the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to prescribe the manner in which programs of the agency are identified overseas, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1082**

William T. Coleman, Jr., Department of Transportation Headquarters Act: Senate passed S. 3239, to designate the headquarters building of the Department of Transportation located at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, in Washington, DC, as the "William T. Coleman, Jr., Federal Building". **Pages S1082–83**

Congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs: Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 490, congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV in the successful 100th season of the National Football League, and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendments proposed thereto: **Page S1083**

McConnell (for Blunt) Amendment No. 1325, to amend the preamble. **Page S1083**

McConnell (for Blunt) Amendment No. 1326, to amend the title. **Page S1083**

University of West Florida Argonauts football: Senate agreed to S. Res. 503, commending the University of West Florida Argonauts football team for its National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II national championship victory. **Page S1083**

Honoring Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School: Senate agreed to S. Res. 504, honoring the memories of the victims of the senseless attack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School on February 14, 2018. **Page S1083**

Measures Considered:

Protect Pain-Capable Unborn Children—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 3275, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children. **Page S1062**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, 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 Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico. **Page S1062**

Prior to the consideration of this measure, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1062**

Subsequently, the motion to proceed was withdrawn. **Page S1062**

Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 311, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion. **Page S1062**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, 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 S. 3275, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children. **Page S1062**

Subsequently, the motion to proceed was withdrawn. **Page S1062**

Pro Forma Sessions—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate adjourn, to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Monday, February 17, 2020, at 1:45 p.m.; Thursday, February 20, 2020, at 2:30 p.m.; and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, February 20, 2020, it next convene at 3 p.m., on Monday, February 24, 2020. **Page S1083**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to the National Emergencies Act, a report of the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Proclamation 9844 of February 15, 2020, with respect to the southern border of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. (PM–46) **Page S1072**

Molloy Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands. **Page S1062**

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, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Thursday, February 13, 2020, a vote on cloture will occur at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, February 24, 2020. **Page S1062**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1062**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 3 p.m., on Monday, February 24, 2020, Senate resume consideration of the nomination; and that the motions to invoke cloture filed during the session of Thursday, February 13, 2020, ripen at 5:30 p.m. **Page S1083**

Carreno-Coll Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico. **Page S1062**

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 Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands. **Page S1062**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1062**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1062**

MacGregor Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior. **Pages S1062–63**

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 S. 311, to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion. **Pages S1062–63**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1062**

Greaves Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court. **Page S1063**

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 Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior. **Page S1063**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1063**

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S1063**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Adam L. Braverman, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

John W. Holcomb, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Knut Sveinbjorn Johnson, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Steve Kim, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Sandy Nunes Leal, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

R. Shireen Matthews, of California, to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Michelle M. Pettit, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Rick Lloyd Richmond, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Todd Wallace Robinson, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Jeremy B. Rosen, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Jennifer P. Togliatti, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

2 Army nominations in the rank of general.

2 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Navy, and Coast Guard. **Pages S1083–85**

Messages from the House: **Page S1072**

Measures Referred: **Page S1072**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1072–73**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S1073–74**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1075–77**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1070–72**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1080–81**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1081**

Record Votes: Seven record votes were taken today. (Total—52) **Pages S1055–58, S1061**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 4:42 p.m., until 1:45 p.m. on Monday,

February 17, 2020. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1083.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

The nominations of James E. McPherson, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Army, and Charles Williams, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, both of the Department of Defense; and

871 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States Northern Command and United States Strategic Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal

year 2021 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from General Terrence J. O'Shaughnessy, USAF, Commander, United States Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command, and Admiral Charles A. Richard, USN, Commander, United States Strategic Command, both of the Department of Defense.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Judy Shelton, of California, and Christopher Waller, of Minnesota, both to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES BUDGET

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2021 for the Department of Health and Human Services, after receiving testimony from Alex M. Azar II, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 26 public bills, H.R. 5884–5909; 2 private bills, H.R. 5910–5911; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 857–859, were introduced. **Pages H1156–57**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H1158**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 4990, to direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the National Science Foundation to carry out research and other activities to promote the security and modernization of voting systems, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–396, Part 1); and

H.R. 4979, to direct the Director of the National Science Foundation to support STEM education and workforce development research focused on rural areas, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–397). **Page H1156**

Removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment: The House passed H.J. Res. 79, removing the deadline for the ratification of

the equal rights amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 232 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 70. **Pages H1129–43**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the joint resolution shall be considered as adopted. **Page H1129**

H. Res. 844, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2546) and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) was agreed to Tuesday, February 11th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow, February 14th. **Page H1143**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified the Congress that the national emergency with respect to the southern border of the United States that was declared in Proclamation 9844 of February 15, 2019 is to continue in effect beyond February 15, 2020. Referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 116–99). **Page H1145**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on pages H1142–43. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:24 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ASSESSING U.S. SECURITY ASSISTANCE TO MEXICO

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Civilian Security, and Trade held a hearing entitled “Assessing U.S. Security Assistance to Mexico”. Testimony was heard from Hugo Rodriguez, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, Department of State; Richard Glenn, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, Department of State; and Barbara Feinstein, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, U.S. Agency for International Development.

THE YOUTH BULGE IN AFRICA: CONSIDERATIONS FOR US POLICY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations held a hearing entitled “The Youth Bulge in Africa: Considerations for US Policy”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PROTECTING FEDERAL JUDICIARY EMPLOYEES FROM SEXUAL HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION, AND OTHER WORKPLACE MISCONDUCT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet held a hearing entitled “Protecting Federal Judiciary Employees from Sexual Harassment, Discrimination, and Other Workplace Misconduct”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D141)

S. 153, to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research. Signed on February 11, 2020. (Public Law 116–115)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2020

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

1:45 p.m., Monday, February 17

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11 a.m., Friday, February 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 11 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Axne, Cynthia, Iowa, E183
Chu, Judy, Calif., E180
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E179
Crist, Charlie, Fla., E183
Cunningham, Joe, S.C., E183

Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E183
Hartzler, Vicky, Mo., E181
Holding, George, N.C., E183
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E181, E182
King, Peter T., N.Y., E181
Lewis, John, Ga., E182
Lowenthal, Alan S., Calif., E180

Murphy, Gregory F., N.C., E181
Norcross, Donald, N.J., E179, E180
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E184
Sires, Albio, N.J., E179
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E179, E181



Congressional Record

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.