United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2020 No. 47

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 11, 2020.

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

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2020, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

COMMEMORATING TOWN OF RAYVILLE AND EULA D. BRITTON ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the efforts of the town of Rayville, Louisiana, and the Eula D. Britton Alumni Association to preserve their community's heritage.

The only part of Eula D. Britton school still standing is its gymnasium, but that didn't stop the 1960 graduate class from doing something good. Quincy Mason, who is in the audience today, and the rest of the alumni association purchased and turned it into a museum, showcasing the school's history.

First known as Rayville Colored School, its first class of 11 students graduated in 1939. It was renamed Rayville Rosenwald High School in 1949, and eventually Eula D. Britton High School in 1956 after its long-serving principal, Eula D. Britton.

In 2014, Quincy Mason, who is present here today in the House gallery, as I said, had the idea to petition for a historical marker to commemorate the school's history for generations to come. This year, on July 3, it will become a reality when the marker is dedicated by its alumni association.

The town of Rayville, Louisiana, is proud of Quincy Mason, who went on to play professional baseball for the Chicago Cubs organization and was inducted into the Southern University Sports Hall of Fame in 2015.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the town of Rayville and the Eula D. Britton Alumni Association for their efforts to preserve their community's rich history.

THANKING RONNIE ANDERSON

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Mr. Ronnie Anderson for his 51 years of service to Louisiana farmers and ranchers.

After graduating from LSU in 1970 with a degree in animal science, Ronnie returned home to work on his family's farm. He quickly became involved in the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation and was elected president of his parish chapter shortly thereafter.

In 1989, he was elected president of the statewide farm bureau, and he has been elected an additional 31 times since.

I have known Ronnie personally for many, many years as a farmer myself, and it has always been clear to me that he loves Louisiana agriculture. When I was elected to Congress, I came to rely on his counsel to advocate for our farmers and ranchers.

During his tenure, the Louisiana Farm Bureau has grown from 67,000 members to more than 148,000, and Ronnie still raises several hundred head of cattle, as well as horses, hay, and timber, on his farm in East and West Feliciana Parishes in my congressional district.

In addition to his work at home and with the farm bureau, Ronnie has served for all but 2 years since 1997 on the Louisiana State University Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Ronnie Anderson for his many, many years of service to Louisiana and wish him well as he retires after 31 years as president of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation.

HONORING ALVARO CIFUENTES

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the life of my longtime friend and mentor, Alvaro Cifuentes.

On March 2, Puerto Rico suffered a tragic loss.

Born in Mayaguez, Alvaro graduated magna cum laude from the University of Puerto Rico in 1972, earning a bachelor's of business administration.

He then went on to graduate from law school from the University of Puerto Rico School of Law, earning a J.D., again magna cum laude, in 1975.

He came from a long line of wise politicos from Puerto Rico who helped navigate the island over decades.

Alvaro practiced law for 17 years and became a managing partner at the law firm of Goldman Antonetti in San Juan.

In 1992, he managed Pedro Rosello's successful race for Governor of Puerto

Printed on recycled paper.

Rico, a man who would go on to win two terms, a hard task in the history of the island.

After serving as Governor Rosello's chief of staff for 3 years, he moved to Washington, D.C., where he focused on building the Democratic Party within the Hispanic community. From 2001 to 2005, he served as the chair of the DNC's Hispanic Caucus, where he increased the party's Hispanic membership by over 30 percent. As chair, Alvaro rebuilt an unprecedented Hispanic campaign network and called for John Kerry to work toward winning Hispanic votes.

In 2004, he earned the honor of being named one of the 100 most influential Hispanics in the United States by the Hispanic Business Magazine.

Anyone who crossed paths with Alvaro knew he was a true man of the people and a fearless champion of Puerto Rico statehood. I remember the first time we talked about how important statehood would be for Puerto Rico.

He recalled the story of the mighty pung, a story in Chinese folklore that talked about a huge bird that played with other smaller birds on a tiny island and had a wingspan over 500 meters.

They would laugh at this giant bird, the mighty pung, with his awkwardness. He found out, through the hawk, that through thermal glides, he would be able to potentially fly like the other birds.

He set off, needing a year to reach the height required. When asked about this difficult task and his inability to fly, he said: ''It is okay. We have a long way to go.''

That is where Alvaro talked about statehood, about how it has been over 120 years, and about how we have an island that is larger in population than 26 States, yet it is taking over a century for us to even get to this point, but it is okay. Alvaro passed before getting to see it happen. We have a long way to go.

He is survived by three children, Alvaro, Carolina, and Natalia Isabel.

Alvaro, you will be dearly missed by myself, by so many in Florida, and on the island of Puerto Rico, but the fight will continue to live on.

RECOGNIZING K–9 VETERANS DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize March 13 as K–9 Veterans Day, an opportunity to commemorate the working dogs that support our men and women in uniform.

This year marks the 78th anniversary of the establishment of the K–9 Corps.

After the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Army began training for the K–9 Corps in 1942, originally known as the War Dog Program. In the years that passed, the K–9 Corps has become a vital part of our Armed Forces operations.

Though military working dogs initially served as morale boosters for our soldiers, they were eventually trained and incorporated into combat. A dog's sense of smell is 5 to 10 times stronger than a human's, which has made them expert counterparts in detecting explosive devices.

More than 1,500 dogs served in the Korean war, 4,000 in Vietnam, and many more in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Like their human counterparts, our military K–9s eventually retire. Many dogs and their handlers develop a strong bond during their service together.

Sadly, prior to the year 2000, military working dogs were considered ''equipment'' and were either left behind or euthanized at the end of their service.

Today, retired military working dogs are put up for adoption, and their personal handlers get first priority to give them a home.

To further this effort, the American Humane Society works to unite our four-legged heroes with their handlers by raising funds to ensure their safe transport home.

Oftentimes, these retired dogs will serve as support animals to servicemembers who may be suffering from PTSD and other disabilities, both mental and physical. Our veterans can greatly benefit from the assistance and the companionship that a dog provides, and our K–9 veterans benefit from their newfound forever homes.

Our K–9 veterans have served our country, and they, too, deserve to be honored for their service.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL RED CROSS MONTH

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize March as National Red Cross Month.

This tradition began in 1943 when President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued the proclamation to designate the month of March to celebrate Red Cross volunteers, donors, and instructors.

The history of the Red Cross, however, goes back even further into American history. In 1881, Clara Barton established the organization right here in Washington, D.C., to better serve people in need. On June 5, 1889, Clara Barton and five volunteers came to Johnstown to respond to the Johnstown Flood.

For more than 100 years, the American Red Cross has worked to support those in need, whether they are men and women in uniform or victims of natural disaster.

Perhaps the organization's best-known program, the American Red Cross established the first nationwide civilian blood donation program in the 1940s.

According to the organization, someone in the United States needs blood every 2 seconds. There are regular blood donation drives right here on Capitol Hill, where we can all volunteer to donate blood that has the potential to save a life.

Less than 38 percent of the U.S. population is eligible to give blood, and only 3 percent of those individuals donate annually.

The critical need for blood and the lifesaving potential that comes from a donation cannot be overstated.

The American Red Cross has always been a leader in this effort, and today, they still provide more than 40 percent of the blood products in the United States.

The success of the Red Cross relies on the generosity of the American spirit.

This month and all year long, I am thankful for their service to our Nation.

COMMENDING HEMET AND PALM SPRINGS FIREFIGHTERS

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, this week, members of the Hemet and Palm Springs Fire Departments gathered in Washington, D.C., for the International Association of Firefighters' annual legislative conference.

I met with several of them in my office and want to express my personal appreciation for their unrelenting service that so often goes above and beyond their call of duty.

Last December, tragedy struck in my district when three children and their father died in an apartment complex fire in Hemet, California.

Despite the dangerous and grim circumstances, Hemet first responders worked heroically and helped save lives.

Days later, the Hemet Fire Department, in a demonstration of kindness, joined with community members to give financial support for the victims' family and everyone affected by the fire.

They simply said they were closing the loop. From fire to getting them back on their feet, they saw it as their responsibility to help those who were afflicted.

This act of compassion shown by the first responders is just one example of the selflessness in which they live their lives every day.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the firefighters from Hemet and Palm Springs, and I thank first responders everywhere. Their heroism is as inspiring as it is impactful.

RECOGNIZING CATHERINE LANG

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

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month to recognize a dedicated public servant from Nebraska's Seventh District. Catherine Lang's record of leadership and advocacy for the State's small business community has improved the lives of many Nebraskans.

Catherine earned both her bachelor of fine arts and juris doctor degrees

from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. As a leader with a passion for fostering educational and economic opportunities for Nebraskans, she has worked hard to build a more robust environment for businesses and universities. She also plays an active role in several philanthropic and public organizations.

□ 1015

Not only has she grown as a leader, the responsibilities entrusted to her have grown as well. Catherine has been crucial in guiding State agencies through periods of transition and expansion. Throughout her career, she has served Nebraska as the Department of Revenue's deputy tax administrator, the Nebraska property tax administrator, the commissioner of labor, and as the director of the Department of Economic Development.

Catherine inherited a legacy of service from her parents, Hugh and Lillian Lang. Her father, Commander ''Chic'' Lang, served as a distinguished Navy pilot during World War II and later as an instructor at the U.S. Navy War College, and her mother enlisted in the U.S. Air Force.

Catherine's parents instilled in her a value she has instilled in her three sons: the importance of a college education as a door to opportunity. Because of this, the Lang family established a scholarship for students at the UNO College of Business for the purpose of cultivating opportunity and character.

Currently, Catherine holds the position of State director of the Nebraska Business Development Center and assistant dean at the UNO College of Business. She leads statewide outreach for NBDC and builds collaborative efforts in the Nebraska University system to support the institution's mission of economic development.

Thank you, Catherine, for dedicating your life to serving and inspiring others, and we thank you for strengthening relationships within our community.

HONORING TIMOTHY KENNY ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Timothy Kenny and his exceptional service as the executive director of the Nebraska Investment Finance Authority, or NIFA. Timothy has been serving Nebraskans in this role since 1994. Before he joined NIFA, he served as director of programs for the Utah Housing Finance Agency and as executive director of the Texas Housing Finance Agency.

NIFA administers programs to help Nebraskans finance affordable housing, medical facilities, community infrastructure, and industrial development projects. They also serve first-time farmers and ranchers by providing affordable financing strategies across the Great Plains.

In the 36 years of its existence, NIFA has worked diligently to finance over 91,000 mortgages for affordable single-family homes. Additionally, over 23,600 affordable rental housing units for Nebraskans living on a budget have been created. Under Tim's leadership, NIFA has taken care of our Armed Forces by providing over $96.1 million in home buyer's assistance.

Previously, Timothy served as a certified public accountant for a private tax and audit practice in Dallas, Texas, and then worked his way up to chief financial officer for homebuilding and real estate firms in Texas and Colorado.

He now resides in Cass County, Nebraska, with his wife, Sara, three children, and numerous grandchildren. On top of his commendable public service, Timothy has supported his children and country through more than 20 deployments in the United States Armed Forces.

Timothy continues to be active in Nebraska by serving on the National Council of State Housing Agencies, the National Association of Home Builders, the Nebraska Subprime Advisory Task Force, and the Governor's Disaster Recovery Task Force. He exemplifies what it means to be a Nebraskan through his hard work, service to others, and compassion for those in need.

I congratulate Timothy on a notable career of public service and a retirement that is well deserved.

SIMLEY WRESTLING TEAM STATE CHAMPIONS

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

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the Simley Spartans wrestling team on their AA State championship.

Simley High School in Inver Grove Heights is surely proud of their accomplishments, as are we all in the Second Congressional District. In fact, their head coach, Will Short, called it a perfect season.

Congratulations to the Spartan wrestlers. They have demonstrated excellence in their sport and a strong commitment to the success of their team. They have delivered outstanding results that they can be proud of in their school and their community.

I thank especially the parents, the coaches, the teachers, and the mentors who have dedicated their time to making their season successful.

Congratulations, Simley.

SENATOR SCHUMER'S UNBECOMING COMMENTS TO SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, last week in the Senate, a resolution was introduced to censure Senate Majority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER for his threatening comments directed at Supreme Court Justices on the steps of the Court during an abortion-related case. These comments were not only unbecoming of a Senator, but they were simply egregious. They crossed the line.

As representative leaders, we are held to a higher standard of conduct, and Senator SCHUMER failed to meet that standard. I call on my colleagues on the other side of the Capitol to support this censure for the preservation of this institution, for the preservation of the constitutionally separate branches of government, and for the health of our Republic.

FEED YOUR MIND

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, this week the USDA, EPA, and FDA have partnered to announce a new public education campaign aimed at helping consumers better understand what is in their food.

The Feed Your Mind initiative was developed to answer the most common questions that consumers have about genetically modified foods, commonly referred to as GMOs. This study will include what GMOs are, how and why they are made, how they are regulated, and it will address health and safety questions that consumers may have about these products.

Biotechnology has allowed important advances in crop technologies and improved our farmers' ability to continue to provide safe, nutritious, and affordable food. Unfortunately, some consumers have fallen victim to untrue or totally misleading rumors about what GMOs do for our food, creating confusion and stifling innovation in the agriculture industry.

I want to applaud the Trump administration for taking on the important task of providing factual information and important information about the food we grow right here in Kansas and across the United States. No consumer should have to fear their food or question the technology that goes into making their meals possible.

The United States has the single safest, most reliable, and most affordable food source in the entire world, and our farmers work daily to inform the public about what they do in the field. These resources will be an important supplement to their outreach efforts.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S CORONAVIRUS LEADERSHIP PLAN

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the Wuhan coronavirus is certainly on the front of Americans' minds these days, but before I speak about the virus, I would like to talk about leadership.

I often tell the kids I work with that leadership is doing the right thing when it is not popular. Here in Washington, I have learned that doing the right thing is when you know over 90 percent of the press and 90 percent of the media is going to disagree with you.

Leadership is when President Trump banned travel from China on February 2. While some people went so low as to call this xenophobic, as a physician, this early decision, I believe, has saved thousands of American lives.

By now, we have millions of test kits distributed out across the country. I want to just reassure Americans that this testing is covered by Medicare, by Medicaid, and by most every one of their insurance companies.

I also want to reassure Americans that antivirals and vaccines are in early phases of trials, way ahead of development. We are very optimistic that these antivirals may soon be available for those who are impacted the most by this Wuhan virus. We are also optimistic that these vaccines will be available by this next winter.

We have a plan. The President has given us a plan. Let's stick to this plan. We are implementing this plan, and it is working.

Again, as a physician who has worked with health departments, I am truly impressed by how we have contained this virus and how our local health departments are working so hard to minimize the spread of this virus. I am absolutely amazed that we only have approximately 1,000 Americans impacted by the Wuhan viruses at this time.

In the meantime, again, let's go back to our plan. It is not a time to panic. This is a time to wash your hands, limit your travel, and, by the way, open your windows and doors when you are at home and let some of this fresh air come in which this virus does not like a bit.

So, thanks, Mr. President, for delivering on your plan. We are truly impressed as physicians in Congress by the great job that you are doing and the leadership you are showing.

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

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH: MARGARET HUDSON

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, every March, we honor the extraordinary contributions of women who have shaped our Nation's history and those who continue to pave the way for the next generation. This year also marks the 100th year since the 19th Amendment granted women the right to vote.

Think about it, just in the last 100 years. Our Nation is now going on 245 years old. A century later, the women who have done so much for our country throughout our Nation's entire history continue to make a difference.

I am proud, today, to say that I serve with a record number of women in Congress as we continue to fight for issues that are so important: equal pay, reproductive freedom, and so much more.

Mr. Speaker, as we use this opportunity to celebrate the incredible women who have changed the world in your life and in my life, I would like to pay tribute to an iconic woman, an artist in my home of Fresno, California, Margaret Hudson.

Ms. Hudson passed away last month, but her legacy lives on in her clay sculptures of California wildlife that can be seen on display throughout the valley. It is incredible work.

From a young age, Margaret loved to spend time outdoors hiking in such places as Sequoia National Park. Her appreciation for the beautiful landscape of the Central Valley would later influence so much of her artwork that we enjoy today.

She attended college in New England and served as a missionary in Japan and South Korea for several years. Her love for art blossomed years later, when she began sculpting from memories of her time in South Korea. She became one of the first female art entrepreneurs in Fresno when she opened up her own studio in 1972.

Through the years, Margaret expanded her interest in the arts to painting and held many of her own art shows to display her work and to encourage young artists such as herself, especially women. Margaret's artwork is a fixture throughout the Central Valley, with permanent works on display at our Valley Children's Hospital and Fresno Chaffee Zoo.

Her work continues to inspire us, and I think it is a reflection of her appreciation and respect for the natural beauty and landscapes that we have in California and throughout our country. Certainly, the Sierra Nevada and the San Joaquin Valley were among many of the reflections and renderings of the creation of the art that she was so proud of and that we so much enjoy today.

So I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the life and the contributions of Margaret Hudson. Her artwork continues to inspire and is cherished as a part of all of those who know it and who enjoy it.

God bless you, Margaret. You made a difference.

RECOGNIZING JOSH SPEIDEL

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Josh Speidel, an extraordinary young man from my hometown of Columbus, Indiana.

Josh was an Indiana All-Star high school basketball player when he was in a tragic car accident. Josh spent many months in hospitals and rehab learning how to walk and talk again. It was a difficult journey, but Josh's family never lost hope.

The University of Vermont honored Josh's basketball scholarship he achieved before the accident and welcomed him back with open arms. I am proud to say that Josh recently scored his first point in his college basketball career and will soon be graduating from the university.

I wish Josh the best of luck in his future. He is an inspiration to all of us.

□ 1030

IVY TECH CC FLIGHT PROGRAM

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Hoosier State's first community college flight program and to commend the partnership between Ivy Tech Community College and the Columbus Municipal Airport.

Since 2017, Ivy Tech Columbus has been offering Ivy Tech's first aviation associate's degree and an aviation management program.

This program is designed to give students hands-on pilot training. In addition to flight time, students also train on a flight simulator at the Columbus Municipal Airport.

I look forward to seeing more skill-based programs like this to help our youth in their careers.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we celebrate the importance of Women's History Month. I would like to take this opportunity to celebrate women throughout the Sixth District who make a difference in our everyday lives.

I think of women business leaders, humanitarians, and activists in our communities, like Jeanie Hahn, Jean Ann Harcourt, Sue Saunders, Lisa Fisher and Celeste Calvitto.

We recognize Linda Ostewig, who leads a faith-based nonprofit for struggling teens to learn healthy lifestyle patterns in our own Hancock County.

I am reminded of the example set by Susan Stahl, who has led Girls Inc. in Madison for over three decades.

We recognize leaders like Wendy Elwood in my hometown of Columbus, who last year was named ''Woman of the Year'' by The Republic newspaper.

Indiana's First Lady, Janet Holcomb, is also from our district in Muncie.

The people of Indiana's Sixth District are blessed to have so many women helping lead and inspire our communities.

We celebrate and honor them as part of Women's History Month.

INCLUSION OF POULTRY IN U.S.-U.K. TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for one of the biggest industries in my district—the poultry industry.

I urge the administration and Ambassador Lighthizer to include poultry in any U.S.-U.K. trade deal.

As the second largest exporter of chicken and the largest exporter of turkey, the U.S. will continue to gain momentum in this industry if the U.K. is added as a new market.

Indiana is the fifth largest turkey producer and second largest egg producer in the United States. A U.K. trade agreement will boost our Hoosier poultry farmers, who are an essential part of our Indiana economy.

As Indiana's Sixth District Representative, I will continue to support our Hoosier farmers and fight for their access to free markets.

FARMING AND CARBON SEQUESTRATION

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the great impact that

farming and the agriculture community has on carbon sequestration.

The use of cover crops increased by 15 percent per year since 2012. This means that 20 million acres across the U.S. are likely to be planted in cover crops this year with the potential to sequester about 60 million metric tons of CO_2, equal to the emissions of over 12 million cars.

The use of ethanol and biodiesel is notably reducing greenhouse gas emissions, the same amount as if 17 million cars were taken off the road in 2018.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to support the agriculture community and its leadership in being stewards of our environment.

BLACK MATERNAL HEALTH MOMNIBUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to speak about the Black Maternal Health Momnibus, an historic and comprehensive package that tackles one of the greatest public health crises of our time.

My work on Black Maternal Health began when my daughter, a Black mom herself, survived a complicated pregnancy that almost claimed her life. How many people my age aren't as lucky, and now have grandkids who grew up without a mommy?

I knew when I got to Congress, I had to make this a priority.

In 2018, Senator KAMALA HARRIS and I worked with the Black Mamas Matter Alliance to introduce resolutions honoring the first Black Maternal Health Week, as well as the Maternal CARE Act. That effort led to last April, when Congresswoman LAUREN UNDERWOOD and I launched the Black Maternal Health Caucus.

This issue was deeply personal for both of us. We wanted to raise awareness, educate our colleagues, and shine a bright spotlight on the maternal health crisis—of mothers needlessly dying during what should be one of the most joyous times of their lives.

Our caucus has grown to more than 100 members in less than a year, which I imagine might be a record feat, but it speaks to the importance of this issue and how it resonates so deeply within Congress and across party lines.

Black maternal health is not a partisan issue. It is a life-and-death issue. The main goal of the caucus is to develop and advance evidence-based policy solutions.

The Black Maternal Health Momnibus Act of 2020 builds upon existing maternal health legislation by filling gaps through nine new bills to comprehensively address every aspect of the Black maternal health crisis. Throughout the process, we were very intentional about centering the voices of Black women and ensuring that Black women-led organizations were consulted early and often.

The Momnibus makes investments in social determinants of health, community-based organizations, the growth and diversification of the perinatal workforce, improvements in data collection and quality measures, digital tools like telehealth and innovative payment models.

In addition to direct efforts to improve Black maternal health outcomes, the Momnibus focuses on high-risk populations, including women veterans, incarcerated women, and Native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a moment to speak about the bill that I am leading within the package: The Kira Johnson Act.

Kira was an entrepreneur, she traveled the world, and she was a mother to a healthy, little boy.

On April 12, 2016, she checked into a hospital with her husband, Charles, to give birth to their second child, Langston.

Despite being in excellent health, despite being a successful businesswoman, despite having health insurance, and doing everything right, Kira did not make it out alive. She died from hours of neglect and severe hemorrhaging, nearly 12 hours after safely delivering her second son.

Kira Johnson mattered.

Kira deserved better.

And this legislation says, unequivocally, that Black Mamas matter. It makes investments in community-based organizations that are leading the charge to protect moms: By supporting maternal mental health conditions and substance use disorders; by supporting doulas and perinatal health workers; and addressing social determinants of health, like housing, transportation, and nutrition.

It also supports research, bias and racism training programs, and the establishment of Respectful Maternity Care Compliance offices to address bias and racism.

At its core, this bill is about accountability and empowering our community health partners who have been providing safe and culturally-sensitive care to Black moms for years.

Again, I am thrilled for the accumulation of nearly a year of research, information-gathering, and collaboration with key stakeholders.

For decades, the U.S. maternal mortality and morbidity rates have gotten worse for all mothers, but especially for Black women whose health outcomes are further compounded by systemic and structural racism.

The Black Maternal Health Momnibus is an historic piece of legislation that not only targets failures in maternal healthcare, but also addresses pervasive maternal health disparities through solutions that are culturally competent and proven effective.

It provides a roadmap so that our healthcare systems, our providers, and society will finally make Black maternal and infant health a priority. No one should have to lose another friend, auntie, sister, daughter, or mommy to this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, let's get it done for all of the moms out there.

CELEBRATING BRIGADIER GENERAL SHAWN MANKE

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Shawn Manke from Cambridge, Minnesota, for his recent promotion to the rank of brigadier general in the Minnesota National Guard.

Shawn grew up on the shores of Spectacle Lake in southwestern Isanti County, and spent his summers working at his family's resort. He is a proud graduate of Cambridge-Isanti High School.

Upon graduation from the ROTC program at the University of North Dakota, Shawn was commissioned as an Army aviator in 1991. After being released from Active Duty, Shawn knew he was not ready to give up his life of service and enlisted as an officer in the Minnesota National Guard.

During his time with the Minnesota National Guard, Shawn has held many leadership positions, including director of Army aviation, commander of the 34th Combat Aviation Brigade, and commander of the 2nd Battalion 147th Assault Helicopter.

Shawn's exemplary leadership has earned him numerous military awards, such as the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal, and the Meritorious Service Medal with four bronze oakleaf clusters.

Brigadier General Shawn Manke is an accomplished officer with the knowledge and experience necessary for his new role.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District, I thank him for his years of dedicated service, and congratulate him on his well-deserved promotion.

STANDING WITH THE GRAND RAPIDS COMMUNITY

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the House floor to offer words of consolation and support to the Grand Rapids community in Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District as they mourn the loss of two local businesses from a tragic fire.

Last Saturday, a fire broke out in the basement at Lakeview Behavioral Health, and quickly spread to the VFW Post 1720 building next door.

While we are fortunate that no one was harmed in the fire, both businesses are a total loss.

I was deeply saddened by this news, as the VFW Post in Grand Rapids served as a place where combat veterans could gather for support and camaraderie since 1929. It also housed valuable historic memorabilia, much of which is now gone.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the brave firefighters and first responders who

quickly responded to this emergency and prevented this fire from spreading further. Your dedication to this community is greatly appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to the veterans who frequented this VFW post, the patients who attended Lakeview Behavioral Health, and the entire Grand Rapids community as they recover from this loss.

Please know that I stand by ready to help in whatever way I can during this rebuilding process.

HONORING THE LIFE'S WORK OF HOWARD HEDSTROM

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the contributions of Howard Hedstrom of Grand Marais, Minnesota, and the entire Hedstrom family.

Last month, at the age of 71, Howard retired as president of Hedstrom Lumber Company, a business that his family built from the ground up and ran for over 100 years.

Howard's grandfather, Andrew Hedstrom, was a Swedish immigrant who pieced together a used sawmill to build a company that would employ three generations of Hedstroms.

While Hedstrom Lumber Company had humble origins, thanks to determination, leadership, and the foresight of company employees, like Howard, it evolved into one of the largest employers in Cook County, Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, for generations, Minnesotans have worked in our forests, helping to support their families and boost rural economies. The Hedstrom family is a fine example of this great tradition.

I am incredibly grateful to Howard and his entire family for their dedication to the Grand Marais community and Minnesota as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Howard a relaxing retirement spent with his wife, Bonnie, and the rest of his loved ones.

HONORING THE LIFE AND MEMORY OF SUSIE SCHLOMANN

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Mrs. Susie Schlomann of Shrewsbury, Pennsylvania, who suddenly passed away unexpectedly last week.

Mr. Speaker, after Pennsylvania's Congressional District boundaries changed, I had the privilege to represent southern York County. I quickly came to know Susie. Susie was passionate and proud of her conservative, political beliefs, volunteering much of her time furthering the causes which she supported, and she was never shy to share her thoughts about what was happening here in Washington.

Susie came to Shrewsbury from Long Island, where she raised her family, including her three children, Tristan, Ted, and Rebecca, and where, in 1978, she married the love of her life, her late husband, Rick. In addition to her three children, Susie is survived by five grandchildren, her brother Andrew, and her sister, Amanda.

Mr. Speaker, we wish all those who are grieving, comfort. And we give thanks for having had the opportunity to know Susie, who filled so many people's lives with happiness.

COMBATING THE INHUMANE PRACTICES AT PUPPY MILLS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the concerning issue of puppy mills throughout the State of Pennsylvania and across America. If we all care for our canine companions, we cannot continue to support the horrifying practices at puppy mills.

Mr. Speaker, it is well-documented that puppy mills supply pet stores with puppies. My home State of Pennsylvania is no exception.

Cutting off the puppy mill to pet store supply chain will decrease the demand for puppies raised in puppy mills. The inhumane practices at most puppy mills are shocking, appalling, and unacceptable. We have all seen the images on television.

Stores that sell commercially-raised puppies operate based on an outdated and socially unacceptable business model. We need to work to shift the pet markets towards humane sources, including shelters and rescues that are burdened with finding families for homeless pets, thousands of which have to be euthanized in Pennsylvania each year.

President Truman once said: If you want a friend in Washington, get a dog.

Mr. Speaker, let's show our best friends the love they deserve by combating the inhumane practice of puppy mills.

□ 1045

CELEBRATING HOUR OF CODE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the school-based initiative designed to increase student interest in the world of coding. The Hour of Code, which occurs every year during Computer Science Education Week, has the goal to teach students coding basics.

The Bristol Township School District is one of several around the world taking advantage of this program, and they are leading the way in our community. Bristol Township schools are known for their science, technology, engineering, art, and math initiatives, and they held multiple events to allow students to participate in the Hour of Code.

The introductory program uses games to teach younger children. By showing kids the basics of coding, it can spark an interest in computer science and engineering, which, as our society becomes more technology based, can be incredibly valuable skills to have.

I applaud the Bristol Township schools for participating in this program, and I hope that other school districts across our community and across our Nation will follow the lead of Bristol Township schools.

CONGRATULATING ROOSEVELT ELEMENTARY'S MILLER MEAN MACHINES

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the champions of the Eleanor Roosevelt Elementary School's 10th annual Super Duper Bowl, the Miller Mean Machines.

Since 2010, Roosevelt Elementary, in Falls Township, has come together for a flag football tournament. The tournament consists of fifth-grade students and their teachers coming together for a fun day outside. The event also acts as a fundraiser, taking donations of both food and money for the Bucks County Emergency Homeless Shelter and the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.

Mr. Speaker, any event that brings our community together for a day of fun, teamwork, and sportsmanship, while also helping those in need, should be celebrated by this House.

Congratulations again to the Mean Machines, and I thank Eleanor Roosevelt Elementary for being an educational leader in our community.

HONORING HEROES OF ROCK HILL POLICE DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two heroes of my local police department in Rock Hill, South Carolina.

In May of last year, Sergeants Cedric Stokes and Bruce Haire demonstrated the meaning of compassion when they used unconventional means to save the life of another man.

That day, the police department heard reports of a man seeking to commit suicide while streaming it live on social media. Without a moment's hesitation, these officers used social media to identify the man online and, upon identification, coordinated rapidly, with the help of Facebook employees, to ensure that the man was found and promptly cared for in a medical facility.

Ours is a brave new world, and the implications of new technology cut both ways. On this day, it was at once a morbid display of pain, but also a beacon signaling for help.

A quote came to mind when I read of these officers' heroic responses. In the words of Theodore Roosevelt:

> Do what you can with all you have, wherever you are.

On behalf of the Fifth District, I commend the officers of the Rock Hill Police Department for their unwavering and adaptive dedication to protect and serve.

Without officers like Sergeant Cedric Stokes and Sergeant Bruce Haire, we would be one beautiful life shorter and our community all the lesser for it.

I think of the words of Winston Churchill, who said, when Great Britain was under siege by Germany:

There will be a time when doing your best isn't good enough. We must do what is required.

These officers did what was required. God bless.

REAUTHORIZING PATRIOT ACT

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues today will offer a bill to reauthorize the PATRIOT Act.

It will have the thin varnish of reform on it, designed to whitewash the egregious constitutional violations that have been going on, but it is the Americans who are going to be shellacked by this legislation and the process used to pass it.

I want to read the Fourth Amendment and part of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution here today on the floor.

''The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.''

The Fifth Amendment says: Nor shall any person be ''deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.''

So, let's think about some of these words because they are being treated as if they are curse words or dirty words today. Warrant, due process, probable cause, these are all things that are guaranteed as rights for all Americans in the Constitution, and none of those can be guaranteed without transparency.

We can't have star chambers and kangaroo courts. This has to happen in daylight, and it has to be reviewable by the people in order to know that these things are true.

These things, they are inconvenient, a warrant, due process, probable cause. They are inconvenient for investigators. They are inconvenient for prosecutors. They sometimes get in the way. They make the job of finding the criminals, of finding the terrorists, a little bit harder. But they are guaranteed rights of all Americans, so we have to keep them in the process.

But let me talk about the legislative process here today, and I want to challenge the authors of this bill to come down here and defend what they have done.

This bill started out in a committee. This is how it is supposed to happen, as a base bill. Then, as the debate started getting underway, oh, it got inconvenient. Things were said that people didn't want to be said. Amendments were offered to make it more constitutional. They didn't like that.

What did they do? The chairman of the committee pulled the bill, canceled the hearing, and canceled the markup of this bill, and they took it behind closed doors. They took it into the back room to write it. They took it into the back room to draft it.

Why did they go into the back room? Because the lobbyists aren't in the committee, and the deep state doesn't get a vote on the committee, so they got them in the back room with them. The lobbyists and the deep state helped draft this bill that we are going to vote on today.

How much time do we have to review it? Less than 24 hours. Last night is when they made the text available.

There is a rule in this House that guarantees 72 hours to review a bill. They are going to suspend that rule here in a few minutes, and people will willingly vote to suspend that rule so they can ram this bill through, so that they can reauthorize the unconstitutional provisions of the PATRIOT Act.

Now, I understand terrorists, foreign terrorists, don't have constitutional rights, so that is why the PATRIOT Act and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act were passed, so that those impediments wouldn't be in the way when you are going after terrorists, foreign terrorists. But everybody is presumed innocent until proven guilty, so we need to maintain that.

One of the worst things that has happened as a result of the FISA and the PATRIOT Act is that a Presidential candidate was spied on. He is now the President. He overcame that. But this bill should fix that.

A candidate, Presidential, congressional, city councilman, never again should they be spied on using these tools that are supposed to go after terrorists, after foreigners.

I urge my colleagues in the House—well, the ones who have offered this bill, I urge them to get down here and defend what they have done. I urge them to come down here and explain why they don't want us to have—they don't want you to have 72 hours to look at this bill. Come down and defend that.

Then, for all of my other colleagues here in the House, I urge you to vote ''no.'' And for my friends in the Senate, vote ''no'' as well.

If this should make it to the President's desk, which I fear it is going to—I fear it is going to be on his desk, and he has some unwise or insincere counselors right now. I urge the President, if this should make it to his desk, to remember what they did to him with this legislation. Remember. And I urge him to veto this bill if this should get there this week.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Jonathan Slavinskas, St. Bernard's Church of Our Lady of Providence Parish, Worcester, Massachusetts, offered the following prayer:

Eternal Word, we come to You with praise and thanksgiving for the many blessings that You bestow upon us. We thank You for the blessings of our faith, freedom, and Nation.

As we gather, we do so rejoicing, giving thanks for being able to live in a nation that provides us with the opportunity to freely elect the women and men within this assembly who have been called to assist in guiding our Nation.

Our prayer is that, through the Members of this assembly's diverse and unique gifts and talents that You have bestowed upon them, they might be woven together as one, continually championing the common good for all within our Nation.

We pray that, in moments of disagreements and debate, an authentic understanding and mutual respect might prevail, bearing witness to the gift of collaboration for the promotion of the common good.

We pray for Your continual blessings to flow upon this assembly and the works that come forth, and we pray for all of those who have been affected by illness and disease that they may find healing and comfort in this time of uncertainty.

We pray for all of this in Your name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a

quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND JONATHAN SLAVINSKAS

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to welcome to the House floor my dear friend, Father Jonathan Slavinskas, who offered today's opening prayer.

Father Jonathan, as most of his parishioners call him, is the pastor of St. Bernard's Church of Our Lady of Providence Parish on Lincoln Street in Worcester, Massachusetts. A lifelong resident of Worcester, he is also the police chaplain for Worcester, Auburn, and Southbridge.

What makes Father Jon so extraordinary is his complete devotion to bettering the lives of his parish community, especially the young people. He hosts an annual Halloween party for hundreds of neighborhood kids so they have a safe place to go trick-or-treating.

Stories abound of his little acts of kindness, like buying pizza for kids hanging out on the church steps or opening up the church gym for youth basketball games or making it a point to walk around the neighborhood and simply say ''hi.''

Madam Speaker, Father Jon's compassion and commitment to making everyone feel welcome at St. Bernard's—no matter who they are—is truly remarkable. He is an inspiration to us all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF RON PETTENGILL

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my dear friend, Ron Pettengill, a pillar of the Rochester community, who passed away on February 28.

As head of the local carpenters union in Rochester and Monroe County building trades, Ron defined the Rochester labor movement, dedicating himself and his life's work to improving the lives of working people everywhere.

Our community is a better and more equitable place because of his tireless commitment to advocating for social change. Ron's work will continue to open doors for people in our community for generations to come. I am so proud to have been able to call him my friend.

I join all of Rochester in mourning his loss and extend my prayers and deepest sympathies to the Pettengill family.

TRUMP KEEPING AMERICANS SAFE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am grateful to President Donald Trump for focusing on the safety and health of American families since the beginning of his administration. Not only did President Trump immediately take action to address the coronavirus with a travel ban, he has increased funding for important disease research and preparedness efforts since he first took office.

President Trump has focused on a whole-of-government approach in combating the coronavirus by ensuring State, local, public, and private officials are prepared to keep families safe. He has made the swift decision to appoint Vice President MIKE PENCE head of the Coronavirus Task Force, who is skilled as a voice for this important service.

Since President Trump was elected, his administration has increased funding to the National Institutes of Health by 39 percent, the Centers for Disease Control by 24 percent, balanced biomedical research by 35 percent, Strategic National Stockpile by 32 percent, and infectious disease response by 70 percent. This administration is committed to keeping families safe while preparing our country for disease outbreaks.

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

STAND UP AND BE COUNTED IN 2020 CENSUS

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Speaker, as we approach April, you will begin to hear more and more about the Census.

The Census is the most important count of people in our country, responsible for allocating nearly $800 billion in Federal funding, and it takes place only once every decade.

By standing up and being counted in the 2020 Census, Madam Speaker, you are ensuring that your State or territory has access to the funding it needs for police and fire departments, healthcare, roads, and many other vital programs.

Madam Speaker, you don't need to be an inventor, a doctor, or even a Member of Congress to shape the future of your community. By being in the 2020 Census, you will help inform funding for local school programs and roads in our community.

We all count and we all get to shape our future by participating in the 2020 Census. You can make a difference in our community this year and respond to the 2020 Census, whether online, by mail, or by phone.

Be counted this April.

CHINESE ENTITIES RECEIVING AMERICAN INVESTMENTS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, China considers the United States their biggest threat in their search for global dominance. However, the truth is that China's recent rise is being enabled by institutional and individual investors in the United States, including Federal, State, and public pension funds like the TSP and CalPERS in California.

A number of Chinese entities, which are receiving American investments, are engaged in activities that violate U.S. law and hurt our national security interests, especially our military, like China Telecom's social credit score system and their repression of the Uighurs, which the House voted to condemn earlier this year.

Our public pensions should not be allowed to become a new funding vehicle for Communist China, which serves as a threat to current and retired Federal and State employees who are unknowingly enabling their aggression against U.S. interests.

HONORING GUNNERY SERGEANT DIEGO PONGO AND CAPTAIN MOISES NAVAS

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

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, last Sunday, March 8, Gunnery Sergeant Diego Pongo and Captain Moises Navas made the ultimate sacrifice while serving their country in north-central Iraq.

Both were marines and assigned to the 2nd Marine Raider Battalion, Marine Forces Special Operations Command, or MARSOC, which is located in

Camp Lejeune in eastern North Carolina in my district. They were both killed in action while supporting Iraqi forces in clearing out a tunnel of ISIS fighters.

Given the current coronavirus situation, it is easy to lose sight of the sacrifices of our servicemembers and their families, but we absolutely cannot allow this condition to make us forget about our men and women in uniform here and abroad.

The deaths of these two brave marines are a somber reminder that our servicemembers and their families sacrifice so much for us each and every day, no matter the circumstances, so that we can live in peace and freedom.

My thoughts and prayers are with MARSOC, Navas' and Pongo's brothers in arms, and especially their families and loved ones.

RECOGNIZING CROSSROADS QUARTET'S 60-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Crossroads Quartet for their 60th anniversary of vocalizing Southern Gospel music throughout Kentucky and other States.

Founded in 1960 in Russell Springs, Kentucky, this fine group of constituents has now been active within the music world for 60 consecutive years. They have traveled thousands of miles, worn out four Dodge vans, and touched numerous lives.

While some of the names and faces have changed, the inspiring mission of Crossroads Quartet has remained a constant. Today founding member Vernie McGaha, alongside Brian McGaha, Dave Powell, and Randy Hart, continues to fulfill the original calling of Crossroads Quartet.

I am proud to be their voice in Washington and am confident that their musical ministry will be active for many years to come. Their decades of contributions are certainly deserving of recognition by this entire body.

BROOKWOOD COMMUNITY

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to invite the entire Congress and all my fellow Texans, especially my neighbors in Texas 22, to the biggest Texas-size birthday party of 2020.

This picture to my left is pure Brookwood. They are turning 35 years old this year. Since 1985, citizens at Brookwood with mental and physical challenges are taught real job skills. They are infused with pride, self-worth, and Christian love.

Brookwood was started by Yvonne Streit. Her 1-year-old daughter, Vicki, had severe brain damage. Yvonne had a mission. From her backyard to churches to the current two campuses with 230 or more citizens, Brookwood is making their citizens in Texas better every single day.

Their official birthday party is April 3 at 11 a.m. The catering is done by the Brookwood Cafe. If you want a belly full of food and a heart full of Christian love, come see us in Brookwood.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF BONNIE DUVALL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Ms. Bonnie McWhorter Duvall. Bonnie recently lost her battle with cancer at just 61 years of age.

Bonnie was the matriarch of a strong farm family from Greensboro, Georgia. She was a member of the Green County Farm Bureau Women's Committee, a mother of four, and a wife to American Farm Bureau Federation President Zippy Duvall.

Bonnie and Zippy spent more than 40 years together, and she enjoyed traveling the country by his side to meet with many of our Nation's farmers over the years.

Though it is a comfort to know that Bonnie is no longer suffering, it is a great sadness that she was taken from her family and friends far too soon.

I would like to extend my deepest sympathies to Zippy and the rest of the Duvall family at this difficult time. They are, and will continue to be, in my prayers.

□ 1215

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the 33rd Anniversary of National Developmental Disabilities Awareness Month.

This important commemoration serves to raise awareness and promote respect for those with intellectual and developmental disabilities, while also highlighting the importance of inclusion.

It is estimated there are over 4.6 million individuals in the United States, and over 250,000 individuals in North Texas alone, with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Texas' Third Congressional District is home to incredible organizations, including Cornerstone Ranch, My Possibilities, and LifePath Systems.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to recognize these dedicated organizations, staff, and volunteers serving as steadfast advocates fostering opportunity for these individuals to realize their full potential.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in thanking these organizations for their hard work and recognizing those with developmental disabilities.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 68, DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2486, FOSTERING UNDERGRADUATE TALENT BY UNLOCKING RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6172, USA FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 891 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 891

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House 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. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2486) to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with each of the two amendments specified in section 4 of this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except as specified in section 3 of this resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) The question of adoption of the motion shall be divided between the two House amendments specified in section 4 of this resolution. The two portions of the divided question shall be considered in the order specified by the Chair.

(b) Each portion of the divided question shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 4. The amendments referred to in the second and third sections of this resolution are as follows:

(a) An amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-52.

(b) An amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-53.

SEC. 5. If only one portion of the divided question is adopted, that portion shall be engrossed as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6172) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 7. On any legislative day during the period from March 13, 2020, through March 22, 2020—

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

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

SEC. 8. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 7 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 9. Each day during the period addressed by section 7 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XV.

SEC. 10. It shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of March 22, 2020, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 11. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of March 23, 2020.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JUDY CHU of California). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 891, providing for consideration of Senate amendment to H.R. 2486, S.J. Res. 68, and H.R. 6172.

The rules provide for consideration of two House amendments to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486, which contained the text of the NO BAN Act and the Access to Counsel Act.

It also provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 68 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of general debate controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It also provides the joint resolution with one motion to commit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 6172 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of general debate equally divided among and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Lastly, this rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman NADLER to H.R. 6172 and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, we are now 3 years into a policy that is the antithesis of what this country stands for: the President's shameful and un-American Muslim ban. President Trump chose Holocaust Remembrance Day, of all days, to sign his first executive order on this. That shut the door to thousands of refugees fleeing war—the very people who had seen America as a beacon of hope and were trying to build a better life.

Instead, this administration turned its back on innocent women, children, and families desperate to escape violence. That is callous, that is wrong, and it goes against everything America is founded on.

President Trump has claimed his Muslim ban is all about national security. But let's be honest here, it was never about that.

It is about a President trying to fulfill offensive campaign promises and further his harmful rhetoric about Muslims.

As a candidate for President, Donald Trump said he would certainly look at closing mosques in the United States. He floated the idea of creating a database for all Muslim Americans. And he even suggested that Muslims in America were cheering as the World Trade Centers fell on September 11. What an ugly, ugly thing to say.

Madam Speaker, I could go on and on and on. This is truly offensive stuff—ideas that should be left somewhere in the darkest corners of the internet.

Then, in December of 2015, he called for, ''a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States.''

This ban is his attempt at turning that campaign rhetoric into actual policy, however cruel and unnecessary.

My colleagues, Representatives CHU, JAYAPAL, and ROSE, put its impact best when they wrote in a recent op-ed piece: ''That means more grandchildren who will never be able to kiss their grandparents, more loved ones unable to say good-bye at a funeral, more graduations where the proud student has no beaming parents cheering for them in the crowd, and more families forced to make impossible decisions under the most trying circumstances.''

I have met people impacted by the Muslim ban, Madam Speaker. It is people like Benham Partopour, a chemical engineering student getting his Ph.D. at Worcester Polytechnic Institute in my home district in central Massachusetts.

He is an Iranian national who was in Iran when President Trump's executive order went into effect. He had a visa, but no airlines were willing to sell plane tickets that would allow him to return to the United States. So, like many other people across the globe, he was stranded.

My office worked with school officials and the ACLU Massachusetts every day until he was able to return home to the United States a week later.

This is who the President is afraid of, Madam Speaker, a bright young man trying to study at a top American university. He is just one of the roughly 135 million people impacted by this policy.

This isn't about crafting sound national security policy; this is about something much more sinister. That is shown by the fact that the President kept drafting versions of his Muslim ban until a watered-down version was able to pass legal muster with conservatives on the Supreme Court. But even they required the administration to grant waivers proving the ban had a ''legitimate national security interest.''

Yet, the State Department has approved just 10 percent of all waivers so far, just 10 percent.

Madam Speaker, does this President really believe that 90 percent of Muslims from impacted countries are terrorists? There is absolutely no evidence of that.

And it gets worse. According to reports, this administration is now considering expanding its travel ban to even more countries. Enough is enough.

Our country already had one of the strongest vetting systems anywhere in the world. We don't need any arbitrary and offensive bans. We can tell the difference between a real threat and the student traveling back to college.

That is why this underlying measure will reverse the bans the President has put in place over the last 3 years, and it will ensure people at ports of entry can seek legal advice during the screening process.

The principle that our diversity is our strength, and the idea that our country is strengthened by immigration, these are core values of this

Democratic majority. That is why we have made this a clear choice and provided a clean up-or-down vote. No stalling tactics. No partisan gimmicks. And I think it is an appropriate process because I want to prevent cynicism and ugliness from being celebrated here on the House floor.

The administration's rhetoric and, quite frankly, so many people here on this floor have often demonized immigrants. It is offensive, and it is not worthy of a debate.

Either you believe we are a nation defined by the Statue of Liberty welcoming immigrants or one that uses religious discrimination in immigration decisions. I think this is an easy call.

Also included in this rule, Madam Speaker, is a reauthorization of the USA FREEDOM Act, as well as a War Powers Resolution led by Senator KAINE that would require a vote in Congress authorizing the use of force before the President escalates hostilities in Iran.

Madam Speaker, this Democratic majority promised to take it up if it passed the Senate, and I am proud that it did, with broad bipartisan support. This is not a partisan measure. Eight Republicans joined with Senator KAINE in supporting this War Powers Resolution.

Passage here would send the Kaine resolution directly to the President's desk.

□ 1230

Madam Speaker, I don't support the FISA reauthorization bill. I appreciate the bipartisan work that went into trying to fashion a compromise, but in the final analysis, I, in good conscience, can't support it.

But on the other matters, make no mistake: This is a historic opportunity. Congress has a chance to reassert its constitutional authority over matters of war and peace; to live up to its Article I responsibility; and to truly respect our troops by giving them the debate on the future that they deserve, should tensions with Iran escalate again.

I hope all my colleagues seize it, and I urge a strong vote for this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Representative MCGOVERN for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today, the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486, contains the text of two pieces of legislation, H.R. 2214 and H.R. 5581, along with the Senate version of the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act of 2019 as a pay-for.

Also included are S.J. Res. 68, a resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran, and H.R. 6172, the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act.

By combining all of these bills together, Democrats have prohibited the minority, meaning the Republicans, the ability to offer a motion to recommit on the floor. The only thing I can think of is that I guess they are afraid we might pass our seventh MTR, as we passed one last week.

H.R. 2214 eviscerates the President's ability, under the law, to limit who may legally enter the United States. President Trump has utilized existing law to determine which countries fail to meet international standards of information sharing or identity management, or were at a high risk of terrorism or public safety concern, and the executive orders he issued reflected that determination. The majority is now seeking to prevent the President from ever using that authority again.

The bill terminates the executive orders currently in place and ceases ''all actions taken pursuant to any proclamation or executive order terminated'' by the bill, which means that all information sharing on terrorists, criminals, and other security threats would cease.

The seven countries specifically targeted with travel restrictions in Executive Order 13769 were actually countries that were determined by Congress and the Obama administration to be countries of particular concern for terrorism activity.

This bill contains onerous reporting and consultation requirements that would effectively prevent the President from acting quickly in the event quick action would be needed.

For example, H.R. 2214 requires consultation between only the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security. However, this does not cover many emergencies the President needs to respond to.

For example, in the event of a disease outbreak, including the novel coronavirus, the Centers for Disease Control would need to be consulted with respect to suspending entry of certain populations.

The combined rule also includes H.R. 5581. This legislation would require the Department of Homeland Security to ensure that every individual who is subject to a secondary inspection would be guaranteed access to counsel or anyone of their choosing within an hour.

This definitely would have serious logistical and practical consequences for CBP's ability to quickly and efficiently screen travelers and carry out the mission of facilitating unlawful trade and travel. CBP conducts over 17 million secondary inspections each year.

Can you imagine that, for every car, a CBP officer is looking at a screen, when there is the X-ray machine of the car, and they radio over to the CBP officer at the port of entry and say: ''Hey, look in the trunk''? Then, they would have to wait an hour if the person objects and says, ''Oh, I want counsel,'' or, ''I want my relative to come within an hour.'' I mean, this is just way onerous.

This combined rule also contains S.J. Res. 68, a resolution to direct the removal of the United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran.

First, I want to note that Secretary Pompeo testified in front of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that ''we are not'' engaged in hostilities against Iran. Thus, the joint resolution is unnecessary.

While Congress has a constitutional duty to authorize the use of military force, we should not be issuing blanket prohibitions without taking the time to develop an appropriate Authorization for Use of Military for the Middle East.

The net effect of the bill may be to make many U.S. counterterrorism operations in the Middle East illegal. Rather than handcuffing our Armed Forces, we should be providing them with the tools they need to effectively combat terrorism against America and Americans abroad.

Lastly, this rule contains H.R. 6172, the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act. This bill reauthorizes expiring provisions necessary to defend the United States, while also including significant reforms to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to restore accountability.

In order to ensure that past FISA abuses, like those against Carter Page, never happen again, numerous reforms are included to protect the American people from both terrorist threats and government overreach.

For example, the bill requires the Attorney General to transmit rules to ensure that FISA applications are accurate and complete. The Attorney General would also be required to approve, in writing, a FISA investigation of an elected official or a Federal candidate.

Also, the FISA court will now transcribe hearings, with DOJ giving FISA applications and relevant materials to Congress in a timely manner, to ensure we can conduct appropriate oversight.

It also creates a new division within DOJ, a compliance officer, that will specifically look at these FISA applications to make sure they are accurate.

Although I am pleased with much of the FISA reform bill, it is unfortunate that it is included with a lot of other bills in this rule, controversial bills that I don't like. Therefore, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, for the record, I want my colleagues to know that pandemics and instances like the coronavirus are already covered by the legislation. Nothing in this bill prohibits the President from using authority under section 212(f) to contain the coronavirus.

This bill allows the President to suspend the entry of a class of individuals if it is determined that they would undermine the security or public safety of

the United States or the preservation of human rights, democratic processes or institutions, or international stability.

But out of an abundance of caution, the Judiciary Committee added a clarification clause on page 7 of the NO BAN Act, which clearly states that the term ''public safety'' includes efforts necessary to contain a communicable disease of public health significance, as defined in section 34(2)(b) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations.

So, this has nothing to do with coronavirus. We are taking action on this bill basically to end the President's discriminatory travel bans.

Madam Speaker, I am quoting from a letter from the ACLU that I will include in the RECORD.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
March 10, 2020.

VOTE ''YES'' ON NO BAN ACT, VOTE ''NO'' ON ANY AMENDMENTS OR OTHER CHANGES

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), and our more than 8 million members, supporters, and activists, we write to express our support for the NO BAN Act, though we have concerns about language that has been added. As the NO BAN Act is scheduled for a floor vote this week, it is essential that no further changes be made to the bill—so that this authority cannot be used to ban whole communities.

We urge you to vote ''YES'' on the NO BAN Act in its current form and vote ''NO'' on any amendments or other changes. The ACLU will score this vote.

The ACLU continues to support the version of the NO BAN Act scheduled for a floor vote this week. However, we have concerns about recent language included in the bill defining public safety to address ''communicable disease'' in response to the current climate and fear around COVID–19 (coronavirus). These changes are unnecessary and further stigmatize immigrant communities where many are facing discrimination in the United States given the Trump administration's stereotypes about communities of color and immigrants—including in reference to coronavirus. There is a long history in the United States of inaccurate connections between health risks and immigrants, which has resulted in irrational immigration policies and discrimination; we are not interested in repeating the mistakes of our past. Any restrictions related to coronavirus, such as those regarding China and Iran, must be based in science and public health, not politics or xenophobia.

The NO BAN Act continues to achieve the ultimate goals of the legislation, which are to rescind the Muslim ban, refugee Muslim ban, and asylum ban, and make critical changes to the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) by putting in place a more stringent standard for presidents invoking any similar suspension or restriction. During the House Judiciary Committee markup, the bill was amended to rescind the President's recently expanded Muslim ban which was issued on January 31st, and targets more African countries, and requires visa reporting related to this ban.

Under current law, the executive branch claims the authority to bar the entry of large groups of people without effective accountability and without regard for the policies codified in other parts of the INA. The NO BAN Act would strengthen limitations on this authority by raising the standard for invoking it. Rather than the current broad and undefined standard, the proposed bill would require the executive branch to meet a more stringent standard—based on ''specific and credible facts'' that any suspension of or restriction from entry must be connected to ''specific acts'' that have actually occurred. Furthermore, the bill requires that any such suspension or restriction meet a compelling government interest and that the government use the least restrictive means in doing so.

The NO BAN Act would also establish a system of checks and balances whereby Congress would be routinely notified and briefed on the status, implementation and constitutional and legislative authority of the executive branch's actions. Finally, the proposed legislation would expand the non-discrimination provision of the INA to prohibit discrimination based on religion. While language connecting these two critical changes to the INA has been removed, the bill now includes a rule of construction indicating that the President, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Homeland Security cannot use this authority to act in a manner that is inconsistent with other policy decisions in immigration law.

This bill is a significant step forward for Muslim communities and other communities that could be targeted discriminatorily or without good reason. By creating substantive standards and accountability, it greatly reduces the possibility of future bias-based bans.

The ACLU urges you to vote ''YES'' on the NO BAN Act in its current form and vote ''NO'' on any amendments or other changes. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

RONALD NEWMAN,
National Political Director.

MANAR WAHEED,
Senior Legislative and Advocacy Counsel.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, one of the things they point out here, which I want to agree with, is that they say: ''There is a long history in the United States of inaccurate connections between health risks and immigrants, which has resulted in irrational immigration policies and discrimination; we are not interested in repeating the mistakes of our past. Any restrictions related to coronavirus, such as those regarding China and Iran, must be based in science and public health, not politics or xenophobia.''

What a radical idea, to actually base some of these decisions on science. Yet, we know that this administration doesn't have any regard for science.

Madam Speaker, I will also include in the RECORD a May 20 Washington Post article titled ''I think Islam hates us': A timeline of Trump's comments about Islam and Muslims.''

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 2017]

I THINK ISLAM HATES US: A TIMELINE OF TRUMP'S COMMENTS ABOUT ISLAM AND MUSLIMS

(By Jenna Johnson and Abigail Hauslohner)

President Trump is in Saudi Arabia this weekend to meet with Arab leaders, visit the birthplace of Islam and give a speech about religious tolerance with the hope of resetting his reputation with the world's 1.6 billion Muslims. But it's unclear if a two-day visit is enough to overshadow his past statements about Islam and its faithful, with his rhetoric becoming more virulent as he campaigned for president.

Here's a look back at some of the comments that he has made:

March 30, 2011: For years, Trump publicly questioned then-President Barack Obama's religious beliefs and place of birth. As he debated running for president in the 2012 election, Trump said in a radio interview: ''He doesn't have a birth certificate, or if he does, there's something on that certificate that is very bad for him. Now, somebody told me—and I have no idea if this is bad for him or not, but perhaps it would be—that where it says 'religion,' it might have 'Muslim.' And if you're a Muslim, you don't change your religion, by the way.'' (Obama is a Christian, and state records show he was born in Hawaii.)

Sept. 17, 2015: At a campaign town hall in New Hampshire, a man in the audience shouted out: ''We have a problem in this country; it's called Muslims. We know our current president is one.'' The man mentioned Muslim ''training camps'' and asked: ''When can we get rid of them?'' Trump responded: ''We're going to be looking at a lot of different things. You know, a lot of people are saying that, and a lot of people are saying that bad things are happening out there. We're going to be looking at that and plenty of other things.''

Sept. 20, 2015: On NBC News, Trump was asked if he would be comfortable with a Muslim as president; he responded: ''I can say that, you know, it's something that at some point could happen. We will see. I mean, you know, it's something that could happen. Would I be comfortable? I don't know if we have to address it right now, but I think it is certainly something that could happen.''

Sept. 30, 2015: At a New Hampshire rally, Trump pledged to kick all Syrian refugees—most of whom are Muslim—out of the country, as they might be a secret army. ''They could be ISIS, I don't know. This could be one of the great tactical ploys of all time. A 200,000–man army, maybe,'' he said. In an interview that aired later, Trump said: ''This could make the Trojan horse look like peanuts.''

Oct. 21, 2015: On Fox Business, Trump says he would ''certainly look at'' the idea of closing mosques in the United States.

Nov. 16, 2015: Following a series of terrorist attacks in Paris, Trump said on MSNBC that he would ''strongly consider'' closing mosques. ''I would hate to do it, but it's something that you're going to have to strongly consider because some of the ideas and some of the hatred—the absolute hatred—is coming from these areas,'' he said.

Nov. 20, 2015: In comments to Yahoo and NBC News, Trump seemed open to the idea of creating a database of all Muslims in the United States. Later, he and his aides would not rule out the idea.

Nov. 21, 2015: At a rally in Alabama, Trump said that on Sept. 11 he ''watched when the World Trade Center came tumbling down. And I watched in Jersey City, N.J., where thousands and thousands of people were cheering as that building was coming down.''

Nov. 22, 2015: On ABC News, Trump doubled down on his comment and added: ''It was well covered at the time. There were people over in New Jersey that were watching it, a heavy Arab population, that were cheering as the buildings came down. Not good.'' (While there were some reports of celebrations overseas, extensive examination of news clips turn up no such celebrations in New Jersey.)

Nov. 30, 2015: On MSNBC, a reporter asked Trump if he thinks Islam is an inherently peaceful religion that's been perverted by a small percentage of followers or if it is an inherently violent religion. Trump responded:

''Well, all I can say . . . there's something going on. You know, there's something definitely going on. I don't know that that question can be answered.'' He also said: ''We are not loved by many Muslims.''

Dec. 3, 2015: The morning after Syed Rizwan Farook and Tashfeen Malik killed 14 people in San Bernardino, Calif., Trump called into Fox News and said: ''The other thing with the terrorists is you have to take out their families, when you get these terrorists, you have to take out their families.'' (Killing the relatives of suspected terrorists is forbidden by international law.) Later, in a speech to the Republican Jewish Coalition, Trump criticized Obama for not using the phrase ''radical Islamic terrorism'' and commented: ''There's something going on with him that we don't know about.''

Dec. 6, 2015: On CBS News, Trump said: ''If you have people coming out of mosques with hatred and death in their eyes and on their minds, we're going to have to do something.'' Trump also said he didn't believe the sister of one of the San Bernardino shooters who said she was crestfallen for the victims, saying: ''I would go after a lot of people, and I would find out whether or not they knew. I would be able to find out, because I don't believe the sister.''

Dec. 7, 2015: Trump's campaign issued a statement saying: ''Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on.'' Trump read this statement aloud at a rally in South Carolina.

Dec. 8, 2015: On CNN, Trump quoted a widely debunked poll by an anti-Islam activist organization that claimed that a quarter of the Muslims living in the United States agreed that violence against Americans is justified as part of the global jihad. ''We have people out there that want to do great destruction to our country, whether it's 25 percent or 10 percent or 5 percent, it's too much,'' Trump said.

Dec. 13, 2015: On Fox News, Trump was asked if his ban would apply to a Canadian businessman who is a Muslim. Trump responded: ''There's a sickness. They're sick people. There's a sickness going on. There's a group of people that is very sick.''

Jan. 12, 2016: At a rally in Iowa, Trump shared his suspicions about Syrian refugees and then read the lyrics to Al Wilson's 1968 song ''The Snake,'' the story of a ''tender woman'' who nursed a sickly snake back to health but then was attacked by the snake. Trump often read these lyrics at rallies.

Feb. 3, 2016: Trump criticized Obama for visiting a mosque in Baltimore and said on Fox News: ''Maybe he feels comfortable there . . . There are a lot of places he can go, and he chose a mosque.'' (It was Obama's first visit to a mosque during his presidency, and it was made in an effort to encourage religious tolerance in light of growing antiMuslim sentiment.)

Feb. 20, 2016: After Obama skipped the funeral of Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, Trump tweeted: ''I wonder if President Obama would have attended the funeral of Justice Scalia if it were held in a Mosque? Very sad that he did not go!'' (Obama did pay his respects when Scalia's body lay in repose in the Supreme Court.) That night at a rally in South Carolina, Trump told an apocryphal tale that he would return to repeatedly about U.S. Gen. John J. Pershing fighting Muslim insurgents in the Philippines in the early 1900s and killing a large group of insurgents with bullets dipped in pigs' blood.

March 9, 2016: On CNN, Trump said: ''I think Islam hates us. There's something there that—there's a tremendous hatred there. There's a tremendous hatred. We have to get to the bottom of it. There's an unbelievable hatred of us.''

March 22, 2016: Soon after three suicide bombings in Brussels tied to a group of French and Belgian Muslims, Trump told Fox Business: ''We're having problems with the Muslims, and we're having problems with Muslims coming into the country.'' Trump called for surveillance of mosques in the United States, saying: ''You have to deal with the mosques, whether we like it or not, I mean, you know, these attacks aren't coming out of—they're not done by Swedish people.''

On NBC News, Trump added: ''This all happened because, frankly, there's no assimilation. They are not assimilating . . . They want to go by sharia law. They want sharia law. They don't want the laws that we have. They want sharia law.''

March 23, 2016: In an interview with Bloomberg TV, Trump said that Muslims ''have to respect us. They do not respect us at all. And frankly, they don't respect a lot of the things that are happening throughout not only our country, but they don't respect other things.''

March 29, 2016: During a town hall in Wisconsin, CNN's Anderson Cooper asked Trump: ''Do you trust Muslims in America?'' Trump responded: ''Do I what?'' Cooper again asked: 'Trust Muslims in America?'' Trump responded: ''Many of them I do. Many of them I do, and some, I guess, we don't. Some, I guess, we don't. We have a problem, and we can try and be very politically correct and pretend we don't have a problem, but, Anderson, we have a major, major problem. This is, in a sense, this is a war.''

May 20, 2016: On Fox News, Trump said this of Muslims: ''They're going to have to turn in the people that are bombing the planes. And they know who the people are. And we're not going to find the people by just continuing to be so nice and so soft.''

June 13, 2016: The day after the mass shooting at a gay nightclub in Orlando, Trump declared in a speech in New Hampshire that ''radical Islam is anti-woman, anti-gay and anti-American.'' He criticized his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton, for refusing to use the term ''radical Islam'' and for speaking positively of Islam. ''Hillary Clinton's catastrophic immigration plan will bring vastly more radical Islamic immigration into this country, threatening not only our society but our entire way of life. When it comes to radical Islamic terrorism, ignorance is not bliss. It's deadly—totally deadly,'' Trump said. Later he added: ''I want every American to succeed, including Muslims—but the Muslims have to work with us. They have to work with us. They know what's going on.''

June 14, 2016: At a rally in North Carolina, Trump noted that the Orlando shooter's parents are Muslim Americans who immigrated from Afghanistan. ''The children of Muslim American parents, they're responsible for a growing number for whatever reason a growing number of terrorist attacks,'' he said, adding that immigration from Afghanistan has increased five-fold. '' . . . Every year we bring in more than 100,000 lifetime immigrants from the Middle East and many more from Muslim countries outside of the Middle East. A number of these immigrants have hostile attitudes.''

June 15, 2016: On Fox News, Trump said this of Muslims who immigrate to the United States: ''Assimilation has been very hard. It's almost—I won't say nonexistent, but it gets to be pretty close. And I'm talking about second and third generation. They come—they don't—for some reason, there's no real assimilation.''

July 21, 2016: In accepting the Republican Party's presidential nomination, Trump focused heavily on ''brutal Islamic terrorism'' and promised: ''I will do everything in my power to protect our LGBTQ citizens from the violence and oppression of a hateful foreign ideology.''

July 24, 2016: On NBC News, Trump defended his proposal for a Muslim ban, despite some of his aides insisting he had rolled it back. ''People were so upset when I used the word Muslim. 'Oh, you can't use the word Muslim,' '' Trump said. ''. . . But just remember this: Our Constitution is great, but it doesn't necessarily give us the right to commit suicide, okay? Now, we have a religious—you know, everybody wants to be protected. And that's great. And that's the wonderful part of our Constitution. I view it differently. Why are we committing suicide? Why are we doing that?''

Aug. 11, 2016: At a meeting of evangelical leaders in Orlando, Trump said: ''If you were a Christian in Syria, it was virtually impossible to come into the United States. If you were a Muslim from Syria, it was one of the easier countries to be able to find your way into the United States. Think of that. Just think of what that means.''

Aug. 18, 2016: During a rally in North Carolina, Trump said that ''all applicants for immigration will be vetted for ties to radical ideology, and we will screen out anyone who doesn't share our values and love our people.''

Sept. 19, 2016: At a rally in Florida, Trump reacted to explosions over the weekend in New York and New Jersey and said: ''There have been Islamic terrorist attacks in Minnesota and New York City and in New Jersey. These attacks and many others were made possible because of our extremely open immigration system, which fails to properly vet and screen the individuals and families coming into our country. Got to be careful.''

Jan. 27, 2017: Within a week of becoming president, Trump signed an executive order blocking Syrian refugees and banning citizens of seven predominantly Muslim countries from entering the United States for 90 days. This order goes into effect immediately, prompting mass chaos at airports, protests and legal challenges. Rudolph W. Giuliani, a close adviser to the president, later said on Fox News: ''So when [Trump] first announced it, he said, 'Muslim ban.' He called me up. He said, 'Put a commission together. Show me the right way to do it legally.' ''

Feb. 28, 2017: Despite urging from some of his Cabinet members, Trump continues to use the term ''radical Islamic terrorism,'' including in a speech to a joint session of Congress.

March 6, 2017: Trump issues a new travel ban for citizens from six majority-Muslim countries, which is also challenged in the courts.

April 29, 2017: At a rally celebrating his 100th day in office, Trump once again dramatically read ''The Snake.''

May 17, 2017: At a commencement ceremony, Trump previewed his upcoming overseas trip and said: ''I'll speak with Muslim leaders and challenge them to fight hatred and extremism and embrace a peaceful future for their faith. And they're looking very much forward to hearing what we, as your representative, we have to say. We have to stop radical Islamic terrorism.''

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the President's comments and tweets about Muslims are truly, truly offensive, and I could list everything he said here today, but it is a long, long list. I think repeating those words would be a mistake because they are unworthy of this floor.

President Trump's Muslim ban continues a sad and unfortunate history of

policies that used immigration law to target people based on their backgrounds. We have had policies in our history that targeted immigrants from China, Japan, and Asia, and laws that qualified people of White descent for naturalization at the expense of everyone else.

Those policies are wrong. They are shameful. And they went against everything this country stands for. President Trump's Muslim ban belongs right beside them, in the dustbin of history, as well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona, my good friend, for yielding time. And frankly, I want to associate myself with her remarks about the underlying legislation.

My remarks, Madam Speaker, will focus on the manner in which the bills that are before us are being brought to the floor.

It is, frankly, very disappointing to me, Madam Speaker, that this even needs to be said. But given the grave consequences of what the majority is proposing to do procedurally, I cannot condemn today's rule strongly enough.

In today's measure, what the majority is proposing amounts to a de facto change to the House rules, one that will trample on the rights of the minority and deny any opportunity to amend the bill on the floor.

Rather than bringing up the two immigration items as the standalone bills that they actually are, the majority has instead chosen the procedural gimmick of using a Senate-amended House bill to package these items together. This has the same effect of denying the minority the more than 100-year-old right to make a motion to recommit, or MTR, as they are commonly known, before moving to final passage.

This is because, under House rules, the minority is not allowed to offer an MTR on any House measures that have been amended by the Senate. Of course, for the majority, the denial of the minority's traditional rights to an MTR is the whole point of this procedural exercise. These underhanded procedural shenanigans are specifically intended to deny the minority the right to an MTR on these bills.

Before my friend, the chairman, responds with the number of times a Republican majority used this procedure, let me be perfectly clear. As he knows, we never, never did that as a means to deny the minority an MTR. In fact, we did it in consultation with the minority and with the sole goal of accelerating passage of key bipartisan legislation in the Senate.

So, why does the Democratic majority insist on these procedural gymnastics? I can think of only one reason: The majority is embarrassed that the minority has now passed an MTR six times in this Congress, including one just last week.

Madam Speaker, this is now the second time in the past 6 weeks that the majority is explicitly adopting a procedure to deny the minority our rights.

□ 1245

I think that if the majority is really so frightened of the motion to recommit and they really want to do away with MTRs, then they should change the standing rules of the House, and that needs to happen on a vote on the House floor so that everyone can see what the majority is actually doing and how it operates.

When Republicans were in the majority, the thought of limiting the use of the MTR to silence minority voices never once crossed our minds, and that is because we recognized the importance of the MTR to this institution. It has been around since the very beginning of the institution, and it has been in its present form since 1909.

In fact, in 1919, Representative Abraham Garrett of Tennessee was quoted as saying: ''The motion to recommit is regarded as so sacred it is one of the few things protected against the Committee on Rules by the general rules of the House.''

Evidently, not anymore.

The present majority is not content with that state of affairs, which is why they are trying, once again, to do an end run around the House rules and adopt a procedural gimmick specifically to stop the minority from exercising its right to an MTR. It is beyond disappointing, Madam Speaker.

It is shocking that the majority would feel the need to rig the entire system to shut us up. My goodness, they have a 35-seat majority. But we all know why that is. It is because the majority cannot effectively defend its own policies.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. So, today, Madam Speaker, I call on all Members to vote ''no'' on this rule. I ask that my colleagues, regardless of party, reject this rigged process, reject this rule, and act to protect the rights of every Member of this Chamber. The future of the institution depends on it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I have high regard for my ranking member, Mr. COLE, and I know he and I both share enormous respect for this institution, but I am going to say for the Record that this process that we are using is not unusual. It is a process that was used by Republicans numerous times during their majority, including 15 times during the past two Republican-led Congresses, to send bills over to the Senate for their expedited consideration.

And I will say, with respect to the gentleman, he mentioned that we were consulted about these processes in the past. I was never consulted when the Republicans used this process. In fact, I remember a time when the Republicans basically hijacked a Democratic bill to attach something to it, without even consulting the sponsor of the bill. So I am not sure what the gentleman was alluding to, and I don't know what my friend's intentions were when they utilized this process.

Madam Speaker, I can't speak to the motivations of the previous majority when they used this process over a dozen times, but what I can speak to is the impact. Each time this process was used by the Republican majority, the Democratic minority was unable to offer a motion to recommit. That is just a fact.

Republicans used this process 15 times over the past two Congresses, and, you know, I get it. My Republican friends want to have an opportunity to try to politicize this debate even more around immigration. But I just want to remind everybody why we are here.

The offensive things that this President has said about immigrants and about Muslims are unconscionable. These travel bans serve no purpose other than to discriminate against Muslims and people from predominantly Muslim countries.

President Trump issued these baseless travel bans under the guise of national security. But we all know what they are really about. They fulfill Trump's offensive campaign promise calling for a ''total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States.''

Those are the President's words.

These discriminatory bans have a real impact on real people's lives and have already affected more than 135 million individuals. So that is why we are debating whether to terminate the travel bans and to stand up against discrimination and hate without any distractions, without any political gimmicks.

I know my friends are not happy with that, but we are going to do the right thing. We are going to stand up to hate and bigotry and discrimination, and we are going to move this legislation forward, and everybody will have an up-or-down vote.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, before I yield time to my friend, I want to point out again that Mr. COLE has been here a long time, and when he says to the public on the floor that when Republicans used this process of combining the bills together in a rule that it was to expedite it over to the Senate, I believe him. And so I believe that their motivation is different, and that is to prevent the minority from having a motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for yielding.

I want to stipulate, Madam Speaker, that I have seen the gentleman from Massachusetts, the leader of our committee, do some things on that committee that no one else has tried to do.

I was in this institution for a decade as a chief of staff, now a decade as a Member of Congress, and he has done some amazing things that I believe will serve this institution and serve the committee, not just this Congress, but next Congress and for decades to come. And I applaud him and his very capable team for pushing those initiatives forward.

But, today, Madam Speaker, we are talking about the exact opposite side of that coin, things that are done in the name of expediency today that may well do damage to this institution, not just this Congress and next Congress, but for decades to come. Habits happen in this institution, Madam Speaker. Habits happen.

My friend from Massachusetts used to work for a great leader in this institution, Mr. Joe Moakley. In fact, his picture hangs on the wall as a former chairman of the Rules Committee.

I used to work for a great Member of this institution as well, Madam Speaker, Mr. John Linder, out of the great State of Georgia. He also served on the Rules Committee.

As we come down to the floor today, for my friends of the majority to defend for the second time in 6 weeks taking away the minority's right to have any input on the process whatsoever, I thought I would go back 20 years from today, back to the year 2000, when the gentleman from Massachusetts' former boss and my former boss sat in these very same chairs.

At that time, Madam Speaker, Republicans were in the majority. I will go back to October 3 of 2000 when Mr. Linder took to the floor and said:

> And the rule provides a motion to recommit, as is the right of the minority.

Republicans were in control, complete control, of this institution. They could jam anything through that they wanted to jam through. But it was the right of the minority to have at least a final voice and a final opportunity to amend the bill.

October 12, a week later, Mr. Linder and Mr. Moakley were on the floor again. Mr. Linder says:

> And, finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, as is the right of the minority.

Again, Madam Speaker, October 19 of that same year, just a week after that, Mr. Linder and Mr. Moakley on the floor again:

> The rule provides a motion to recommit, as is the right of the minority.

We will go a week after that, Madam Speaker. Same two gentlemen on the floor again, same Republican majority in charge. Mr. Linder, on the floor:

> Resolution . . . as is the right of the minority.

A week after that, Madam Speaker:

> Motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority.

I will go on and on and on. Because 20 years ago, it was not a question of whether or not the minority would have a single voice. Remember, Madam Speaker, these bills that the gentleman from Massachusetts is talking about, these immigration bills, went through committee, no Republican amendments were adopted; went to the Rules Committee, no Republican amendments were made in order. There has been absolutely no minority input of any kind on these bills he is talking about. There is so much more in this underlying bill. But 20 years ago, the habit was we would recognize that the minority has a right.

In fact, I don't even need to go back 20 years, Madam Speaker. I serve on the Select Committee on Modernization. That is a bipartisan committee here in the House that is designed to look at the current rules and organization of the House and talk about how it is that we can do better.

I don't have to go back 20 years, Madam Speaker. I can go back to last year, March 13, 2019, a press release from the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, on the remarks that she made in front of that joint select committee looking at modernizing the institution. And she said: Some people have talked about changing the motion to recommit, this or that. But she said:

> I am a big respecter of the rights of the minority in the Congress of the United States, and I believe as Speaker of the whole House that initiatives you put forth must come from the whole House.

We are looking at how to make the motion to recommit better, Madam Speaker. I will take us back to a prescription drugs bill just a few short weeks ago, where the minority traded away its right to a motion to recommit in favor of a complete substitute.

Let's debate the issues instead of the motion to recommit. The motion to recommit that passed last week, Madam Speaker, said let's not allow violent convicted criminals to serve as TSA agents.

This is what the majority is protecting America from: amendments from the minority that would protect TSA employees from working side by side with violent convicted felons. This isn't an adversarial idea, Madam Speaker. This is an idea that we all agreed on, which is why it passed with great bipartisan support.

You never know when the bad habits you get into are going to stick.

I will take you back to a time when my friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, and my ranking member, Mr. COLE, were on the floor just few short years ago, and my friend from Massachusetts said this. He said:

> Mr. Speaker, I have nothing but the highest respect for my colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), and I know he wants this House to run better. But the fact of the matter is I feel bad that he has to defend this lousy, restrictive, indefensible process. That is our job on the Rules Committee sometimes.

And I want to say to my friend from Massachusetts, as he said to our friend from Oklahoma: I have nothing but the highest respect for my colleague from Massachusetts, and I know that he wants this House to run better. But the fact of the matter is I feel bad that he has to defend this lousy, restrictive, indefensible process.

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

Madam Speaker, let me just say for the record, nobody is changing the MTR. We are using a process that my Republican friends used over a dozen times in the past, in the last Congress.

Yes, the Rules Committee has an obligation to try to make sure that we bring important legislation to the floor in a fair and reasonable process, and we are doing that.

But we also have an obligation——

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would prefer not to be interrupted. I am in the middle of—Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, because he keeps on interrupting me.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I don't think of it as interrupting. I apologize to Chairman MCGOVERN. I think of it as elucidating.

What my friend has said is absolutely right. This process has been used before, just not for this purpose, which is why Politico ran——

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I reclaim my time.

Do you know what? The result, when my friends used this process, is the same. We were not allowed to offer an MTR to any of the bills when they utilized this process.

□ 1300

And so, I just state that that is just a fact. But the Rules Committee also has an obligation, and I believe everybody in this House has an obligation to stand up against bigotry and hate and racism and religious discrimination, and that is what these underlying bills deal with.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a February 16, 2020, The Guardian article, titled; '' 'Trump is deciding who is American': how the new travel ban is tearing families apart.''

[From the Guardian, Feb. 16, 2020]

TRUMP IS DECIDING WHO IS AMERICAN: HOW THE NEW TRAVEL BAN IS TEARING FAMILIES APART

(By Sean Levin)

It started out as a joyous day for Olumide. On 31 January, the 32-year-old Nigerian American learned in an email that the US was finally processing the visa applications of his wife and daughter in Nigeria.

Hours later, Donald Trump shattered their celebration, announcing that he was adding six countries to the travel ban, including Nigeria. The decision cuts off pathways to permanent US residency for Nigerians, throwing Olumide's case into limbo at the final stage of the process. It leaves his wife and and 11-year-old girl stuck across an ocean with little hope of making it to the US.

''This is inhuman,'' said Olumide, a systems analyst and US military veteran who

served in Afghanistan and lives in Washington DC. He asked to use his middle name out of fear he might jeopardize his case. ''As a soldier, I understand the need to protect the country. But to completely shut the doors . . . it's just plain wrong.''

MILLIONS OF AFRICANS NOW BANNED: 'WE ARE NOT CRIMINALS'

Trump's January order builds on the 2017 travel ban that has continued to target five Muslim-majority countries, and significantly restricts permanent residency for nationals from Eritrea, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria and Myanmar. It also blocks people from Tanzania and Sudan from obtaining green cards through the ''diversity visa'' lottery.

Just like the 2017 restrictions, it blocks permanent immigration from the targeted countries, making limited exceptions if applicants prove that denials would cause ''undue hardship'' and that granting them visas would support ''national interest''.

The original ban already resulted in denied visas for more than 42,000 people, the majority from Iran. The addition of the new countries has doubled the number of Muslims targeted across the globe to roughly 320 million, advocates estimate. Roughly one-quarter of all Africans are now affected. The restrictions now apply to 13 countries, including Nigeria, home to Africa's largest population and economy. It cuts off countries where some are fleeing violence. Some estimate the new ban, which goes into effect on 21 February, could hinder more than 12,000 immigrants seeking to resettle in the US and reunite with family in the next year.

The restrictions are a signature component of Trump's aggressive anti-immigrant agenda, which has included curbs on legal migration, a destruction of theAmerican asylum system, an all-time low cap on refugees, expanded detention and mass deportations.

''Trump started out by scapegoating Muslims in 2017,'' said Javeria Jamil, attorney with Asian Americans Advancing Justice's Asian Law Caucus, who has been fielding calls from families affected by the new ban. ''Now, it's not just the Muslim ban. It has turned into an African ban.''

The Trump administration has claimed that the ban, which blindsided some diplomats, is a national security measure, and that the added countries failed to meet US security and information-sharing standards.

But immigrant rights groups said the policy is a political maneuver amid Trump's reelection campaign—and one that will have profound consequences.

''People are in turmoil,'' said Audu Kadiri, a 43-year-old community organizer who left Nigeria in 2014. He had planned to bring his mother to the US, but the ban may make that impossible. The activist, who now lives in the Bronx, hasn't yet told his mother about Trump's order, because he doesn't know how to break the news. ''There is so much collateral damage, it's hard to quantify.''

In Nigeria, Kadiri was an LGBTQ+ rights advocate who worked on HIV prevention and other human rights issues. He was forced to flee due to his activism and sought asylum in the US. It's now unsafe for him to return to Nigeria, which is why he wants his 68-year-old mother to come to the US.

He hasn't seen her since 2014 and, if Trump is re-elected, he fears it will be at least another five years before they reunite. She'll probably miss the birth of his third child.

''Nigerians have contributed to the development of this country, like every immigrant community,'' he said. ''We are not criminals.''

TORN APART, WITH DWINDLING OPTIONS

Before the January announcement, the Trump administration had already clamped down on travel from Africa, including hikes in visa fees, and new obstacles and increased denials for Nigerians seeking approval for short-term visits. The US further suspended visitor visas from Eritrea in 2017.

That means families have been fighting for years to use the dwindling avenues available to them to reunite, and for those who have invested significant time and money into the process, the sudden news of an outright ban was particularly brutal.

''There's nothing you can do, and it makes you feel so helpless,'' said Olumide, the veteran. Olumide arrived in the US from Nigeria when he was 10 years old. He met his wife in Nigeria in 2012 after he left the military, and the two got married last year.

US Citizenship and Immigration Services approved the petition for his wife and daughter in January, just before the announcement of the ban. But they don't yet have their visas—and the ban may make it impossible to get them.

Olumide had hoped they would be starting their lives together in the US by now, and said he was pained by feelings of guilt: ''I made promises to her.'' The couple hasn't fully processed the news, he added: ''We don't want to think about not being together.''

He noted that his daughter has typhoid and his wife has malaria, and he constantly fears for their health and safety.

Hana Mohamed, a 20-year-old student in San Diego, who grew up in Sudan, said she was eager for her grandparents to come to the US, especially so her grandmother could get medical care in California: ''It's just so sad and frustrating. They are getting older, and I want to see them before anything happens.''

Mohamed said it was difficult to accept that the US was banning large groups of Muslims in the name of safety while seeming to do little about the ongoing terror threat of American mass shootings: ''It's just so shocking that we have come to this day where a whole nation of people are getting discriminated against. Isn't the purpose of the United States to stand up for everyone who is getting hurt and treat them right?''

One Eritrean American who works as an engineer in Silicon Valley, and requested anonymity for fear of hurting his family's case, has petitioned for his mother to come live with him in the US and was hoping she would soon get an interview date at the embassy. Then the new ban was unveiled.

''We've waited our turn. We've followed the law. I'm a tax-paying citizen contributing to the economy,'' he said, noting that his mother is 69 years old and lives alone in Eritrea. ''This is just pure evil.''

He said he felt Trump was implementing the ban as a ''soundbite for the campaign'' while disregarding that it would leave Eritreans like his mother with no options: ''This was our only hope to get her here.''

For Eritreans, the ban comes as as the Trump administration has ramped up deportations of Eritrean asylum seekers, despite the US government's own acknowledgment of the torture and arbitrary detention Eritreans are currently facing.

Abraham Zere, an Eritrean journalist who was granted asylum in the US and now lives in Ohio, said it seemed some Eritreans were reluctant to speak out about the ban and live in fear of potential repercussions from both governments: ''People are scared to even discuss it.''

Zere's own family is affected: his mother is still in Eritrea, separated from her children. She can't even video chat with her family because of the poor internet in Eritrea, which means she never gets to see her granddaughter, an eight-year-old she hasn't yet met, he said.

Some warn the ban may have life-or-death consequences. For queer and transgender migrants in the targeted countries, it could lead them to embark on perilous journeys to escape to the US as they run out of options, said Zack Mohamed, who is Somali American and a member of the Black LGBTQIA+ Migrant Project: ''This is a big 'not welcome' sign in front of our faces.''

In response to questions about the impact on migrants fleeing violence, a US state department spokesperson said the ban was not meant to ''limit the ability of an individual to seek asylum'', adding: ''Our first priority remains national security. We continue to work with our dedicated consular officers in the field to identify and expedite those individuals with urgent travel needs.''

Asked about charges that the ban is discriminatory, the spokesperson said the restrictions are based on ''nationality'' and ''visa category'' and that ''consular officers do not adjudicate based on religion''. The spokesperson said there were specific criteria to determine which countries are restricted and noted that Chad was on the original list but removed in 2018.

FIGHTING TO END THE BAN

With the first travel ban upheld by the US supreme court, there are few recourses left to challenge the policy. Advocates are hoping a Democratic president will immediately repeal the ban and have also recently renewed the push for Congress to pass the No Ban Act, which would end the ban and prevent discriminatory immigration policies.

Until then, Trump will continue to use his executive power to try to redefine what it means to be a citizen, advocates warned.

''The president of the United States, the US government is explicitly trying to decide who gets to be an American,'' said Eric Naing, who is Burmese American and works with Muslim Advocates, a group that has challenged the ban. His family would not have been able to come to the US if the ban on Myanmar had been in place. ''He's saying I shouldn't be American. My parents shouldn't be American. It's deeply upsetting.''

Olumide noted that the ban was punishing countless American citizens like him: ''It's hurting the exact people you're trying to protect.''

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the President's travel ban isn't just bad policy, it is cruel. And it is tearing families apart.

That includes veterans who have served our Nation, some of whom were in the middle of the process of bringing their families to America when this policy came down. Now they worry their loved ones may never be able to join them here in the United States, all because of a completely arbitrary Muslim ban.

One veteran said in this piece, ''As a soldier, I understand the need to protect the country. But to completely shut the doors . . . it's just plain wrong.''

These veterans aren't trying to endanger our country, Madam Speaker, they put their lives on the line to protect it. But this is the kind of real-life impact we are seeing. The President's ban is not just offensive, it is actively separating loved ones, including those who have served this country on the battlefield. I mean, it is time to say: ''Enough.''

My friends like to talk about how they support our troops and our veterans. Well, this policy is adversely impacting so many of our veterans.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a February 2, 2020, New York Times article, titled, ''New U.S. Travel Ban Shuts Door on Africa's Biggest Economy, Nigeria.''

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 2020]

NEW U.S. TRAVEL BAN SHUTS DOOR ON AFRICA'S BIGGEST ECONOMY, NIGERIA

(By Ruth Maclean and Abdi Latif Dahir)

The newlyweds had already been apart for half their yearlong marriage. Miriam Nwegbe was in Nigeria. Her husband was in Baltimore, and until she could join him, everything was on hold: finding a home together, trying for their first baby, becoming an American family.

Then, on Friday, their lives were thrown into disarray by the expansion of President Trump's ban on immigration to include six new countries, including four in Africa. Nigeria, the continent's most populous nation, was one of them.

''America has killed me,'' Ms. Nwegbe's husband, Ikenna, an optometrist, texted her when he heard. ''We are finished.''

A year after the Trump administration announced that a major pillar of its new strategy for Africa was to counter the growing influence of China and Russia by expanding economic ties to the continent, it slammed the door shut on Nigeria, the continent's biggest economy.

The travel restrictions also apply to three other African countries—Sudan, Tanzania, and Eritrea—as well as to Myanmar, which is accused of genocide against its Muslim population, and Kyrgyzstan, a former Soviet state.

The ban will prevent thousands of people from being able to move to the United States.

The initial ban, which was put into effect in 2017, restricted travel from some Muslim-majority countries as part of Mr. Trump's plan to keep out ''radical Islamic terrorists.'' It has already affected more than 135 million people—many of them Christians—from seven countries.

With the new expansion, the ban will affect nearly a quarter of the 1.2 billion people on the African continent, according to W. Gyude Moore, a visiting fellow at the Center for Global Development, a research group, potentially taking a heavy toll on African economies—and on America's image in the region.

''Chinese, Turkish, Russian, and British firms, backed by their governments, are staking positions on a continent that will define the global economy's future,'' he said, adding, ''One hopes that the United States would follow suit and fully engage with the continent—but that hope fades.''

The rationale for the new restrictions varies depending on country, but the White House announcement said that most of the six countries added to the list did not comply with identity-verification and information-sharing rules.

And Nigeria, it said, posed a risk of harboring terrorists who may seek to enter the United States. The country has been hit brutally by the Islamist group Boko Haram, though the extremists have shown little sign that they have the capability to export their fight overseas.

Critics, many of whom also denounced the initial ban, saw something far more venal at play.

''Trump's travel bans have never been rooted in national security—they're about discriminating against people of color,'' Senator Kamala Harris, the former Democratic presidential candidate, declared on Sunday. ''They are, without a doubt, rooted in anti-immigrant, white supremacist ideologies.''

Two Democrats still in the race also weighed in. Elizabeth Warren described the measure as a ''racist, xenophobic Muslim ban.'' Former Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr. called it ''a disgrace.''

And Nancy Pelosi, the house speaker, said Democratic lawmakers would push ahead with a measure to forbid religious discrimination in immigration policy.

Beyond those people who may now never make it across American borders, the new ban could also affect millions who have no plans to travel to the United States themselves but may have benefited from the billions of dollars in remittances visa holders send home each year.

The United States may also emerge a loser, studies suggest. Nigerians are among the most successful and highly educated immigrants to America. (Mr. Trump, demanding to know why immigration policies did not favor people from countries like Norway, once disparaged those from Africa and Haiti, and said Nigerians would never go back to their ''huts'' if they were allowed in.)

Hadiza Aliyu lives in Borno, the Nigerian state at the epicenter of the Boko Haram crisis that has left tens of thousands dead. But she thought she had found a way out.

Ms. Aliyu was preparing to apply to move to the United States, where she once studied and where her two brothers live.

She was furious when she heard about the extended ban.

''Trump has been looking for a way to get at us Africans for a very long time, and finally got us,'' Ms. Aliyu said. ''To hell with Republicans and their supremacist ideas.''

Mika Moses moved to Minnesota from Nigeria nine years ago to join his mother and siblings, who were allowed entry after the family was attacked in religious riots in their northern city of Kaduna in 1991. His wife, Juliet, and their daughter were planning to join him, but are stuck in Kaduna, where Ms. Moses sells soda in a small store.

She said they were heartbroken by the news that the move would now be impossible.

''I have been struggling to raise our daughter alone,'' she said. ''Why would Trump do this to us, after we have waited for nine years?''

Nigerians already living in the United States have been calling lawyers to try to figure out whether they will have to leave. Marilyn Eshikena, a biomedical research ethicist, has lived in the United States for the past seven years, but her visa expires this year. Her employer sponsored her application for a green card.

''If it turns out that everything needs to stop, they will feel cheated, because they spent a lot of money on this process,'' Ms. Eshikena said. ''I will also feel cheated, because all the time that I spent working here will ultimately be for nothing. I can't even imagine what packing up and leaving will mean for me.''

Her departure may also have serious consequences for her brother, who is studying in Canada. Ms. Eshikena has been sending part of her earnings to help pay his rent.

Some Nigerians praised Mr. Trump for his decision, arguing it might make it more difficult for those responsible for stealing government money back home to find cover in the United States, and force the country's leaders to be more honest and work harder to develop Nigeria.

In 2018, 7,922 immigrant visas were issued to Nigerians. Of these, 4,525 went to the immediate relatives of American citizens, and another 2,820 to other family members. An estimated 345,000 people born in Nigeria were living in the United States in 2017, according to the census bureau.

If the visas are coveted in Nigeria, they are just as prized in African countries like Eritrea, where government repression is rampant and those who try to leave face obstacles and danger. With more than 500,000 refugees living outside the country, Eritrea was the ninth-largest source of refugees in the world in 2018, according to the United Nations, but fewer than 900 Eritreans received immigrant visas to the United States that year.

Abraham Zere, a journalist who moved to the United States from Eritrea in 2012, had dreamed of living in the same country as his mother since leaving home. On Saturday, he said his plans to bring her to the United States had been thrown into disarray. His family has been in constant communication on the messaging platform WhatsApp trying to understand what the ban will mean for them.

''This decision complicates everything and creates fear,'' said Mr. Zere, 37, a doctoral candidate at the School of Media Arts and Studies at Ohio University.

Mr. Zere and other Eritreans say they can't go back. They fear they will be punished for criticizing the government or leaving without approval.

''If I can't be reunited with my mother,'' Mr. Zere said, ''it nullifies the whole notion of protection and punishes innocent citizens for reasons they had no slightest part in.''

With nine siblings scattered across Europe, Africa, and the United States, Mr. Zere said their family has never had a full family portrait taken.

The economic consequences of the ban could be far-reaching, experts said.

''Being cut off from the largest economy in the world systematically is problematic,'' said Nonso Obikili, a Nigerian economist.

The biggest impact, he said, could be on remittances.

Nigerians abroad send home billions of dollars each year, $24 billion in 2018 alone, according to the accounting firm PwC. With Nigeria's economy highly dependent on oil and its unemployment rate at 23 percent, this money provides a lifeline for millions of its citizens.

The new restrictions come at a time when the United States says it wants to jockey for power in Africa, particularly through its ''Prosper Africa'' initiative announced last summer, which aims to double two-way trade and investment.

''If on the one hand you're trying to make a push into Africa, and on the other hand you're barring the largest African country by population from moving to your country, then it does send mixed signals,'' Mr. Obikili said.

In January 2017, Mr. Trump's travel ban targeted several other African nations, including Chad, Libya, and Somalia. Chad was later removed from that list, but the executive order halted the plans of thousands of Somali refugees living in camps in Kenya who were about to travel to the United States and start new lives.

According to the United States Department of Homeland Security, nearly 30,000 Nigerians overstayed their nonimmigrant visas in 2018. The number of Nigerians visiting the United States dropped sharply after the Trump administration made it harder for visitors to obtain visas last summer.

The new restrictions affect those who want to move to the United States, not visit it.

The six countries newly added to the immigration ban are not easily categorized together by religion. Nigeria, for example is thought to be home to more than 200 million people, roughly half of them Muslim and half Christian. Of the four African countries

newly singled out, only Sudan has a significant majority of Muslims.

The United States has left Sudan on a list of state sponsors of terrorism, even as the country works to reverse decades of authoritarian rule under President Omar Hassan al-Bashir, who was deposed in April.

''This ban contributes to the overall impression that Sudan remains a very fragile state,'' said Cameron Hudson, a senior fellow with the Atlantic Council, a research group.

Many people from the countries newly targeted by the ban said the uncertainty was the hardest thing to bear. Ms. Nwegbe, the newlywed, who works as the chief operating officer of a tourism company that tries to encourage people to visit Africa, said the ban came as she and her husband were building their future.

''We're in limbo and our relationship is suffering,'' she said. ''This is unnecessary hardship.''

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the President's ban is not about national security, it is about targeting immigrants from predominantly Muslim countries.

In 2017, the President issued an executive order that banned foreign nationals from seven Muslim-majority countries from entering the United States. Then earlier this year, he went even further, expanding the travel ban to six more countries.

This is affecting over 300 million people on the African Continent and refugees from Myanmar, where the Muslim minority is facing a genocide—genocide, Madam Speaker.

This administration is closing the door on the very people who are struggling to survive. That is not the America that I know. That is not an American value. We need to act to defend our values.

Madam Speaker, I just want to point out to my colleagues that what is in place right now, what this White House has done, I think by any objective or reasonable measure, is wrong. It reflects badly on who we are as a country. It is not just. It is not fair. It is so wrong.

And we all—I don't care what our political persuasion may be, I don't care whether you support the President in his reelection bid or not—I mean, we have to do what is right for our country. This is doing great damage to who we are. It represents the kind of closed-mindedness, and the kind of bigotry that we should all be fighting against.

Madam Speaker, I hope my friends will vote for the rule and vote for this legislation. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. And I apologize if I jumped ahead in any way, shape, or form. I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Madam Speaker, with all that is going on this week, Democrats have still found time for their favorite pastime, voting on partisan legislation that would actually make our country weaker.

Democrats could not have picked a worse week to try to undermine American travel restrictions.

President Trump's quick decision to restrict travel to countries like Iran and China; now that was smart. It was a smart response, and it is helping to keep America safe. The President's actions, then and now, are clearly within his rights.

But today, I want to talk about the rights of this Congress, of this body, and how Democrats want to take those away.

For the second time this Congress, the House is considering two important pieces of legislation by attaching them to completely unrelated shell vehicles, thereby preventing the minority from offering a motion to recommit.

Now, the last time this occurred, Representative RO KHANNA actually admitted the maneuver was intentionally designed to silence dissenting opinions. He didn't just admit it, he bragged about it, that they would be able to deny the voice of Congress.

And now, with last week's passage of the sixth motion to recommit this Congress, Democrat leadership is once again choosing to restrict debate on an issue of national security. It is not only that this is bad for America, it is bad for the tradition of fairness and free debate that, you know what, Democrats promised to uphold.

Don't take my word for it. I listened to my friend, Chairman MCGOVERN of the Rules Committee say, in September 2018, and I quote, Madam Speaker, he boasted on this very floor: ''If Democrats are trusted with the majority, we will have a more accommodating process. This place will be run like professionals. Ideas will be allowed to come forward, and the House of Representatives will actually debate again.''

If there is one thing we know about this Democrat majority, it is that they overpromise and under-deliver. Today is no exception.

The right that Democrats want to take away is an important right, maybe one of the most important in all of Congress. It is the last chance for a minority party to offer amendments on legislation. It is called the motion to recommit.

As you know, the motion to recommit has been a hallmark of the House for more than 100 years. It was created to give the minority party the right ''to have a vote upon its position upon great public questions.''

I have got to be very clear. Eliminating this would be a nuclear option.

That is why I sent a letter—actually two letters—to Democrat leadership to stop this madness. Unfortunately, my last letter to Leader HOYER on this subject went unanswered, so did my letter this week to Leader HOYER and Chairman MCGOVERN.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD both of the letters at this time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 27, 2020.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Majority Leader of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER HOYER: I am writing to request that you suspend consideration of this week's Iran-related legislation until basic and essential rights of the minority are observed.

As we both can agree, the decision to go to war is the most significant choice Congress can make, followed only by impeachment. No matter what one thinks of the 2002 AUMF, there are weighty consequences—both real and symbolic—when the House debates overturning military authorization and possibly cutting funding for American troops serving in a volatile theater. I would hope that such an extraordinary step would be taken with a careful eye towards promoting full and thorough deliberation.

Unfortunately, the manner in which you intend to bring these measures to the floor is anything but full and thorough. Specifically, by attaching these items to an unrelated Gold Medal bill, you purposefully eliminated the last opportunity afforded to the minority party to amend legislation—the Motion to Recommit—a maneuver Representative Ro Khanna recently admitted was intentionally designed to silence dissenting opinions.

Simply put, this is wrong—and I believe you know it to be in bad faith. In fact, we are unaware of the House ever debating matters of war and peace in such an unprecedented, irregular, and restrictive way.

From its inception in 1909, the Motion to Recommit was created with the stated purpose of giving the minority party the right ''to have a vote upon its position upon great public questions.'' Certainly, the issue before us this week meets the standard of a great public question.

More recently, you, yourself, stated: ''More members, from across the ideological spectrum, need to have input into the work we do.'' I would respectfully ask that we strive towards that standard and immediately remedy this overreach so the minority may be allowed to offer input on the legislation before us, as has been tradition for over one hundred years in the House.

It had been my hope that in this new year. we would begin to move on from the numerous abuses or power we witnessed on the part of the House majority during the impeachment proceedings. If, however, we can no longer count on fundamental safeguards to minority rights being guaranteed, I fear your decision this week will only serve to further erode trust, fairness, and comity in this institution moving forward.

I look forward to your response on this critical matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House Republican Leader.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2020.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Majority Leader of the House,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM MCGOVERN,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules,
Washington, DC.

LEADER HOYER AND CHAIRMAN MCGOVERN: I am writing to request that you suspend consideration of this week's Judiciary legislation until basic and essential rights of the minority are fairly observed.

For now the second time this Congress, it appears the House will consider two pieces of legislation by attaching them to a completely unrelated shell vehicle, thereby precluding the minority from offering a motion to recommit.

The last time this occurred, Representative Ro Khanna admitted the maneuver was intentionally designed to silence dissenting opinions. Coming on the heels of the 6th motion to recommit being adopted this Congress, it serves to reason that Democrat Leadership is once again willfully choosing to restrict debate, rather than promote a full and thorough deliberation of these measures.

My last letter to Leader Hoyer on this subject regrettably went unanswered. Given the gravity of this new precedent you are setting for our institution, I believe all members deserve a public response to the following questions:

Will you commit to ending this practice, which has been pursued without any consultation or sign-off from our side of the aisle?

If not, are you contemplating using any Republican-sponsored vehicles in this ploy, which presumably would be done without their approval?

What is the status of the request by freshmen Democrats to consider ending the use of the motion to recommit entirely?

As you both know, the motion to recommit has been a hallmark of the House for over one hundred years. It was created with the stated purpose of giving the minority party the right ''to have a vote upon its position upon great public questions.''

In my view, eliminating the motion to recommit would be akin to the ''nuclear option'' in the House. I sincerely believe neither of you seeks to have that ignominious distinction on your resumes. However, your actions thus far in the 116th Congress sadly do not inspire confidence.

Though we may not serve in the majority at present, our members still represent millions of Americans across the country who lend us their voice and count on us to fight for their priorities in Washington. In that spirit, I would respectfully ask that we not proceed on these measures until the minority is allowed to offer meaningful input on the matters before us through a motion to recommit, as has been tradition in the House since 1909.

We look forward to your response on this critical matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House Republican Leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I believe the Members of this House deserve a public response about this situation. Will Democrats commit to ending this abusive practice, or do they plan to follow the lead of their freshmen and end the use of the motion to recommit entirely, to end a 100-year history of the body of this House?

MTRs not only promote full and thorough deliberation, but they also improve legislation. Think for a moment, just within this Congress, 6 out of 60 MTRs have been adopted by this Congress. Think about that.

That means a bipartisan majority of this House felt the need to improve 10 percent of the bills put forward on which MTRs were offered. That should show you how vital the last amendment is and always should be.

Madam Speaker, though we may not serve in the majority right now, our Members still represent millions of Americans who lend us their voice and count on us to fight for their priorities in Washington.

Madam Speaker, the last 8 years this House had a different majority. I happened to have the privilege of serving as majority leader. Not once did we ever consider taking away the MTR, because we believed in the minority's rights and the traditions of the institution in which we are privileged to serve.

We believed that the power of the idea should win. We believed in the promises that we made and that is why we kept them. We would not make promises while in the minority, and when we captured the majority, in less than a year, break them time and again. We would not go unanswered, a question from the minority as well.

There is something bigger than politics. It is the voice of the American public—to use the sheer power of politics to silence millions of Americans is just wrong; to change a tradition that has been around more than 100 years; to make sure a bill cannot become better simply because you want the partisan side; or to be so afraid of the debate to deny it to happen, we are so much better than that—the rights and the traditions of this institution in which we have always been privileged to serve. I wish I could say the same for this new Democrat majority.

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

Madam Speaker, I just want to remind the distinguished minority leader that in the last Congress my Republican friends used this exact same process 15 times, and it ended up denying us a motion to recommit.

But I also want to say, I don't need any lectures about how this House should be run from the distinguished gentleman from California. I remind my friends on both sides of the aisle that in the last Congress when the Republicans were in charge, it was the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America.

No other Congress in our history had more closed rules where Members were denied the ability to offer anything on the House floor. And my friends somehow take that as a great sign of—I don't want to go back to those days.

Madam Speaker, I will just say one other thing. The distinguished minority leader made the statement that somehow this bill that we are trying to bring forward somehow would make this country less safe.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article that appeared in the New York Times, titled ''Trump's Travel Ban, Aimed at Terrorists, has Blocked Doctors.''

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 2017]

TRUMP'S TRAVEL BAN, AIMED AT TERRORISTS, HAS BLOCKED DOCTORS

(By Donald G. McNeil Jr.)

The Trump administration has mounted a vigorous defense of its ban on travel from seven majority-Muslim nations, saying it is necessary to prevent terrorists from entering the United States. But the ban, now blocked by a federal judge, also ensnared travelers important to the well-being of many Americans: doctors.

Foreign-born physicians have become crucial to the delivery of medical care in the United States. They work in small towns where there are no other doctors, in poor urban neighborhoods and in Veterans Affairs hospitals.

Foreign-born physicians ''are the doctors in small towns in Maine and Iowa,'' said Dr. Patricia F. Walker, the associate director of the University of Minnesota's Global Health Pathway, which helps refugee doctors practice in the United States.

''They go to the places where graduates of Harvard Medical School don't want to go,'' she said.

Across the United States, more than 15,000 doctors are from the seven Muslim-majority countries covered by the travel ban, according to The Medicus Firm, a firm that recruits doctors for hard-to-fill jobs. That includes almost 9,000 from Iran, almost 3,500 from Syria and more than 1,500 from Iraq.

Dr. Hooman Parsi, an oncologist so talented that he has an O–1 visa granted to individuals with ''extraordinary ability or achievement,'' was to start seeing patients on Wednesday in San Bernardino, Calif.

A federal judge in Seattle lifted the administration's travel ban on Friday, and a federal appeals court has declined to restore it. Yet Dr. Parsi is still stuck in Iran, waiting for a delayed visa amid the confusion while his American employer fumes.

''We need him desperately,'' said Dr. Richy Agajanian, the managing partner of the Oncology Institute of Hope and Innovation, which had just hired him. ''We had an office completely constructed—we spent three months on it, and it was supposed to open Feb. 1. Now we can't open it. This is really sad and frustrating.''

The 30-doctor practice does a lot of work in the Inland Empire, in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, Dr. Agajanian noted. ''It's very sparse in doctors out there—many miles between oncologists,'' he said. ''The patients he would be seeing have to travel another 25 miles now. Our doctors are already overworked, and now they'll have to be on call more often.''

The United States has a persistent doctor shortage, even though 31 new medical schools have opened since 2002 and many existing ones have increased class sizes, according to Merritt Hawkins, a Dallas-based medical recruiting firm.

It also noted that there are 22 percent more residencies available each year than there are American graduates to take them. Graduates of foreign medical schools now fill that gap; the largest number come from India, followed by Pakistan, China, the Philippines, Iran and Israel.

(Iran is on Mr. Trump's exclusion list; Pakistan, a Muslim-majority country with a history of internal and external terror attacks, is not.)

Many foreign graduates have J–1 visas, which give them about three years to complete their residencies. ''They must pass licensing exams and they must do a residency to practice here, even if they're superstars where they come from,'' said Phillip Miller, a Merritt Hawkins spokesman.

Foreign-born graduates have often worked at world-class institutions and have published academic papers, so they have higher average scores than American graduates on the medical knowledge portions of the licensing examinations, according to Merritt Hawkins research—though most initially score lower on the clinical skills portions, which include English and communication skills.

''I had to work my butt off to get here,'' said Dr. Abdelghani el Rafei, a first-year resident at the University of Minnesota. ''They only take the top graduates from schools in countries like mine.''

Such foreign-born graduates must return home when their visas expire, but they can get extensions if they agree to work in an area that the Department of Health and Human Services considers ''medically underserved,'' which is roughly defined as having less than one primary care doctor for every 3,000 people.

Those who practice in an underserved area for several years can apply for green cards. ''After that, they can practice anywhere, but at least you've had three or four years of a physician in your town, and that's pretty significant,'' Mr. Miller said.

Citing figures from the Iowa Board of Medicine, The Des Moines Register reported last week that 172 doctors practicing in Iowa were from the seven countries subject to Mr. Trump's travel ban, and that 23 percent of the state's 13,000 practicing doctors were born outside the United States.

Andrea Clement, a spokeswoman for Medicus, said that 76 percent of the foreign doctors it placed last year had gone to areas with fewer than 25,000 people or to small to medium-size cities of 25,000 to 500,000.

It placed more foreign doctors in Wisconsin than in any other state, she said, followed by California, Texas, Maryland, Oregon, Missouri, Tennessee, Ohio and Arizona.

Some urban areas are medically underserved, too. While Manhattan's Upper East Side has five times the number of doctors it needs to be adequately served under federal guidelines, parts of the Bronx and Brooklyn have acute doctor shortages.

More than 150,000 residents of Brooklyn's Bedford-Stuyvesant section, for example, are rated as medically underserved under federal guidelines. One of the doctors stranded overseas last week, according to Pro Publica, was Dr. Kamal Fadlalla, an internal medicine specialist from Sudan who is a second-year resident at Interfaith Medical Center, which serves Bedford-Stuyvesant and Crown Heights.

Many foreign-born doctors, experts said, go into family medicine, pediatrics, internal medicine, general surgery and other frontline specialties where they see thousands of patients a year, including many on Medicare and Medicaid, rather than pursuing lucrative urban specialties like plastic surgery.

As an oncologist, Dr. Parsi was an exception. He moved to the United States in 2007 for postdoctoral work in molecular biology. Then, after passing his medical exam, he completed his residency at the University of Cincinnati and a fellowship in hematology and oncology at the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center.

Because he had to leave the country to get his new visa stamped into his passport, he had flown to Dubai, in the United Arab Emirates. He cleared a security vetting there, he said, but had to wait a few days for the visa, so he flew to Tehran to see his father.

But the new court ruling affects only those who had current visa stamps in their passport, so even though he is being issued a new visa, he still cannot return to the United States, he said on Saturday.

''Everyone, including me, would like to keep the bad people out,'' said Dr. Naeem Moulki, a Syrian citizen who is finishing his medical residency in Minneapolis and plans to begin a cardiology fellowship in Chicago in the fall. ''But this is not the best way to do it. If I have to leave, it affects my patients.''

Dr. El Rafei said that the ban, which means he cannot go home to see his family, had depressed him.

''I felt like I was back in Syria again,'' he said. ''You feel hunted there, as if you did something wrong, even if you didn't. Now I feel the same way here.''

He sees patients one day a week at the V.A. Hospital in Minneapolis, where he is sometimes asked where he is from.

''One of my patients, he was a veteran in his 60s, said to me, 'Why do you people hate us?' '' he said. ''I told him about Syria. I said: 'We don't hate you. The bad people you see on TV are the same people who make us suffer, too.' ''

''I love this country,'' he added. ''There's a time in our residency when we can work in Africa or someplace. I want to work in a small American town, to show people that we're not all bad. The U.S. gives us a lot, so we want to give back what we can.''

Correction: Feb. 6, 2017

An earlier version of this article misattributed a quotation about the preparation necessary for a foreign doctor to get work in the United States. It was said by Dr. Abdelghani el Rafei, a first-year resident at the University of Minnesota, not Dr. Naeem Moulki, a Syrian citizen who is finishing his medical residency in Minneapolis.

Correction: Feb. 25, 2017

An article on Feb. 6 about the effect of the Trump administration's ban on travel from seven majority-Muslim nations on foreign-born doctors in the United States described incorrectly the physicians seeing patients in rural settings. Forty-two percent of doctor visits in these areas are handled by family physicians, not by foreign-born physicians. (The figure for foreign-born physicians is not known.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. It says: ''Foreign-born physicians have become crucial to the delivery of medical care in the United States. They work in small towns where there are no other doctors, in poor urban neighborhoods and in Veterans' Affairs hospitals.''

It also says: ''Across the United States, more than 15,000 doctors are from the seven Muslim-majority countries covered by the travel ban, according to The Medicus Firm, a firm that recruits doctors for hard-to-fill jobs. That includes almost 9,000 from Iran, almost 3,500 from Syria, and more than 1,500 from Iraq.''

I didn't hear a single word about that. I didn't hear a single word about how denying doctors the ability to come here is somehow in our national interest. Not a single word objecting to the hate-filled rhetoric coming out of this White House denigrating Muslims.

We have a President who bragged about trying to put in place a Muslim ban. I mean, we have a lot of talk on this floor about the need for religious freedom and to speak out against discrimination against individuals based on their religion, and yet, not a word about that.

So, what we are doing by bringing these bills to the floor, we are standing up for American values, we are rejecting bigotry, we are rejecting hate, we are rejecting intolerance.

Madam Speaker, I hope all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support our effort.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, my dear friend raised an issue that is very interesting, because he knows this. At any time that it was used it was in consultation with the minority. Even when it was taken away, you know what we did, we added back an amendment so you could have the debate on the floor. It was only during appropriations consultation with you to be able to move something in a timely manner. He understands that.

Madam Speaker, my only question to my friend on the other side is: Will the gentleman answer the letter? When the minority leader of the House sent the Rules Committee chairman a letter—the simple question is—with three simple questions: Will the gentleman take this opportunity to answer the letter? That is all I ask.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished minority leader's question. I would just say to him that the letter that he referred to, I read about it in the press. I didn't receive it until last night.

I will also say to him, again, this consultation that he talks about is something that none of us have any recollection of.

In fact, I remember when the Republicans hijacked the Democratic bill to basically deny us a motion to recommit. We were never consulted about that.

I would simply say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that this is about whether or not we are going to stand and tolerate a policy that I think by any measure is bigoted and, quite frankly, undermines our values.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

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

We have obviously had a heated debate today, and it has been interesting. Of course, we disagree on a number of things.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will amend the rule to immediately bring to the floor Leader MCCARTHY's bill, H.R. 6177, which would require Members of Congress to disclose delinquent tax liabilities and wage garnishments.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) to further explain the amendment and the leader's bill.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

As my friend said, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer H.R. 6177. Leader MCCARTHY's bill, H.R. 6177, is simple. It requires Members of Congress to disclose unpaid tax liabilities

and garnishments in their annual financial disclosure reports.

As we approach tax season, where, under a penalty of fine or prison, we expect every American to file their taxes, those same hardworking Americans deserve to know whether their Representatives are doing the same.

And, like the American public, if a Member of this body fails to meet their tax obligations, my bill requires their pay be placed into escrow until their tax obligation is met. This is responsible governing that informs the public and holds all of us accountable.

The House should advance this legislation today.

This bill falls under the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration, and, as ranking member, I am prepared to work with the Chief Administrative Officer to execute this legislation. Also, as ranking member of the committee, I have seen legislation run through this committee that tried to use the tax dollars of hardworking Americans to fund their own congressional campaigns. Every member of the majority in this room, in this Chamber, cosponsored that bill when it was introduced.

This 6-to-1 small dollar match of campaign dollars would have created a mandatory donation from the American taxpayer to each congressional candidate, meaning, for every $200 donated to a campaign, the Federal Government—the taxpayers—would give $1,200 to that Member of Congress' campaign.

Imagine if every Member of Congress—not counting all the candidates in each congressional race, just the current 435 Members—received just $1 million in matched funds from the Federal Government, from the taxpayers. That is close to half a billion dollars going just to the campaigns, the political coffers of Members of Congress.

If it is the position of the majority party to force Americans to support politicians with their tax dollars and raise the taxes of hardworking families, we should at least let those same Americans know which of us in this body are even paying their own taxes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. In addition to the NO BAN bill, there is also a War Powers Resolution bill that will be made in order if this rule passes.

I include in the RECORD a February 14 New York Times article, titled: ''White House Memo Justifying Suleimani Strike Cites No Imminent Threat.''

[From The New York Times, Feb. 14, 2020]

WHITE HOUSE MEMO JUSTIFYING SULEIMANI STRIKE CITES NO IMMINENT THREAT

(By Catie Edmondson)

WASHINGTON.—The White House told Congress on Friday that President Trump authorized the strike last month that killed Iran's most important general to respond to attacks that had already taken place and deter future ones, contradicting the president's claim that he acted in response to an imminent threat.

In a legally mandated, two-page unclassified memo to lawmakers, the White House asserted that the strike that killed Maj. Gen. Qassim Suleimani was ''in response to an escalating series of attacks in preceding months'' by Iran and Iran-backed militias.

''The purposes of this action were to protect United States personnel, to deter Iran from conducting or supporting further attacks against United States forces and interests, to degrade Iran's and Quds Force-backed militias's ability to conduct attacks, and to end Iran's strategic escalation of attacks,'' said the report, which was transmitted on Friday to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The document confirmed what lawmakers had privately suspected as the Trump administration has offered a shifting set of justifications for the strike against General Suleimani in Baghdad—taken with no congressional consultation—which brought the United States and Iran to the brink of war.

''This official report directly contradicts the president's false assertion that he attacked Iran to prevent an imminent attack against United States personnel and embassies,'' Representative Eliot L. Engel of New York, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, said in a statement. ''The administration's explanation in this report makes no mention of any imminent threat and shows that the justification the president offered to the American people was false, plain and simple.''

In the days after the strike that killed General Suleimani, administration officials gave a variety of rationales for the action as they confronted questions about why the president undertook such a provocative move that could incite an escalation with a dangerous rival. Mr. Trump and other top officials, including Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, said the strike was conducted in response to imminent threats to American lives, but they declined to provide any evidence, leaving lawmakers in both parties irate.

Pressed over several days, Mr. Pompeo conceded that the United States did not have specific intelligence on where or when an attack would take place. Mr. Trump claimed that four American embassies had been targeted for attacks, but under questioning during a television interview, Mark T. Esper, the secretary of defense, said he had seen no evidence of that.

Mr. Trump later insisted on Twitter that General Suleimani had, in fact, been planning an imminent attack on United States forces, but added, ''it doesn't really matter because of his horrible past!''

Representative Michael McCaul of Texas, the top Republican on the Foreign Affairs Committee, said in a statement that ''U.S. intelligence indicated Soleimani was plotting more attacks on Americans and he was an authorized target in Iraq because of the ongoing threat he posed to Americans there.''

''The administration would have been 'culpably negligent' if they hadn't acted,'' Mr. McCaul said, quoting Gen. Mark A. Milley, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. ''It is unfortunate that Democrats continue to criticize the president for a successful U.S. military strike of this brutal terrorist with American blood on his hands.''

The report on Friday came a day after the Senate passed a resolution aimed at restraining Mr. Trump's war-making powers with Iran. The rare bipartisan vote illustrated the depth of the skepticism in both parties about the president's strategy, and lawmakers' frustration with the administration's refusal to consult Congress on military matters. The House is expected to pass the measure soon, sending it to the president's desk. Mr. Trump's advisers have said he will veto it.

The White House infuriated lawmakers in early January when it sent Congress a formal notification of the drone strikes required under the War Powers Act. Lawmakers had expected it to lay out a legal justification for the strike, but the entire document was classified, and officials who read it said it contained no information on future threats or an imminent attack.

Lawmakers were further angered by a series of briefings delivered by top administration officials that they described as insulting and demeaning, complaining that they were dismissed for questioning the administration's strategy.

Friday's report also only discussed previous acts of aggression by Iran. It cited as a legal framework the president's constitutional powers as commander in chief and the authorization for the use of military force in Iraq that Congress passed in 2002, using two justifications the administration has previously mentioned.

''Iran's past and recent activities, coupled with intelligence at the time of the airstrike, indicated that Iran's Quds force posed a threat to the United States in Iraq,'' the report said.

Congressional Democrats have coalesced behind a new push to repeal the 2002 law, which was passed to authorize a military response to Saddam Hussein and his government. They said Mr. Trump's broad reading of it illustrated how the statute has been stretched and distorted to accommodate missions that Congress never envisioned when it was debated.

''To suggest that 18 years later this authorization could justify killing an Iranian official stretches the law far beyond anything Congress ever intended,'' Mr. Engel said.

The House last month voted to repeal the 2002 law, with lawmakers in both parties arguing that the authorization had become outdated and been abused by presidents as a blank check to circumvent Congress in taking military action. During negotiations on the annual defense policy bill, the White House, focused on creating the Space Force as the sixth branch of military and maintaining the ability to divert military construction funds to pay for the border wall, was initially open to repealing the 2002 law, but the Pentagon intervened.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, Congress has been clear, we did not authorize the President's, in my opinion, reckless actions, nor have we provided any authorization for the use of force against Iran.

What we are hearing from the administration, on the other hand, has been about as clear as mud. Initially, President Trump and other administration officials claimed the January strike was in response to an imminent threat.

Now we have confirmed through a legally mandated report to Congress from the administration that that was not the case.

This report made no mention of imminent threat, confirming the fact that President Trump was legally required to come to Congress for approval before carrying out the strike.

The President may not like it, but the Constitution is clear: The President must seek specific authorization from Congress for any use of force against Iran, period.

And I would just simply say that this shouldn't be controversial because, whether you support the President extending military operations against

Iran or not, we should all agree that Congress has a constitutional responsibility here.

I want to commend my friends in the Senate for passing the Kaine resolution, and I thank the eight Republicans who stood up for the institution and for Congress' constitutional authorities. I point that out, as well, and I hope that my colleagues will support the rule and support the Kaine resolution when it comes up for a vote.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In closing, I urge my Democratic colleagues to bring to the floor border security measures that will help us help those who are truly in danger and in need of asylum. We can all agree these are issues that need to be fixed. Now let's work together for all our constituents to get things fixed.

Madam Speaker, I urge ''no'' on the previous question, ''no'' on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6 minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle want us to get lost on the process, but we can't lose sight of the policy. This is about whether Congress should repeal President Trump's Muslim ban, and we don't agree—I would say, respectfully, to my colleague—on the Rules Committee.

This is about whether we should prevent this administration from putting in place more discriminatory travel bans in the future, whether individuals deserve access to legal advice during the screening process at ports of entry, and whether Congress should vote before any escalation in hostilities with Iran.

That is what is before us in the rule today. These are incredibly important issues. They go to the heart of what America is supposed to be about.

Now, some on the other side are upset that they can't use certain parliamentary procedures to debate all kinds of divisive issues. Instead, they want to make this debate about anything other than the President's reckless foreign policy. I get that, but we are not going to get distracted here.

This President is already looking at expanding his cruel travel ban. His approach abroad is totally unpredictable, and either you are going to stand up for America and stand up for our values, or you are going to stand by the President. That is the choice before us.

For us, the choice is clear. I have constituents who have been adversely impacted, whose lives have been ripped apart by this President's immigration policies. It is heartbreaking. It is not who we are. And, for whatever reason, the President continues down this road of dividing this country along racial lines, along religious lines, I mean, you name it—constant division.

Enough. Enough. We are better than that. We are better than that.

I hope that there is a strong bipartisan vote in support of the No Muslim Ban Act. This is not who we are. We can't let this be who we are.

I strongly urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, when the Committee on Rules filed its report (H. Rept. 116–415) to accompany House Resolution 891, the Committee was unaware that the waiver of all points of order against consideration of the H.R. 6172 included a waiver of Clause 9 of rule XXI, which requires a list of all earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits contained in the measure, or a certification that the measure does not contain any of those items. However, per Chairman SCHIFF's statement submitted for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 11, 2020, the provisions that warranted a referral to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in H.R. 6172 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in Clause 9 of rule XXI.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 891

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 12. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6177) to require Members of Congress to disclose delinquent tax liabilities and wage garnishments, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 13. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6177.

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

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

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 760.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 186, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—226

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

NAYS—186

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meuser
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—17

Beyer
Brownley (CA)
Collins (GA)
Fortenberry
Gaetz
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Lewis
Meadows
Miller
Mullin
Palazzo
Perlmutter
Ratcliffe
Rodgers (WA)
Rooney (FL)
Speier

□ 1348

Mr. KINZINGER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. MOORE changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 188, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—223

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

NAYS—188

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meuser
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—18

Beyer
Biggs
Brownley (CA)
Collins (GA)
Fortenberry
Gaetz
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Lewis
Meadows
Miller
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Palazzo
Ratcliffe
Rooney (FL)
Ruppersberger
Speier

□ 1358

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORT FOR VETERANS IN EFFECTIVE APPRENTICESHIPS ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 760) to enable registered apprenticeship programs to better serve veterans, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—412

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin

Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—17

Beyer
Brownley (CA)
Case
Collins (GA)
Fortenberry
Gaetz
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Lewis
Meadows
Miller
Mullin
Palazzo
Ratcliffe
Rooney (FL)
Scanlon
Speier

□ 1406

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECURE 5G AND BEYOND ACT OF 2020

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 893) to require the President to develop a strategy to ensure the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems and infrastructure in the United States, and to assist allies and strategic partners in maximizing the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems, infrastructure, and software, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 893

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 ''Secure 5G and Beyond Act of 2020''.

SEC. 2. APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.

In this Act, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. STRATEGY TO ENSURE SECURITY OF NEXT GENERATION WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS AND INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President, in consultation with the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, the Secretary of Commerce, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Energy, and the Secretary of Defense, and consistent with the protection of national security information, shall develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a strategy—

(1) to ensure the security of 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure within the United States;

(2) to provide technical assistance to mutual defense treaty allies of the United States, strategic partners of the United States, and other countries, when in the security and strategic interests of the United States, to maximize the security of 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure inside their countries; and

(3) to protect the competitiveness of United States companies, privacy of United States consumers, and integrity and impartiality of standards-setting bodies and processes related to 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The strategy developed under subsection (a) shall be known as the ''National Strategy to Secure 5G and Next Generation Wireless Communications'' (referred to in this Act as the ''Strategy'').

(c) ELEMENTS.—The Strategy shall represent a whole-of-government approach and shall include the following:

(1) A description of efforts to facilitate domestic 5th and future generations wireless communications rollout.

(2) A description of efforts to assess the risks to and identify core security principles of 5th and future generations wireless communications infrastructure.

(3) A description of efforts to address risks to the national security of the United States during development and deployment of 5th and future generations wireless communications infrastructure worldwide.

(4) A description of efforts to promote responsible global development and deployment of 5th and future generations wireless communications, including through robust international engagement, leadership in the development of international standards, and incentivizing market competitiveness of secure 5th and future generation wireless communications infrastructure options.

(d) PUBLIC CONSULTATION.—In developing the Strategy, the President shall consult with relevant groups that represent consumers or the public interest, private sector communications providers, and communications infrastructure and systems equipment developers.

SEC. 4. STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an implementation plan for the Strategy (referred to in this Act as the ''Implementation Plan''), which shall include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) A description of United States national and economic security interests pertaining to the deployment of 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure.

(2) An identification and assessment of potential security threats and vulnerabilities to the infrastructure, equipment, systems, software, and virtualized networks that support 5th and future generations wireless communications systems, infrastructure, and enabling technologies, which shall, as practicable, include a comprehensive evaluation of the full range of threats to, and unique security challenges posed by, 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure, as well as steps that public and private sector entities can take to mitigate those threats.

(3) An identification and assessment of the global competitiveness and vulnerabilities of United States manufacturers and suppliers of 5th and future generations wireless communications equipment.

(4) An evaluation of available domestic suppliers of 5th and future generations wireless communications equipment and other suppliers in countries that are mutual defense allies or strategic partners of the United States and a strategy to assess their ability to produce and supply 5th generation and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure.

(5) Identification of where security gaps exist in the United States domestic or mutual defense treaty allies and strategic partners communications equipment supply chain for 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure.

(6) Identification of incentives and policy options to help close or narrow any security gaps identified under paragraph (5) in, and ensure the economic viability of, the United States domestic industrial base, including research and development in critical technologies and workforce development in 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure.

(7) Identification of incentives and policy options for leveraging the communications equipment suppliers from mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to ensure that private industry in the United States has adequate sources for secure, effective, and reliable 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment.

(8) A plan for diplomatic engagement with mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to share security risk information and findings pertaining to 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment and cooperation on mitigating those risks.

(9) A plan for engagement with private sector communications infrastructure and systems equipment developers and critical infrastructure owners and operators who have a critical dependency on communications infrastructure to share information and findings on 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment standards to secure platforms.

(10) A plan for engagement with private sector communications infrastructure and systems equipment developers to encourage the maximum participation possible on standards-setting bodies related to such systems and infrastructure equipment standards by public and private sector entities from the United States.

(11) A plan for diplomatic engagement with mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to share information and findings on 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment standards to promote maximum interoperability, competitiveness, openness, and secure platforms.

(12) A plan for diplomatic engagement with mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to share information and findings on 5th and future generations wireless communications infrastructure and systems equipment concerning the standards-setting bodies related to such systems and infrastructure equipment to promote maximum transparency, openness, impartiality, integrity, and neutrality.

(13) A plan for joint testing environments with mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to ensure a trusted marketplace for 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure equipment.

(14) A plan for research and development by the Federal Government, in close partnership with trusted supplier entities, mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries to reach and maintain United States leadership in 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure security, including the development of an ongoing capability to identify security vulnerabilities in 5th and future generations wireless communications systems.

(15) Options for identifying and helping to mitigate the security risks of 5th and future generations wireless communications systems and infrastructure that have security flaws or vulnerabilities, or are utilizing equipment sourced from countries of concern, and that have already been put in place within the systems and infrastructure of mutual defense treaty allies, strategic partners, and other countries, when in the security interests of the United States.

(16) A description of the roles and responsibilities of the appropriate executive branch agencies and interagency mechanisms to coordinate implementation of the Strategy, as provided in section 5(d).

(17) An identification of the key diplomatic, development, intelligence, military, and economic resources necessary to implement the Strategy, including specific budgetary requests.

(18) As necessary, a description of such legislative or administrative action needed to carry out the Strategy.

SEC. 5. LIMITATIONS AND BRIEFINGS.

(a) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Strategy and the Implementation Plan shall not include a recommendation or a proposal to nationalize 5th or future generations wireless communications systems or infrastructure.

(2) FEDERAL AGENCY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit any authority or ability of any Federal agency.

(b) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall seek public comment regarding the development and implementation of the Implementation Plan.

(c) BRIEFING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 21 days after the date on which the Implementation Plan is completed, the President shall direct appropriate representatives from the departments and agencies involved in the formulation of the Strategy to provide the appropriate committees of Congress a briefing on the implementation of the Strategy.

(2) UNCLASSIFIED SETTING.—The briefing under paragraph (1) shall be held in an unclassified setting to the maximum extent possible.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, in conjunction, shall—

(A) implement the Strategy;

(B) keep congressional committees apprised of progress on implementation; and

(C) not implement any proposal or recommendation involving non-Federal spectrum administered by the Federal Communications Commission unless the implementation of such proposal or recommendation is first approved by the Commission.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the authority or jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission or confer upon the President or any other executive branch agency the power to direct the actions of the Commission, whether directly or indirectly.

(e) FORM.—The Strategy and Implementation Plan shall be submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 11, 2020.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 11, 2020, at 9:49 a.m.:

That the Senate agrees to House amendments to the bill S. 1822.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 891, I call up 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JAYAPAL). Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the RECORD related to S.J. Res. 68, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure, a resolution that will allow Congress to stand up for its constitutional responsibilities over war powers, a resolution that will send a clear message that the American people don't want war with Iran and that Congress has not authorized war with Iran.

In the few months since the House last took up legislation to address the administration's policy toward Iran, much has shifted.

I think we are all relieved that tensions have ratcheted down. After the strike that took out Qasem Soleimani, we appeared to be on the brink of a direct conflict with Iran, but things have cooled off since. Some will say this resolution is no longer needed or has no legal effect because we are not shooting at Iran today. They say we are not in hostilities with Iran.

But that is not an accurate reading of the law. The drafters of the War Powers Resolution accounted for the situation we are in today. They were clear that Congress' powers are not as narrow as the administration would like us to believe and, apparently, as some Members of this body would like us to believe.

The committee report from 1973 says, ''In addition to a situation in which fighting actually has begun, hostilities also encompasses a state of confrontation in which no shots have been fired but where there is a clear and present danger of armed conflict.'' That sounds a lot like what we are facing today, except shots have been fired on both sides.

Further, the President had to send 6,000 additional troops to the Middle East after the Soleimani incident, precisely because there is a clear and present danger of armed conflict.

Congress doesn't have to wait until the President alone decides to use military force again. Indeed, it is our responsibility to do something because we know that tensions could flare up again at a moment's notice.

□ 1415

Iran has not been deterred, as the administration promised. Indeed, there have already been four attacks on American personnel after the President ordered Soleimani's killing, injuring more than 100 U.S. servicemembers.

This isn't deterrence. The regime is again pushing ahead with research into a nuclear weapon and expanding its stockpile of enriched uranium.

Now, I don't like the Iranian Government. I don't like what they stand for. I don't like what they do. But the reality is this: Following the strike, we are now closer to a war with a country that is closer to possessing a nuclear weapon.

The last few weeks have also shown the administration scrambling to come up with a legal justification for the strike. Contrary to the initial claims, it quickly became clear that there was no imminent threat.

In fact, when the administration sent a legally required report to Congress, laying out the legal and policy justifications, there was no mention of an imminent threat—none whatsoever.

What was in that report, however, was an alarming claim that underscores why it is so important to press ahead with this resolution. According to the administration, the strike on Soleimani was legally authorized by the 2002 Saddam Hussein war authorization. Let me say that again: the 2002 Saddam Hussein, Iraq war authorization.

Madam Speaker, I was here in 2002 when the House considered that resolution, and I can tell you: Congress did not intend for it to authorize a war against Iran. Read it. Nowhere will you find any mention of Iran.

Incidentally, the House has voted to repeal this out-of-date war authorization, thanks to Congresswoman LEE's efforts, which I have supported.

I have heard some arguments that the 2002 authorization wasn't just about Saddam, but was also about terrorism, because that legislation says Saddam Hussein might give al-Qaida weapons of mass destruction. That finding was debunked a long time ago, and it still has nothing to do with Iran.

Some also claim that because the forces in Iraq under the 2001 and 2002 war authorizations have acted in self-defense against Iraqi militias backed by Iran, that somehow means that the 2002 AUMF can be used to attack Iran directly.

Anyone who is confused about this needs to read the administration's legal rationale more closely. They have been all over the map, trying to untangle this confusion, but their official justification is clear. It distinguishes the Soleimani killing from the defensive actions taken against militias—apples and oranges.

The administration, and any administration, should not be relying on the 2002 AUMF for anything, but we should all be able to recognize that attacking Iran is very different from other uses of force in Iraq.

It is an absurd reading of the authorization, and if the administration is going to lean on that outdated law for this, what else do they plan to use it for?

Some executive branch officials, past and present, also argue that the Constitution gives the President sweeping unilateral power to use military force without coming to Congress. I will say that again: without coming to Congress. But even among this group, it is hard to find anyone who actually believes Congress authorized the strike against Soleimani.

What has me worried is that the President made a decision to escalate tensions with Iran; failed to consult Congress, even though he had ample opportunity to do so; misled the American people about why the strike was necessary; and then switched gears and conjured up this dubious, after-the-fact legal justification.

Here is the reality: The American people don't want war with Iran. The Congress has not authorized war with Iran. That should be crystal clear.

Congress has the right to declare war. It is in the Constitution. It doesn't say that the President has the right, any President. It doesn't say the President has the right; Congress has the right.

We are trying to fulfill the Constitution. We are trying to take the Constitution back to the way it was and the way it was interpreted. Congress has the power to declare war.

Many of us are very concerned that since December 7, 1941, when President Franklin Roosevelt stood up and declared war against Japan, we have not had a declared war since then. So, what has that done? It has really rendered Congress impotent. Congress, essentially, has no say, and the President is the one who decides unilaterally.

That cannot be. That should not be. It is going directly against the Constitution, and we should not stand for it any longer.

So, as I said, the American people don't want war. Congress has not authorized war. That should be crystal clear.

However, since the administration is somehow claiming that Congress has already authorized force against Iran, then it becomes that much more important for Congress to go on record saying otherwise, and that is what this joint resolution would do.

We passed a similar measure in January. At the time, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle argued that the House version was unenforceable because it was a concurrent resolution, that it would never go to the President's desk and wouldn't have the power of law.

I disagreed with that assessment. In my view, the House version was a clear exercise of Congress' authority over war powers. We don't have authority over war powers only if the President says so. We have authority over war powers because the Constitution says so.

The House and Senate have both acted, and the Supreme Court has made clear that the President's Article II war powers are at their lowest ebb when he acts against the express will of Congress. We have expressed our will. The President does not have authority for war with Iran.

But the legislation we are considering today takes a step further. It is a joint resolution, not a concurrent resolution, so it will go straight to the President's desk if it passes the House unamended.

It is important that Congress stands up for itself, but more important is that Congress stands up for its constitutional authorities and makes it clear that we don't want war and that we haven't authorized war with Iran.

Advancing this measure would be the right thing to do under any circumstances, but it is especially important in the face of an administration that, again and again, tries to brush Congress aside as though we are an annoyance rather than a constitutionally coequal branch of government.

Now, I will be honest and say that this has been done by subsequent administrations on both sides of the aisle. Well, we don't want it done by any administration. Congress has the power to declare war—not a President, Congress.

We are not an annoyance; we are a constitutionally coequal branch of government. I am glad to support this measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I just have to say, here we go again. This is the third time in 2 months that the Democrat leadership has put this divisive and irresponsible debate on the House floor.

I have to ask, Madam Speaker, what are we doing here today on this War Powers Resolution again?

Our constituents are concerned about the impact of coronavirus on American lives and the United States economy, not partisan posturing. In fact, the WHO just declared that the coronavirus is now a pandemic.

Madam Speaker, that is what we should be focused on here today.

This political War Powers Resolution is based on a false premise. It orders the President to terminate hostilities against Iran. The problem is, for the other side, we are not engaged in hostilities in Iran.

I asked Secretary Pompeo that very question on February 28, 8 weeks after the Soleimani strike, before our Committee on Foreign Affairs: Are we engaged in hostilities against Iran? His response was: ''We are not.''

Our military commander in the Middle East agrees. General McKenzie was asked yesterday at the Armed Services Committee if we are engaged in hostilities against Iran or Iranian forces. He said, as Secretary Pompeo said: ''No, we are not.''

I am a strong supporter of our Article I powers, as I know the chairman is as well. If we were to launch strikes in Iran, I believe that the President would need to come before this body to ask for a new authorization.

But that, Madam Speaker, is not what we are facing. This text completely ignores the remarkable restraint that the President has shown over the past few months. He has used force only when necessary to protect American lives.

I was with the President at the White House when he was deciding how to respond to Iran's shooting down of our drone. He would have been justified, I believe, in taking out launch sites, but he decided to deescalate instead. He was very clear, saying: ''I do not want to go to war with Iran.''

The January 2 strike on Qasem Soleimani inside Iraq, not Iran, was not an escalation by the United States. It was an appropriate response to his deadly targeting of Americans and diplomats in Iraq.

Soleimani has the blood of hundreds of Americans on his hands. Most recently, he organized an escalating series of attacks in Iraq, an escalating series of these attacks which killed an American, wounded multiple U.S. servicemen, and involved the siege of our Embassy, an attack on our Embassy in Baghdad.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Milley, said the administration would have been ''culpably negligent'' had they not acted to take him out.

The strike on Soleimani in Iraq was totally justified as self-defense under the President's Article II constitutional powers.

Jeh Johnson, President Obama's general counsel at the Department of Defense and Secretary of Homeland Security, a person I have great, tremendous respect for and who I worked very closely with when I was chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, in his words, he stated that Soleimani ''was a lawful military objective, and

the President, under his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief, had ample domestic legal authority to take him out without an additional congressional authorization.''

This is the man in the Obama administration who approved the airstrikes against the terrorists.

More importantly, the Soleimani strike was a success. Let me quote from a recent Washington Post article, where they said: The Revolutionary Guard ''now finds itself on the back foot, a notable change after successfully projecting its power in the Middle East over recent years.''

The Quds Force—Quds, meaning Jerusalem—that is their ultimate objective, to annihilate the State of Israel. ''The Quds Force has been significantly deterred from retaliating further against the United States.''

But the Democrats cannot admit anything good can come from this President, and that has consequences. In my judgment, we are wasting precious legislative days and setting a terrible precedent of abusing War Powers procedures.

This will be the fifth time that this Congress, and in this Congress, that we are considering a War Powers Resolution directing the President to withdraw U.S. forces from wars we are not actually fighting—three on Iran and two on Yemen.

Iran and its proxies are watching right now, as we spin our wheels. What they see, Madam Speaker, unfortunately, is not a united America, but a divided America that does not fully support the ability of our Commander in Chief to adequately respond to threats against Americans.

Now is not the time to tie our Commander in Chief's hands. Now is the time to support our troops and to support our diplomats.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I thank my friend, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for their good work.

I understand we have a difference of opinion, and I do deeply respect my friend from Texas and his substantive and thoughtful contributions to our foreign policy debate in our committee, but I must disagree with the argument that we ought to be focused on only one thing right now.

As grave as the coronavirus crisis is—and I would be happy to talk about that and the missteps of this administration in making it worse—Congress is the people's body. We are here defending the legislative branch of government and its constitutional role on matters of war and peace. What could be more serious?

The fact that we are here the third time doesn't make it any less grave or serious. It underlines the importance of the issue and the fact that many of us in this body are going to continue to be here on the floor until Congress reasserts the role the chairman outlined for us that is the constitutional role.

We have allowed way too much power to gravitate to the executive branch. We have abrogated our responsibilities here in Congress for decades. We like having it both ways. We tsk-tsk when the executive branch, we think, crosses the line, but we don't want to take responsibility for it.

This resolution asks Congress to do just that: stand up and take responsibility, while holding the executive branch accountable.

President Trump ordered a provocative and disproportionate drone strike that killed the Iranian Quds Forces commander, Major General Qasem Soleimani, a bad actor, but that begs the question: Should we have done it?

And, oh, by the way, what level of consultation and intelligence ought to be shared with the legislative branch that has constitutional responsibility for matters of war and peace?

We know the administration had to do some fast footwork to rationalize why now, why him, why there, and, oh, by the way, what are the consequences of doing that? In all of those questions, even with a formal briefing of Congress, the administration simply did not have good answers. In fact, they had contradictory answers.

Taking Soleimani out, my friend from Texas says, was a good thing. Well, it is not without consequences. We evacuated nonessential personnel from Iraq as a consequence of that move because of the terror threat. One hundred U.S. military personnel suffered brain damage or head damage because of the retaliatory strikes on the U.S. base in Iraq. These things have consequences.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, reining in the administration is the right thing to do until and unless we get answers and debate and intelligence provided to the legislative branch for justification as we move forward.

The idea that we are not at war with Iran so it is actually a redundant or unnecessary conversation, I think, is not an argument. In fact, now is precisely the time to constrain the executive branch, to set boundaries, to make sure they understand that Congress reasserting itself will set boundaries and legitimate barriers for proceeding down that road without first coming to the legislative branch as, indeed, Franklin Delano Roosevelt did in 1941, walking right down, with great difficulty, that aisle, asking Congress to declare war; and, indeed, Congress listened and responded. That is how it ought to work.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who served in the United States Army and fought in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, thank you to lead Republican MCCAUL for important words to start today's debate.

For the third time in 2 months, as he pointed out, we are here to debate an Iran War Powers Resolution. Once again, this resolution requires terminating the use of force against Iran, even though U.S. Forces are not engaged in hostilities against Iran.

As we stand here today, the President has repeatedly said in the past that he does not want a war with Iran. I don't. This body doesn't. My constituents don't.

The President, himself, as lead Republican MCCAUL has pointed out, has shown incredible restraint when opportunities have presented, when there was legal justification to strike back.

We must continue to pursue peace through strength. The military option is the last possible option that we should ever use, but we need Iran to understand that it is on the table.

My colleague from the other side of the aisle who just spoke used the term ''disproportionate'' to describe taking out Qasem Soleimani. As people listen to today's debate, and if you are one of the 600-plus families who lost your son or daughter, your husband or your wife, maybe your mother or father because of Qasem Soleimani, if you are one of the thousands of people who were injured because of Qasem Soleimani, U.S. troops—600 U.S. troops, thousands of U.S. troops were injured because of Qasem Soleimani, and, literally, in the days leading up to this attack, we had U.S. citizens who were killed and wounded because of Qasem Soleimani.

What is the justification? What was Qasem Soleimani doing in Iraq? How about we look at IRGC's own statement of January 3? The IRGC said that Soleimani was in Iraq to ''plan a confrontation against the new scheme of the Americans to rebuild DAESH and the Takfiri groups in order to again disrupt Iraq's security.''

Anyone who wants to suggest that Soleimani was in Iraq to do anything that was good and not to be planning and engaged in hostilities has to ignore the IRGC's own words.

The IRGC is a designated foreign terrorist organization. Qasem Soleimani is a designated terrorist himself, as sanctioned by the United States and the EU and the U.N., and we took him out. And I say good.

To hear my colleague on the other side of the aisle call it disproportionate, my question is: How many more U.S. troops have to die at the hands of Qasem Soleimani before it is

proportionate? How many more have to lose arms and legs at the hands of Qasem Soleimani until my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will call it proportionate?

I salute the President for making a decision; it was well done.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, it is gratifying to see that Congress is becoming serious about restoring our authority over matters of war and peace. Our oversight responsibilities don't end when the news cycle changes. I hope that the outcome of this vote today will be another bipartisan rejection of war with Iran.

But let's be honest. We know that the eventual outcome will be a Presidential veto. We have been through this already with the Yemen War Powers Resolution when we passed it last year.

But despite the inevitable veto, it is critically important that we are here today voting to insist on our constitutional power. Our Founders understood that these decisions are too important to rest in the hands of one person.

The decision to assassinate General Soleimani was a reckless and badly considered decision that made Americans less safe, and it opened the door to a series of escalating retaliations that makes the world less safe.

But my vote today is not just about this particular strike or preventing a particular war. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle were eager to claim these authorities when there was a Democratic President in the Oval Office. Had I been in office then, I would have joined them in demanding congressional authorization for wars in Libya and Syria. It should not depend on what political power is in the White House.

We should be consistent in our principles. In my view, this means maintaining the momentum of this vote and our previous vote to repeal the 2002 AUMF. It means finally taking up BARBARA LEE's bill to repeal the 2001 AUMF as well.

Madam Speaker, I support this resolution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WALTZ), a veteran of the war in Afghanistan and the first Green Beret elected to Congress.

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, I find this interesting and sad. Since the last time we were here, for all the handwringing, all of the hues and cries that the President was taking us to the brink of war, that he was a warmonger, that this was so reckless as we are still hearing today, well, what has actually happened?

The problem with my colleague's argument is that it flies in the face of what is actually happened in the Middle East.

What has happened is deterrence has been restored. It is relatively peaceful at this point.

I say, ''relatively.'' The fact is that we don't have thousands of boots on the ground in Teheran or in Iran.

What we all know who have actually fought against the Quds Force and fought against the Iranians is they are deterred by strength and emboldened by weakness.

So this bill seeks to restrain the President, who has shown incredible restraint.

Did he respond to the attacks on international shipping? No.

Did he respond to attacks on world energy supplies? No.

Did he respond to the attack on an American drone? No.

Only after another American was killed—yet another American was killed—and our Embassy was attacked did he finally respond. And what did he do? A limited, proportional, targeted strike in Iraq—not Iran—that had zero civilian casualties.

And every American, from the lowest private to the Commander in Chief, has the right to self-defense. It was his duty. It was the President's duty as Commander in Chief to stop the Iranian escalation and to respond.

And, by the way, what did he do? He took down the head of a terrorist organization who was declared, under the Obama administration, a terrorist, no different than Osama bin Laden, no different than al-Baghdadi. A terrorist is a terrorist.

In this case, Soleimani was a massive and serial human rights abuser, responsible for the deaths of tens of thousands of people across the Middle East, and the world is a better place for the fact that he is no longer on this Earth.

Madam Speaker, all this is doing is seeking to tie the President's hands; and the last thing I want is any Commander in Chief—and to my colleague—for any party having to come back to this body to defend Americans, to defend our diplomats, and to exercise his right to take terrorists off the face of this Earth.

I cannot encourage my colleagues more strongly to oppose this resolution. This is politics at its worst.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the Chairman for yielding and also for his consistent leadership on issues of war and peace and making sure that Congress does its job.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 68, which is a resolution terminating the use of U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities against Iran. This critical resolution helps put a check on the administration's reckless and irrational military action against Iran.

The American people do not want, nor can we allow, another unnecessary war of choice in the Middle East. This resolution is an important step in our efforts to prevent that from happening.

Make no mistake: The assassination of Mr. Soleimani just a few months ago placed us on the brink of war. This did constitute an act of hostility against Iran, and, in fact, injured at least 100 of our brave troops. Also, it hurt our national security and made us less safe.

President Trump's continued and reckless military action without congressional approval or authorization caused this crisis. But we are here today to make clear that the President cannot launch a war with Iran without the explicit authorization of Congress.

Madam Speaker, we have been down this dangerous path before in Iraq, and we cannot afford another ill-advised, destructive, and costly war in the Middle East.

And, yes, I opposed the use of force without congressional authorization during the previous administration. This is not a partisan issue. Congress must do its job, and we must even go further to restore our constitutional duty over military action.

I hope the Senate takes up my bill, H.R. 2456, to repeal the 2002 Iraq AUMF, which the House passed in January, which the administration, mind you, used as the basis for the assassination of Soleimani and its military hostilities toward Iran.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California.

□ 1445

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, let me remind you that the 2002 Iraq resolution was introduced to address weapons of mass destruction purportedly in Iraq. Now, this was a lie, it was put forth by the Bush administration. And many of us who were here tried to halt the use of force and to allow the inspectors to complete their inspections. Unfortunately—and I had an amendment to do this—it received just 72 votes.

Now, regardless of how one voted, the 2002 authorization was specific to Iraq, not Iran, nor any other country. And so it is past time that Congress reassert our congressional authority on matters of war and peace. We must also return to diplomacy and peace and stop these endless wars.

So I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this. It is time that we do our job. Congress has been missing in action.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGGLEMAN), who served in the United States Air Force for over a decade and is a veteran of Operation Allied Force and Enduring Freedom.

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to H.R. Res. 68, which is a divisive resolution that ties President Trump's hands during a time when our Nation and regional allies like Israel need our support.

This resolution ignores efforts the President has made to avoid war, instead continuing the Democratic Party's fixation on the President's strike on Qasem Soleimani in Iraq.

My background does give me an expert perspective on the challenges in the Middle East, and an understanding of the current situation on the ground. Not only did I deploy directly after 9/11, I was the counter-IED team chief in 2006 and 2007 for the Counter-IED Operations Intelligence Integration Center. So our team saw firsthand what Iranian Quds Forces could do to U.S. forces based on IED deployment and technology transfer.

This was not some type of reckless assassination. This was a targeted elimination of a terrorist on our target list. President Trump's escalated air strikes against those planning to inflict harm on Americans are warranted responses against Iranian actions.

The United States reserves the right to defend itself, especially against bad actors like Soleimani and Iran. Instead of supporting a President who struck a terrorist, Democrats have retreated to partisan talking points and have flocked to this bill, which undermines the President's actions and shows a lack of American resolve to our enemies abroad. This legislation harms our ability to protect American interests. It harms our military preparedness.

Lines 20–25 of the resolution state that the President must terminate the use of United States Armed Forces for hostilities against Iran ''or any part of its government or military?''

Does this include proxies in Iraq, Afghanistan, Lebanon, Algeria, Yemen, Bahrain, and Shia militia groups? The IRGC is a foreign terrorist organization, including its Quds Force.

Soleimani was with a person called al-Muhandis, the center of command and control against American forces, Shia militia groups, and an Iranian proxy. Do we consider force protection conditions? The Commander in Chief needs flexibility in this new Arab warfare.

And I do agree that it is time for Congress to update our authorizations for use of military force. I am eager to participate in this process during this time of asymmetric warfare and rapid response to terrorism. Let's provide solutions. Let's not provide political hyperbole.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this War Powers Resolution to ensure that the President cannot start a war with Iran without Congress' approval.

I understand this is the fourth time that the House will vote to say ''no'' to war with Iran since President Trump ordered an unauthorized, illegal strike on Iranian General Soleimani. We passed our own war powers measure, led by Representative SLOTKIN.

We passed a bill with bipartisan support to cut off funding for unauthorized, offensive military operations against Iran. And we voted to repeal the 2002 Iraq war authorization that the Trump administration has inappropriately used to justify the strike on Soleimani and potential future strikes against Iranian targets.

Madam Speaker, we have to be clear that this is not about whether General Soleimani was a good guy or a bad guy. Nobody is really disputing that.

The question here is: What is Congress' authority to have a say on whether or not the United States is going to war? If we are going to send troops into war, then we have an obligation to vote on that, to debate that, and to make sure that we preserve the congressional authority.

And I think, Madam Speaker, that this is something that both Democrats and Republicans have consistently succumbed to. So we have consistently, Democrats and Republicans, given authority to the Chief Executive that is not theirs to start with. Congress has spoken again and again on this. We should have learned by now.

The American people have spoken. They don't want us in endless wars without authorization from Congress, without a debate here in Congress, without utilizing those Constitutional powers that our Founding Framers gave us. It is time for us to do this, and to ensure that the President listens.

So today, I am urging all of my colleagues to set aside partisanship, to think about this as something that we are reclaiming for ourselves as Congress, to support this resolution that has already passed the Republican-held Senate with bipartisan support.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to, again, state the main reason for us voting on this. I am no fan of the regime in Iran. And I certainly was no fan of Soleimani, who had blood on his hands and did all kinds of heinous things. I don't care so much about them.

What I care about is us. What I care about is the Constitution of the United States of America. It was drafted a certain way. It wasn't drafted to say that the President, no matter who that President is, no matter what party that President is from, the President has authority to do whatever he likes.

It clearly says—and I said this before, but I think it is worth repeating. It clearly says that Congress has the power to declare war. Congress. And what we are trying to do on this side of the aisle is trying to strike that balance, the checks and balances. We all learned them when we went to school, checks and balances.

The Constitution doesn't say the President can do anything he wants and the Congress must follow suit. It says that Congress has the sole right to declare war.

It is really disturbing to me that subsequent Presidents—and this isn't only the fault of one President or one political party. This is a road that we all share blame for this—we have allowed our branch of government to wither on the vine when it comes to declaring war, when it comes to war powers.

We have essentially said that any President can just declare war, and Congress has got to go along with it. If you don't go along with it, somehow you are unpatriotic or you don't care about the country. Quite the opposite. Quite the opposite.

We care about the country and we are patriotic, and that is why we believe that the Constitution needs to be adhered to.

Now, I would also encourage my colleagues to look more closely at the facts, instead of just accepting what the executive branch is saying about reinterpreting the law.

As I said in my opening statement, the drafters of the War Powers Resolution were clear, that the situation we are in today is in a state of hostility. We are constantly today in a state of hostility.

The committee report passing the War Powers Resolution from 1973, in the Congress, says: ''In addition to a situation in which fighting actually has begun, hostilities also encompasses a state of confrontation in which no shots have been fired, but where there is a clear and present danger of armed conflict.''

Certainly, we are in that situation now. That is exactly the situation we are in right now.

So Congress' powers are not as narrow as the administration would like us to believe. I don't care who is President, and I don't care about who is elected in Congress. What I care about is that Congress fulfill its duties; fulfill its duties as the Constitution says that we must.

So we are doing this again because the other body has not been cooperative and doesn't seem to want to make a move on anything. We are doing this because we have to do this. We are doing this because this is important.

And no matter, again, 10 years from now, 20 years from now, there will be other Members here, I would hope that whoever is President then—no matter what party, whoever controls the majority of Congress—no matter what party, this is not political. This is not about party. This is not about trying to do anything, as far as I am concerned, except reestablishing Congress' right to declare war.

I don't know what is more important than war and peace. I certainly don't think Congress ought to start giving away its responsibilities.

I have been in this body a long time, and we have constantly argued against the administration—no matter who was in that administration—from usurping the roles that Congress has, from taking away congressional power, not only on matters of peace and war, but on everything; earmarks or anything you want to say.

Congress has just sort of said to the President: Go ahead, you make the decision. We are just sort of along for the ride. We are kind of observers. We are observers.

Well, we are not observers. We are people who care very dearly about the Constitution.

And, again, I conclude by saying, Congress has the right to declare war. Only Congress has the right to declare war. That is what we are affirming today, and why I hope we get votes from both sides of the aisle. This is not a political discussion. It doesn't matter who is in the White House. It doesn't matter who is in Congress. What matters is that Congress not cede its responsibility to any other branch but its own.

Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, there was reference that the taking out of Soleimani was an assassination. I just want to remind this body of Jeh Johnson's words, President Obama's general counsel at the Department of Defense, Secretary of Homeland Security, who I have tremendous respect for. He signed off on airstrikes under the Obama administration, stating that Soleimani was a lawful military objective, and the President, under his Constitutional authority as Commander in Chief, had ample domestic legal authority to take him out without additional congressional authorization. I think that really puts this matter to rest.

But let me also say that the chairman and I are very bipartisan. We respect this committee. We respect the integrity of this committee. We both see the world very much in the same way. I know the chairman is not a supporter of Soleimani. I believe the chairman believes, as I do, that the world is safer without Mr. Soleimani in it.

The chairman and I are very staunchly pro-Israel, and are for Israel, and very much against the actions of the Ayatollah in Iran. So I don't question the chairman whatsoever.

In fact, I take great pride in the fact that the chairman and I work very well together. When we disagree—and sometimes we do—we agree to disagree, and we do so with civility, which I think has been lost at times in this body, in this town. And so I want to start with that.

I will say that all the hearings I have had, and briefings prove that Soleimani was a terrorist who actively engaged in a campaign of violence against Americans and our interests. And after not one, two, but three times debating this issue on the floor, I think we about said all we can say.

I think we can all agree he was a brutal terrorist and that the world is better off without him.

□ 1500

But I have to question, why now are we debating this? Our country is facing a public health emergency.

Madam Speaker, as I stated, the World Health Organization just announced in the time of this debate that the coronavirus is now a pandemic.

As of today, there are more than 121,000 reported cases of coronavirus worldwide, including over 1,000 right here in the United States. And while the CDC maintains the likelihood of a person catching the disease is low, the fallout from the fear caused by COVID–19 is real and is causing real damage.

Just 2 days ago, people were watching as their 401(k)s and retirement funds were disappearing and Wall Street saw the biggest drop in more than a decade. I know in my district, the city of Austin suffered a significant economic blow with the cancellation of South by Southwest, an event the chairman and I were actually scheduled to speak at regarding how we were the committee that works together and doesn't give in to toxic partisan politics.

Last year, this conference in my hometown brought more than $350 million to Austin, making it the most profitable event for the city's hospitality industry. More communities are facing economic fallout, as well. And the fear is only rising as we continue to see more stories.

Several Members of Congress themselves, our colleagues, are currently self-quarantining after potentially being exposed to the virus, yet we are talking about this resolution today.

I would just close by saying, I was back in my district over the weekend talking to my constituents. They were really not concerned about the War Powers Resolution. Their number one concern right now is: My God, is my child going to get coronavirus? Am I going to get coronavirus? When is it going to impact my backyard, my neighbors? They want to be safe, and they want Congress to do something.

I am hopeful, Madam Speaker—I know they are in negotiations right now between the leadership of our two parties that we can come together, just as we did last week, in passing a $7.8 billion supplemental to address this crisis—that we can come together as Republicans and Democrats to do good things for the American people and to protect the American people and to make them safe.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, before I close, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

Mr. MOULTON. Madam Speaker, we are here today to fundamentally do our jobs. That is something that we ask of our troops every single day across the world on the front lines in places like Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, and throughout Africa.

There is bipartisan concern, bipartisan recognition that Iran has ill will towards the United States, that Iran is an enemy of the United States, that Iran wants nothing more than to see our country and our democracy die.

The most solemn responsibility that we have in ensuring that that doesn't happen is upholding the fundamental principles of our country and of our democracy, of showing that we have the courage here in Congress to uphold that oath, that same oath that we ask our troops to uphold in far more difficult circumstances every single day.

Iran is threatened by us because of the values that we represent and the power that those values carry in the world. It is when we abandon those values, when we undermine those principles, when we forget that oath to our Constitution that our enemies start to win.

I have fought Iranians on the ground in Iraq. I have seen Iranians kill Americans. I remember how much more accurate the Iranian mortars were than the Iraqi ones we were used to facing. I get this, but I also never forget that oath that we took, and this resolution, passing this resolution is about upholding that oath to our Constitution.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS), a member of the Armed Services Committee and the lead Republican of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today, we are dealing with legislation that didn't make sense on January 9, it didn't make sense on January 30, and it doesn't make sense today.

Today marks the third time the House has considered a version of this legislation in just 3 months. I am back to remind my colleagues that our conflict is not with the Iranian people, but with their tyrannical and murderous regime.

The Iranian Government, using agents like General Soleimani and the IRGC, has been arming Shia militias, including Hezbollah and others across the Middle East for decades. General Soleimani's organization was responsible for the deaths of nearly 600 Americans.

This resolution offers safe harbor to those killers.

It offers safe harbor to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, a designated foreign terrorist organization.

It offers safe harbor to terrorist groups receiving advanced weapons directly from the Iranian Government.

These forces are critical to the Ayatollah's clear goal of complete influence over the entire Middle East.

But the American people know the regime's legacy. They know the Ayatollah doesn't care about the bloody cost of its terrorism. The legislation before the House today only paves the way for new Iranian aggression.

Halting military operations and putting red tape on the Commander in

Chief does nothing to fix the problems in the Middle East.

I believe this resolution makes America less safe. It makes a mockery of years of dedicated counterterrorism efforts.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' for the third time in 3 months on coddling Iranian terrorists.

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

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

I believe I have said about everything I can say on this issue, so I won't take up more time of Congress, other than to say we are not at war with Iran. If we were, I would be the first one to say Congress has a responsibility to act. If Soleimani was taken out in Iran, I would be the first to say we need an Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Congress does have the power to declare war under the Constitution, and many colleagues on my side of the aisle agree with that concept, but it is just not factually what is happening on the ground today in Iran. If that day happens, we are fully prepared to have this discussion. This is what I would call a premature argument to make.

And I would say, with respect to updating the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs, I have had several meetings with Members on both sides of the aisle, many of whom were not here when those were passed by Congress in 2001 and 2002, who also agree that we should be working to modernize these Authorizations for Use of Military Force.

I think there is that consensus, Madam Speaker, here today. I would encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—and I know Chairman ENGEL is also supportive of working together—to try to modernize these Authorizations for Use of Military Force.

But that is not the situation on the ground today, and I cannot support this resolution simply for the fact it is based on a false premise. It will tie the hands of our Commander in Chief to respond in self-defense to Americans, our diplomats serving over there very bravely, and our American soldiers who are over there very bravely—it ties his hands to defend from an attack launched by Iran.

And lastly, I say, Mr. Soleimani was not a good man. He was an evil mastermind of terror. For two decades he killed Americans. He brought the Russians into Syria. They slaughtered tens of thousands of innocent people in Syria. He is responsible for so much blood on his hands.

I would close by saying—and I do think there is consensus on this issue, as well—that the world is indeed a better place without this mastermind of terror, the greatest mastermind since bin Laden was removed from the face of this Earth.

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

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

I have said all along that this is not a partisan issue, and it isn't. Executive branch officials from both parties have tried to sideline Congress when it comes to war. It is time we said: ''Enough.'' It may be in the executive branch's interest to keep Congress out, but that doesn't make it legal or make it right.

Madam Speaker, no one in this body mourns Qasem Soleimani, certainly not me. No one doubts that he was a hardened terrorist with the blood of Americans and others on his hands. But that is not the issue before us today.

The issue is that the Trump administration decided to kill him without authorization from Congress, without any prior consultation with Congress, then misled the American people about why that was necessary. And then, when the administration's explanation couldn't withstand scrutiny, they tell us Congress had already authorized military action against Iran.

Madam Speaker, I think we would know if we had voted to authorize military action against Iran. Those aren't the kinds of votes you easily forget.

So, today, we will vote on this resolution and send it to the President's desk. And it carries with it a very clear, very important message: Congress has not authorized war, and Congress has not authorized war against Iran.

It is remarkable that we even need to say this, but as is often the case, up is down, down is up, laws don't matter, and Congress doesn't matter because the Constitution doesn't matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JAYAPAL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

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

Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of S.J. Res. 68 is postponed.

□ 1515

USA FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 891, I call up the bill (H.R. 6172) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the amendment printed in House Report 116–415 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 6172

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act of 2020''.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Amendments to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

TITLE I—FISA BUSINESS RECORDS

Sec. 101. Repeal of authority to access on an ongoing basis call detail records.
Sec. 102. Protection of certain information.
Sec. 103. Use of information.
Sec. 104. Limitation on retention of business record information.
Sec. 105. Effective date.

TITLE II—ACCURACY AND INTEGRITY OF FISA PROCESS

Sec. 201. Certifications regarding accuracy of FISA applications.
Sec. 202. Description of techniques carried out before targeting United States person.
Sec. 203. Investigations relating to Federal candidates and elected Federal officials.
Sec. 204. Removal or suspension of Federal officers for misconduct before Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.
Sec. 205. Penalties for offenses related to FISA.
Sec. 206. Contempts constituting crimes.
Sec. 207. Effective date.

TITLE III—FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT

Sec. 301. Declassification of significant decisions, orders, and opinions.
Sec. 302. Appointment of amici curiae and access to information.
Sec. 303. Effective and independent advice for Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.
Sec. 304. Transcripts of proceedings and communications regarding applications.
Sec. 305. Information provided in annual reports.

TITLE IV—TRANSPARENCY, SUNSETS, AND OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 401. Congressional oversight.
Sec. 402. Establishment of compliance officers.
Sec. 403. Public reports on information obtained or derived under FISA and protection of First Amendment activities.
Sec. 404. Mandatory reporting on certain orders.
Sec. 405. Report on use of FISA authorities regarding protected activities and protected classes.
Sec. 406. Improvements to Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.
Sec. 407. Sunsets.
Sec. 408. Technical amendments.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment

to, or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

TITLE I—FISA BUSINESS RECORDS

SEC. 101. REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO ACCESS ON AN ONGOING BASIS CALL DETAIL RECORDS.

(a) CALL DETAIL RECORDS.—

(1) REPEAL.—Subsection (b)(2) of section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (C);

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''in the case of'' and all that follows through ''in subparagraph (C)),''; and

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C).

(2) PROHIBITION.—Section 501(a) (50 U.S.C. 1861) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) An application under paragraph (1) may not seek an order authorizing or requiring the production on an ongoing basis of call detail records.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) ORDERS.—Subsection (c) of section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''with subsection (b)(2)(D)'' and inserting ''with subsection (b)(2)(C)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (F) and inserting the following:

''(F) in the case of an application for call detail records, shall direct the Government—

''(i) to adopt minimization procedures that require the prompt destruction of all call detail records produced under the order that the Government determines are not foreign intelligence information; and

''(ii) to destroy all call detail records produced under the order as prescribed by such procedures.'';

(2) COMPENSATION.—Subsection (j) of section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861) is amended to read as follows:

''(j) COMPENSATION.—The Government shall compensate a person for reasonable expenses incurred for providing technical assistance to the Government under this section.''.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (k)(4)(B) of section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861) is amended by striking ''For purposes of an application submitted under subsection (b)(2)(C)'' and inserting ''In the case of an application for a call detail record''.

(4) OVERSIGHT.—Section 502(b) (50 U.S.C. 1862(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (4); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (8) as paragraphs (4) through (7), respectively;

(5) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Section 603 (50 U.S.C. 1873) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by transferring subparagraph (C) of paragraph (6) to the end of paragraph (5);

(ii) in paragraph (5)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking the semicolon and inserting ''; and''; and

(III) in subparagraph (C), as transferred by clause (i) of this subparagraph, by striking ''any database of'';

(iii) by striking paragraph (6) (as amended by clause (i) of this subparagraph); and

(iv) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6); and

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''any of paragraphs (3), (5), or (6)'' and inserting ''either of paragraph (3) or (5)''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''Paragraphs (2)(B), (2)(C), and (6)(C)'' and inserting ''Paragraphs (2)(B) and (2)(C)''.

(6) PUBLIC REPORTING.—Section 604(a)(1)(F) (50 U.S.C. 1874(a)(1)(F)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking the semicolon and inserting ''; and'';

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking clause (iii).

SEC. 102. PROTECTION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.

(a) PROTECTION.—Subsection (a) of section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861), as amended by section 101, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5)(A) An application under paragraph (1) may not seek an order authorizing or requiring the production of a tangible thing under circumstances in which a person has a reasonable expectation of privacy and a warrant would be required for law enforcement purposes.

''(B) An application under paragraph (1) may not seek an order authorizing or requiring the production of cell site location or global positioning system information.''.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF EMERGENCY AUTHORITY FOR CELL SITE LOCATION OR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM INFORMATION.—The Attorney General may treat the production of cell site location or global positioning system information as electronic surveillance rather than business records for purposes of authorizing the emergency production of such information pursuant to section 105(e) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805(e)).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861) is further amended by striking ''Subject to paragraph (3)'' and inserting ''Subject to paragraphs (3), (4), and (5)''.

SEC. 103. USE OF INFORMATION.

Section 501(h) (50 U.S.C. 1861(h)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Information acquired'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Information acquired''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(2) USE IN TRIALS, HEARINGS, OR OTHER PROCEEDINGS.—For purposes of subsections (b) through (h) of section 106—

''(A) information obtained or derived from the production of tangible things pursuant to an investigation conducted under this section shall be deemed to be information acquired from an electronic surveillance pursuant to title I, unless the court or other authority of the United States finds, in response to a motion from the Government, that providing notice to an aggrieved person would harm the national security of the United States; and

''(B) in carrying out subparagraph (A), a person shall be deemed to be an aggrieved person if—

''(i) the person is the target of such an investigation; and

''(ii) the activities or communications of the person are described in the tangible things that the Government intends to use or disclose in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding.''.

SEC. 104. LIMITATION ON RETENTION OF BUSINESS RECORD INFORMATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Section 501(g) (50 U.S.C. 1861(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''In this section'' and inserting ''In accordance with paragraph (3), in this section'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

''(3) LIMITATION ON RETENTION.—The minimization procedures under paragraph (1) shall ensure that tangible things, and information therein, received under this section may not be retained in excess of 5 years, unless—

''(A) the tangible thing or information has been affirmatively determined, in whole or in part, to constitute foreign intelligence or counterintelligence or to be necessary to understand or assess foreign intelligence or counterintelligence;

''(B) the tangible thing or information is reasonably believed to constitute evidence of a crime and is retained by a law enforcement agency;

''(C) the tangible thing or information is enciphered or reasonably believed to have a secret meaning;

''(D) retention is necessary to protect against an imminent threat to human life;

''(E) retention is necessary for technical assurance or compliance purposes, including a court order or discovery obligation, in which case access to the tangible thing or information retained for technical assurance or compliance purposes shall be reported to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate on an annual basis; or

''(F) retention for a period in excess of 5 years is approved by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, based on a determination that retention is necessary to protect the national security of the United States, in which case the Director shall provide to such committees a written certification describing—

''(i) the reasons extended retention is necessary to protect the national security of the United States;

''(ii) the duration for which the Director is authorizing retention;

''(iii) generally the tangible things or information to be retained; and

''(iv) the measures the Director is taking to protect the privacy interests of United States persons or persons located inside the United States.''.

(b) OVERSIGHT.—Section 502(b) (50 U.S.C. 1862(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (8)(E), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9) a description of each time that an exception to the 5-year limitation on the retention of information was made pursuant to any of subparagraphs (C) through (E) of subsection (g)(3) of section 501, including an explanation for each such exception.''.

SEC. 105. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to applications made under section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) on or after such date.

TITLE II—ACCURACY AND INTEGRITY OF FISA PROCESS

SEC. 201. CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING ACCURACY OF FISA APPLICATIONS.

(a) TITLE I.—Subsection (a) of section 104 (50 U.S.C. 1804) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(10) a certification by the applicant that, to the best knowledge of the applicant, the

attorney for the Government and the Department of Justice has been apprised of all information that might reasonably—

''(A) call into question the accuracy of the application or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application conducted by the department or agency on whose behalf the application is made; or

''(B) otherwise raise doubts with respect to the findings required under section 105(a).''.

(b) TITLE III.—Subsection (a) of section 303 (50 U.S.C. 1823) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9) a certification by the applicant that, to the best knowledge of the applicant, the attorney for the Government and the Department of Justice has been apprised of all information that might reasonably—

''(A) call into question the accuracy of the application or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application conducted by the department or agency on whose behalf the application is made; or

''(B) otherwise raise doubts with respect to the findings required under section 304(a).''.

(c) TITLE IV.—Subsection (c) of section 402 (50 U.S.C. 1842) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) a certification by the applicant that, to the best knowledge of the applicant, the attorney for the Government and the Department of Justice has been apprised of all information that might reasonably—

''(A) call into question the accuracy of the application or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application conducted by the department or agency on whose behalf the application is made; or

''(B) otherwise raise doubts with respect to the findings required under subsection (d).''.

(d) TITLE V.—Subsection (b)(2) of section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861), as amended by section 101, is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) a statement by the applicant that, to the best knowledge of the applicant, the application fairly reflects all information that might reasonably—

''(i) call into question the accuracy of the application or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application conducted by the department or agency on whose behalf the application is made; or

''(ii) otherwise raise doubts with respect to the findings required under subsection (c).''.

(e) TITLE VII.—

(1) SECTION 703.—Subsection (b)(1) of section 703 (50 U.S.C. 1881b) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(K) a certification by the applicant that, to the best knowledge of the applicant, the attorney for the Government and the Department of Justice has been apprised of all information that might reasonably—

''(i) call into question the accuracy of the application or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application conducted by the department or agency on whose behalf the application is made; or

''(ii) otherwise raise doubts with respect to the findings required under subsection (c).''.

(2) SECTION 704.—Subsection (b) of section 704 (50 U.S.C. 1881c) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) a certification by the applicant that, to the best knowledge of the applicant, the attorney for the Government and the Department of Justice has been apprised of all information that might reasonably—

''(A) call into question the accuracy of the application or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application conducted by the department or agency on whose behalf the application is made; or

''(B) otherwise raise doubts with respect to the findings required under subsection (c).''.

(f) REVIEW OF CASE FILES TO ENSURE ACCURACY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall promulgate rules governing the review of case files, as appropriate, to ensure that applications to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court under titles I or III of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) that target United States persons are accurate and complete.

SEC. 202. DESCRIPTION OF TECHNIQUES CARRIED OUT BEFORE TARGETING UNITED STATES PERSON.

(a) TITLE I.—Section 104(a)(6) (50 U.S.C. 1804(a)(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) with respect to a target who is a United States person, including a statement describing the investigative techniques carried out before making the application; and''.

(b) TITLE III.—Section 303(a)(6) (50 U.S.C. 1823(a)(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) with respect to a target who is a United States person, includes a statement describing the investigative techniques carried out before making the application; and''.

SEC. 203. INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO FEDERAL CANDIDATES AND ELECTED FEDERAL OFFICIALS.

(a) TITLE I.—Section 104(a)(6) (50 U.S.C. 1804(a)(6)), as amended by section 202, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) if the target of the electronic surveillance is an elected Federal official or a candidate in a Federal election, that the Attorney General has approved in writing of the investigation;''.

(b) TITLE III.—Section 303(a)(6) (50 U.S.C. 1823(a)(6)), as amended by section 202, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(G) if the target of the physical search is an elected Federal official or a candidate in a Federal election, that the Attorney General has approved in writing of the investigation;''.

SEC. 204. REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION OF FEDERAL OFFICERS FOR MISCONDUCT BEFORE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.

Section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(l) REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION OF FEDERAL OFFICERS FOR MISCONDUCT BEFORE COURTS.—An employee, officer, or contractor of the United States Government who engages in deliberate misconduct with respect to proceedings before the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review shall be subject to appropriate adverse actions, including, as appropriate, suspension without pay or removal.''.

SEC. 205. PENALTIES FOR OFFENSES RELATED TO FISA.

(a) FALSE DECLARATIONS BEFORE FISC AND FISCR.—Section 1623(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting before '', or both'' the following: ''or, if such proceedings are before or ancillary to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review established by section 103 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803), imprisoned not more than eight years''.

(b) INCREASED PENALTY FOR UNAUTHORIZED USE.—Section 109(c) (50 U.S.C. 1809(c)) is amended by striking ''five years'' and inserting ''eight years''.

(c) UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OF APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 109 (50 U.S.C. 1809) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''intentionally'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ''intentionally'' before ''engages in''; and

(ii) by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting ''intentionally'' before ''disclose or uses''; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) is an employee, officer, or contractor of the United States Government and intentionally discloses an application, or classified information contained therein, for an order under any title of this Act to any person not entitled to receive classified information.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking ''under subsection (a)'' and inserting ''under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)''.

SEC. 206. CONTEMPTS CONSTITUTING CRIMES.

Section 402 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''any district court of the United States'' the following: '', the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review established by section 103 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803),''.

SEC. 207. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to applications made under section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861) on or after such date.

TITLE III—FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT

SEC. 301. DECLASSIFICATION OF SIGNIFICANT DECISIONS, ORDERS, AND OPINIONS.

(a) TIMING OF DECLASSIFICATION.—Subsection (a) of section 602 (50 U.S.C. 1872) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The Director shall complete the declassification review and public release of each such decision, order, or opinion by not later than 180 days after the date on which the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review issues such decision, order, or opinion.''.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—Such subsection is further amended—

(1) by striking ''Subject to subsection (b)'' and inserting ''(1) Subject to subsection (b)'';

(2) by striking ''includes a significant'' and all that follows through '', and,'' and inserting ''is described in paragraph (2) and,''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The decisions, orders, or opinions issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review described in this paragraph are such decisions, orders, or opinions that—

''(A) include a significant construction or interpretation of any provision of law, including any novel or significant construction or interpretation of—

''(i) the term 'specific selection term'; or

''(ii) section 501(a)(5); or

''(B) result from a proceeding in which an amicus curiae has been appointed pursuant to section 103(i).''.

(c) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENT.—Section 602 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1872) shall apply with respect to each decision, order, or opinion issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review before, on, or after the date of the enactment of such section. With respect to such decisions, orders, or opinions issued before or on such date, the Director of National Intelligence shall complete the declassification review and public release of each such decision, order, or opinion pursuant to such section by not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. APPOINTMENT OF AMICI CURIAE AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION.

(a) EXPANSION OF APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.—Subparagraph (A) of section 103(i)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

''(A) shall appoint an individual who has been designated under paragraph (1) to serve as amicus curiae to assist such court in the consideration of any application for an order or review that, in the opinion of the court—

''(i) presents a novel or significant interpretation of the law, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate; or

''(ii) presents exceptional concerns about the protection of the rights of a United States person under the first amendment to the Constitution, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate; and''.

(b) AUTHORITY TO SEEK REVIEW.—Subsection (i) of section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (11) as paragraphs (8) through (12), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

''(7) AUTHORITY TO SEEK REVIEW OF DECISIONS.—

''(A) FISA COURT DECISIONS.—Following issuance of an order under this Act by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, an amicus curiae appointed under paragraph (2) may petition the court to certify for review to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review a question of law pursuant to subsection (j). If the court denies such petition, the court shall provide for the record a written statement of the reasons for such denial. Upon certification of any question of law pursuant to this subparagraph, the Court of Review shall appoint the amicus curiae to assist the Court of Review in its consideration of the certified question, unless the Court of Review issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate.

''(B) FISA COURT OF REVIEW DECISIONS.—An amicus curiae appointed under paragraph (2) may petition the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review to certify for review to the Supreme Court of the United States any question of law pursuant to section 1254(2) of title 28, United States Code.''.

(c) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—

(1) APPLICATION AND MATERIALS.—Subparagraph (A) of section 103(i)(6) (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(6)) is amended by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clause:

''(ii) may make a submission to the court requesting access to any particular materials or information (or category of materials or information) that the amicus curiae believes to be relevant to the duties of the amicus curiae.''.

(2) CONSULTATION AMONG AMICI CURIAE.—Such section is further amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) as subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

''(B) CONSULTATION.—If the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review determines that it is relevant to the duties of an amicus curiae appointed by the court under paragraph (2), the amicus curiae may consult with one or more of the other individuals designated by the court to serve as amicus curiae pursuant to paragraph (1) regarding any of the information relevant to any assigned proceeding.''.

(d) TERM LIMITS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 103(i) (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''An individual may serve as an amicus curiae for a 5-year term, and the presiding judges may, for good cause, jointly reappoint the individual to a single additional term.''.

(2) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to the service of an amicus curiae appointed under section 103(i) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)) that occurs on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, regardless of the date on which the amicus curiae is appointed.

SEC. 303. EFFECTIVE AND INDEPENDENT ADVICE FOR FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.

Section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803), as amended by section 204, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(m) INDEPENDENT LEGAL ADVISORS.—

''(1) AUTHORITY.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review may jointly employ legal advisors to assist the courts in all aspects of considering any matter before the courts, including with respect to—

''(A) providing advice on issues of law or fact presented by any application for an order under this Act;

''(B) requesting information from the Government in connection with any such application;

''(C) identifying any concerns with any such application; and

''(D) proposing requirements or conditions for the approval of any such application.

''(2) DIRECTION.—The legal advisors employed under paragraph (1) shall be subject solely to the direction of the presiding judges of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review.''.

SEC. 304. TRANSCRIPTS OF PROCEEDINGS AND COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING APPLICATIONS.

(a) TRANSCRIPTS.—Subsection (c) of section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Proceedings under this Act'' and inserting ''(1) Proceedings under this Act'';

(2) by inserting '', and shall be transcribed'' before the first period;

(3) by inserting '', transcriptions of proceedings,'' after ''applications made''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Transcriptions of proceedings shall be stored in a file associated with the relevant application or order.''.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR WRITTEN RECORDS OF INTERACTIONS WITH COURT.—Such subsection, as amended by paragraph (1) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Attorney General and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court shall maintain all written substantive communications between the Department of Justice and the court, including the identity of the employees of the court to or from whom the communications were made, regarding an application or order made under this title in a file associated with the application or order.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (i)(2) of section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended by striking ''subsection (c)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)(1)''.

SEC. 305. INFORMATION PROVIDED IN ANNUAL REPORTS.

(a) REPORTS BY DIRECTOR OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 603 (50 U.S.C. 1873) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (F), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(G) the number of times the Attorney General required the emergency production of tangible things pursuant to section 501(i)(1) and the application under subparagraph (D) of such section was denied;

''(H) the number of certifications by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review pursuant to section 103(j); and

''(I) the number of requests to certify a question made by an amicus curiae to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review pursuant to section 103(i)(7).''.

(b) REPORTS BY DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—Subsection (b)(5)(B) of such section, as amended by section 101, is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', including information received electronically and through hardcopy and portable media''.

TITLE IV—TRANSPARENCY, SUNSETS, AND OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 401. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 601 (50 U.S.C. 1871) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection (e):

''(e) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.—In a manner consistent with the protection of the national security, nothing in this Act or any other provision of law may be construed to preclude the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate from receiving in a timely manner, upon request, applications submitted under this Act to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, orders of the court, and relevant materials relating to such applications and orders.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 602(a) (50 U.S.C. 1872(a)) is amended by striking ''in section 601(e)'' and inserting ''in section 601(f)''.

SEC. 402. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMPLIANCE OFFICERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VI (50 U.S.C. 1871 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 605. COMPLIANCE OFFICERS.

''(a) APPOINTMENT.—The head of each covered agency shall appoint a single Federal officer to serve as the Compliance Officer for that agency.

''(b) COMPLIANCE.—Each Compliance Officer appointed under subsection (a) shall be responsible for overseeing the compliance of the relevant covered agency with the requirements of this Act.

''(c) AUDITS.—Each Compliance Officer shall conduct routine audits of the compliance by the relevant covered agency with—

''(1) the requirements of this Act regarding submitting applications to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, including with respect to the accuracy of such applications; and

''(2) the minimization, targeting, querying, and accuracy procedures required by this Act.

''(d) ASSESSMENTS.—Each Compliance Officer shall—

''(1) conduct on a routine basis assessments of the efficacy of the minimization, targeting, querying, and accuracy procedures adopted by the Attorney General pursuant to this Act; and

''(2) annually submit to the Assistant Attorney General designated as the Assistant Attorney General for National Security under section 507A of title 28, United States Code, and the head of the relevant covered agency the findings of such assessments, including any recommendations of the Compliance Officer with respect to improving such procedures.

''(e) REMEDIATION.—Each Compliance Officer shall ensure the remediation of any compliance issues of the relevant covered agency identified pursuant to this section or the rules of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

''(f) INSPECTOR GENERALS ASSESSMENT.—On an annual basis, and consistent with the protection of sources and methods, each Inspector General of a covered agency shall submit to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the appropriate congressional committees an assessment of the implementation of this section by the covered agency.

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

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

''(A) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

''(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

''(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term 'covered agency' means a department or agency of the United States Government that submits applications to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court under this Act.

''(3) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.—The term 'Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court' has the meaning given that term in section 101.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 604 the following new item:

''Sec. 605. Compliance officers.''.

SEC. 403. PUBLIC REPORTS ON INFORMATION OBTAINED OR DERIVED UNDER FISA AND PROTECTION OF FIRST AMENDMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall make publicly available the following reports:

(1) A report explaining how the United States Government determines whether information is ''obtained or derived'' from activities authorized by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) for purposes of the notice requirements under such Act.

(2) A report explaining how the United States Government interprets the prohibition under section 501(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1861(a)) on conducting an investigation of a United States person ''solely upon the basis of activities protected by the first amendment to the Constitution''.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that the reports under subsection (a) are detailed and use hypothetical fact patterns to describe how the United States Government conducts the analyses covered by the reports.

(c) FORM.—The reports under subsection (a) shall be made publicly available in unclassified form.

SEC. 404. MANDATORY REPORTING ON CERTAIN ORDERS.

(a) REPORTING ON UNITED STATES PERSON QUERIES.—Subsection (b)(2) of section 603 (50 U.S.C. 1873), as amended by section 101, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''the number of search terms concerning a known United States person'' and inserting ''the number of search terms that concern a known United States person or are reasonably likely to identify a United States person''; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''the number of queries concerning a known United States person'' and inserting ''the number of queries that concern a known United States person or are reasonably likely to identify a United States person''.

(b) MODIFICATION TO EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (d)(2) of such section, as amended by section 101, is amended by striking ''(A) FEDERAL'' and all that follows through ''(B) ELECTRONIC MAIL ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS.—''.

SEC. 405. REPORT ON USE OF FISA AUTHORITIES REGARDING PROTECTED ACTIVITIES AND PROTECTED CLASSES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board shall make publicly available, to the extent practicable, a report on—

(1) the extent to which the activities and protected classes described in subsection (b) are used to support targeting decisions in the use of authorities pursuant to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.); and

(2) the impact of the use of such authorities on such activities and protected classes.

(b) ACTIVITIES AND PROTECTED CLASSES DESCRIBED.—The activities and protected classes described in this subsection are the following:

(1) Activities and expression protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(2) Race, ethnicity, national origin, religious affiliation, sex, and any other protected characteristic determined appropriate by the Board.

(c) FORM.—In addition to the report made publicly available under subsection (a), the Board may submit to the appropriate congressional committees a classified annex.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 406. IMPROVEMENTS TO PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.

Paragraph (4) of section 1061(h) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(h)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) TERM.—

''(A) COMMENCEMENT.—Each member of the Board shall serve a term of 6 years, commencing on the date of the appointment of the member to the Board.

''(B) REAPPOINTMENT.—A member may be reappointed to one or more additional terms.

''(C) VACANCY.—A vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

''(D) EXTENSION.—Upon the expiration of the term of office of a member, the member may continue to serve, at the election of the member—

''(i) during the period preceding the reappointment of the member pursuant to subparagraph (B); or

''(ii) until the member's successor has been appointed and qualified.''.

SEC. 407. SUNSETS.

(a) USA PATRIOT IMPROVEMENT AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2005.—Section 102(b)(1) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (50 U.S.C. 1805 note) is amended by striking ''March 15, 2020'' and inserting ''December 1, 2023''.

(b) INTELLIGENCE REFORM AND TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2004.—Section 6001(b)(1) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended by striking ''March 15, 2020'' and inserting ''December 1, 2023''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of the enactment of this Act or March 15, 2020.

SEC. 408. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 103(e) (50 U.S.C. 1803(e)), by striking ''702(h)(4)'' both places it appears and inserting ''702(i)(4)''.

(2) In section 105(a)(4) (50 U.S.C. 1805(a)(4))—

(A) by striking ''section 104(a)(7)(E)'' and inserting ''section 104(a)(6)(E)''; and

(B) by striking ''section 104(d)'' and inserting ''section 104(c)''.

(3) In section 501(a) (50 U.S.C. 1861(a)), by indenting paragraph (3) 2 ems to the left.

(4) In section 603(b)(2)(C) (50 U.S.C. 1873(b)(2)(C)), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon.

(5) In section 702 (50 U.S.C. 1881a)—

(A) in subsection (h)(3), by striking ''subsection (i)'' and inserting ''subsection (j)'';

(B) in subsection (j)(1), by striking ''subsection (g)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (h)''; and

(C) in the subsection heading of subsection (m), by inserting a comma after ''ASSESSMENTS''.

(6) In section 801(8)(B)(iii) (50 U.S.C. 1885(8)(B)(iii)), by striking ''702(h)'' and inserting ''702(i)''.

(7) In section 802(a)(3) (50 U.S.C. 1885a(a)(3)), by striking ''702(h)'' and inserting ''702(i)''.

(b) REFERENCES TO FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT AND FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 101 (50 U.S.C. 1801) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(q) The term 'Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court' means the court established under section 103(a).

''(r) The terms 'Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review' and 'Court of Review' mean the court established under section 103(b).''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 102 (50 U.S.C. 1802), by striking ''the court established under section 103(a)'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court'';

(B) in section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803)—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''The court established under this subsection'' and inserting ''The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court''; and

(II) by striking ''the court established under this subsection'' each place it appears and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court'';

(ii) in subsection (g)—

(I) by striking ''the court established pursuant to subsection (a)'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court'';

(II) by striking ''the court of review established pursuant to subsection (b)'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review''; and

(III) by striking ''The courts established pursuant to subsections (a) and (b)'' and inserting ''The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review'';

(iii) in subsection (h), by striking ''a court established under this section'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review'';

(iv) in subsection (i)—

(I) in paragraph (1), by striking ''the courts established under subsections (a) and (b)'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review'';

(II) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking ''the courts'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review'';

(III) in paragraph (5), by striking ''the court'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review, as the case may be,'';

(IV) in paragraph (6), by striking ''the court'' each place it appears and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review'';

(V) by striking ''a court established under subsection (a) or (b)'' each place it appears and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review''; and

(VI) by striking ''A court established under subsection (a) or (b)'' each place it appears and inserting ''The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review'';

(v) in subsection (j)—

(I) by striking ''a court established under subsection (a)'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court''; and

(II) by striking ''the court determines'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court determines'';

(vi) by striking ''the court established under subsection (a)'' each place it appears and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court''; and

(vii) by striking ''the court established under subsection (b)'' each place it appears and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review'';

(C) in section 105(c) (50 U.S.C. 1805(c))—

(i) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''the Court'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''the court'' each place it appears and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court'';

(D) in section 401(1) (50 U.S.C. 1841(1)), by striking '', and 'State' '' and inserting '' 'State', 'Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court', and 'Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review' '';

(E) in section 402 (50 U.S.C. 1842)—

(i) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''the court established by section 103(a) of this Act'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court''; and

(ii) in subsection (h)(2), by striking ''the court established under section 103(a)'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court'';

(F) in section 501 (50 U.S.C. 1861)—

(i) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''the court established by section 103(a)'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court'';

(ii) in subsection (g)(3), by striking ''the court established under section 103(a)'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court''; and

(iii) in subsection (k)(1), by striking '', and 'State' '' and inserting '' 'State', and 'Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court' '';

(G) in section 502(c)(1)(E), by striking ''the court established under section 103'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (as defined by section 101)'';

(H) in section 801 (50 U.S.C. 1885)—

(i) in paragraph (8)(B)(i), by striking ''the court established under section 103(a)'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(10) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.—The term 'Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court' means the court established under section 103(a).''; and

(I) in section 802(a)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1885a(a)(1)), by striking ''the court established under section 103(a)'' and inserting ''the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court''.

(c) UPDATED REFERENCES TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 102(a) (50 U.S.C. 1802(a))—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''him'' and inserting ''the Attorney General''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''his certification'' and inserting ''the Attorney General's certification'';

(2) in section 103(a)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1803(a)(1)), by striking ''his decision'' and inserting ''the decision of such judge'';

(3) in section 104(a) (50 U.S.C. 1804)(a))—

(A) in the language preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''his finding'' and inserting ''the Attorney General's finding''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''his belief'' and inserting ''the applicant's belief'';

(4) in section 105(a) (50 U.S.C. 1805(a)), by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the judge'';

(5) in section 106 (50 U.S.C. 1806)—

(A) in subsection (e), by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the person''; and

(B) in subsection (j), by striking ''his discretion'' and inserting ''the discretion of the judge'';

(6) in section 109 (50 U.S.C. 1809)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the person''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''his official duties'' and inserting ''the official duties of such officer'';

(7) in section 305 (50 U.S.C. 1825)—

(A) in subsection (f)(1), by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the person''; and

(B) in subsection (j)(1), by striking ''his discretion'' and inserting ''the discretion of the judge'';

(8) in section 307 (50 U.S.C. 1827)—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the person''; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking ''his official duties'' and inserting ''the official duties of such officer''; and

(9) in section 403 (50 U.S.C. 1843), by striking ''his designee'' and inserting ''a designee of the Attorney General''.

(d) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AMENDMENTS MADE BY THIS ACT.—For purposes of applying amendments made by provisions of this Act other than this section, the amendments made by this section shall be treated as having been enacted immediately before any such amendments by other provisions of this Act.

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

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), and the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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 into the RECORD.

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, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, authorizes the government to collect foreign intelligence in the United States under the supervision of a secret court.

It is one of the most complicated, technical statutes we handle, but the story of FISA and how Congress reacts to its use is really very simple.

Some measure of surveillance is necessary to keep our country safe. Left unchecked, however, the executive branch is all too willing to unleash its considerable surveillance capabilities on the American people.

Our job as Members of Congress is to make sure that our intelligence capabilities are robust, but also to provide that critical check, to claw back authorities that go too far, and to press for changes that protect our civil liberties to the maximum extent possible.

H.R. 6172, the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act, is one step in that ongoing project of protecting our civil liberties.

It is by no means a perfect bill. There are many other changes to FISA that I would have liked to have seen here, but this bill includes very important reforms.

First and foremost, it ends the NSA's call detail records program, which

began as part of a secret and unlawful surveillance project almost 20 years ago. This experiment has run its course, and our responsibility is to bring it to its formal end. It should never have been permitted to start, but now at least we can finally end it.

This bill also prohibits the use of section 215 to acquire information that would otherwise require a warrant in the law enforcement context. Our understanding of the Fourth Amendment has come to recognize a privacy interest in our physical location, and this legislation provides new protections accordingly.

As the law continues to evolve, the public will see how the government applies these standards in the FISA court. This bill requires the government to disclose all significant opinions of the FISA court within 180 days.

The bill also requires a one-time historical review of all significant opinions issued by the court since its inception. The Department of Justice may have good cause to classify the details of any particular case, but there is no reason that important interpretations of the law should be kept secret. There never was, and we finally managed to get rid of it.

Now, since we circulated the original draft of this bill, we have heard from a wide range of stakeholders, from the most progressive Members of the Democratic Caucus to the staunchest supporters of President Trump, and they have convinced us to make yet additional changes.

To address the concerns of those who seek additional guarantees of privacy, we have added new retention limits, new reports to explain key legal issues, and an explicit prohibition on the use of section 215 to obtain GPS and cell site location information.

Other Members asked us to address the deep structural flaws in FISA identified by the inspector general in the report issued late last year. We have done just that. Working with our Republican colleagues, we have mandated additional transparency in FISA applications, created additional scrutiny for cases that involve elected officials, and elevated the consequences for misrepresenting information to the FISA court.

I should also address the Members on both sides of the aisle who urged opposition to this bill because it does not contain every reform we might have wanted.

Madam Speaker, I agree. It does not contain every reform that I want. I am no fan of the underlying authorities.

I represent Lower Manhattan. I was in Congress when the World Trade Center was hit. Then and now, I resented that the government exploited 9/11 to pass the PATRIOT Act, which was much too restrictive of civil liberties, and other measures that I find dangerous and overbroad.

For many years, I led the opposition to reauthorization of the business records provision of FISA, which we are finally doing something about today.

I am a founding member of what was then called the PATRIOT Act Reform Caucus to reform the PATRIOT Act. I have voted against every FISA bill that did not contain significant reform.

But the measure before us today does contain significant reform—again, not every change we would like to see, certainly not many of the changes I would like to see, but very decisive steps in the direction of protecting our civil rights and our civil liberties.

We are taking that step as we should—together, in a bipartisan fashion, and in complete agreement that when it comes to safeguarding our civil liberties, we have done what we could do, and we still have a great deal of work to do.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of the reform legislation.

This bill is not perfect, as the chairman said. It does not contain every reform that I would like to see or the reforms that I advocated for and many others advocated for, but it is a start. Most importantly, this bill is an improvement over what currently exists, over the status quo.

The legislation begins to address the problems that we saw with the FBI's illegal surveillance of Trump campaign associate Carter Page.

On December 9, 2019, the nonpartisan Justice Department inspector general released a 400-page report detailing the FBI's misconduct and the failures in its warrantless surveillance of Mr. Page.

Congressman MEADOWS and I urged our Democratic chairman to hold hearings on this report, but they were not interested.

Still, I hope all of my colleagues had a chance to read the inspector general's report because it should concern every single American.

Remember, if our law enforcement agencies can do this to a President, imagine what they can do to you and me.

The Justice Department inspector general found 17 significant errors or omissions in the FISA warrant applications for Mr. Page. Said more plainly, they lied to the court 17 times.

They didn't tell the court important information, like the guy who wrote the dossier was being paid for by the opposition party's campaign. They didn't tell the court the guy who wrote the document, the dossier, that they used to get the warrant was ''desperate'' to stop Trump and had communicated that to the Justice Department.

The inspector general also found 51 factual assertions made to the FISA court that were wrong or unsupported. It detailed how the FBI was too eager to rely on phony political opposition research conducted by Christopher Steele and, as I said, funded by the Democrats.

According to the inspector general: ''The FISA request form drew almost entirely from Steele's reporting in describing the factual basis to establish probable cause to believe that Page was an agent of a foreign power,'' which was not true.

The inspector general determined that the FBI did not have corroborating information to support the specific allegations made against Mr. Page. In fact, Steele was feeding the FBI gossip and innuendo as proof of wrongdoing. Then, the FBI used that information, as I said, to spy on an American citizen, without corroborating the information.

This is a great misuse of immense power that our Federal Government agencies have, and it is a severe abuse of trust.

Now, there has been a lot of talk about accountability for this misconduct, and I absolutely agree. There needs to be accountability at all levels.

The inspector general found that an FBI attorney actually doctored a piece of evidence. An FBI attorney did this. He doctored a piece of evidence that he used to obtain the warrant to spy on Mr. Page.

The attorney took an email that would have cut against the surveillance order on Mr. Page and changed its meaning. He changed its meaning 180 degrees so that it would support the surveillance. This is totally unacceptable.

The same FBI lawyer who the inspector general found to have shared anti-Trump text messages with his colleagues, writing all kinds of things—''the crazies won finally,'' ''viva la resistance''—this attorney went on to serve on Special Counsel Robert Mueller's team investigating the debunked allegations about Russian collusion.

The FBI's misconduct on FISA is not limited to junior staffers, as some of my colleagues have asserted. Such rampant and flagrant abuse can occur only because of senior leadership failures: Director Comey, Deputy Director McCabe, and General Counsel Jim Baker.

In fact, the inspector general said as much in his report. Here are his words: ''In our view, this was a failure of not only the operational team, but also of the managers and supervisors, including senior officials, in the chain of command.''

It is no coincidence that the two most senior FBI officials involved, Director Comey and Deputy Director McCabe, were both referred for criminal prosecution by the inspector general for wrongdoing related to the investigations.

We cannot forget this background because that is why this reform legislation—again, while not everything we hoped for—is a necessary first step.

This bill would add several requirements to ensure a FISA application is complete and accurate. It requires the Attorney General to sign off on a FISA investigation of an elected official or candidate for Federal office. It forces the Justice Department to fire anyone who knowingly hides information from the FISA court. And the bill enhances congressional oversight of the FISA process.

It also allows the FISA court to appoint an amicus in cases involving political activities of a U.S. person. Because the FISA process is ex parte—meaning, of course, the U.S. person is not represented—I hope the appointment of the amicus will help the FISA court to protect the civil liberties of U.S. persons.

Like I said, I think we can and should do more, and I look forward to working with the chairman toward that end. But right now, this bill would improve the civil liberty protections of U.S. citizens.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD this letter from the chairwoman of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM,
Washington, DC, March 10, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 6172, the ''USA Freedom Reauthorization Act.'' There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

In the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously on this bill, I am willing to waive this Committee's right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Oversight and Reform does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name Members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective Committees.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
Chairwoman.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, I am delighted to be able to join our Republican colleagues and Democratic colleagues and those of us who have advocated for a progressive mindset as it relates to civil liberties in this country in support of the reauthorization of the USA FREEDOM Act.

With that backdrop, however, I want to say to my good friend, he knows that the inspector general's report indicated that there was no political motive to the beginning of the investigation. And even though referrals have been made, none of the individuals he mentioned have been criminally prosecuted.

That is behind us, to a certain extent, but it is a good backdrop to make sure that anything we do, no matter who the individuals are, that we do it with the impeccable credentials of the Constitution, civil liberties, civil justice, and equality.

That is why I rise to support this legislation, although I know that a more detailed review might have warranted some additional fixes.

But I think it is important to take note that we do have the prohibition of the government from using section 215 to collect any records that would require a warrant if the information being assessed was for law enforcement purposes.

We are trying to contain and constrain. The bill requires the government to provide notice to individuals whose information is collected pursuant to 215, and it strengthens First Amendment protections by requiring the FISA court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review to appoint an amicus curiae in any instance where an application by the government presents significant concerns about impinging on the First Amendment.

The bill also strengthens the amicus curiae's ability to protect privacy in civil liberties cases. As well, it directs the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board to conduct a study of the way the government's use of FISA authorities may be premised.

The bill improves transparency. The bill strengthens reporting requirements. It strengthens, as I said, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.

In further debates right after 9/11, I worked on a number of legislative initiatives, including one bill in 2013, the FISA Court and Sunshine Act, bipartisan legislation that provided much-needed transparency without compromising national security to the decisions, orders, and opinions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

That language is in this bill, the opportunity to review those decisions and for those decisions to be able to be reviewed as well.

I am a longstanding supporter of the USA FREEDOM Act, particularly because section 301 of that bill, which is not in this bill, has protections against reversed targeting.

□ 1530

Each moment that we have an opportunity to provide security for this Nation we also have the equal opportunity of infringing on the civil liberties of our fellow citizens. It is important today to stand on this floor and say to the American people that we do believe in their constitutional rights and the Bill of Rights. This legislation is to further contain those infringements and to protect the rights of our citizens.

Madam Speaker, I want my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and as an original cosponsor of the USA Freedom Act, which stands for ''Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ending Eavesdropping, Dragnet-collection, and Online Monitoring Act'', I rise in support of the ''USA Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2020.''

I support the USA Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2020 for several reasons:

1. The bill continues to prohibit the NSA from collecting bulk phone records. By doing so, the government no longer has the authority to collect large amounts of call detail records on an ongoing basis. The Call Detail Records program not only resulted in the over-collection of records that the NSA did not have authority to receive but also resulted in several technical problems.

2. The USA Freedom Reauthorization Act prohibits the government from using Section 215 to collect any records that would require a warrant if the information being accessed were for law enforcement purposes. This provision ensures that Section 215 can keep pace with future developments in the law as courts interpret Carpenter v. United States and apply it to other contexts.

3. The bill requires the government to provide notice to individuals whose information is collected pursuant to Section 215 if the government plans to use that information, or any information derived from it, in a criminal case or other legal proceeding.

4. The USA Freedom Reauthorization Act strengthens First Amendment Protections by requiring the FISC and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review to appoint an amicus curia in any instance where an application by the government presents significant concerns about impinging on the First Amendment activities of Americans.

5. The bill contains other measures to strengthen amici curiae's ability to protect privacy in civil liberties in cases to which they are appointed.

6. The USA Freedom Reauthorization Act directs the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board to conduct a study of the way the government's use of FISA authorities may be premised on or may impact protected classes, including based on race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, or sex.

7. The bill improves transparency by requiring the declassification of significant FISC and FISC–R opinions within 180 days.

8. The USA Freedom Reauthorization Act strengthens the reporting requirement for Section 702 queries by eliminating an existing exemption for the FBI.

9. The bill strengthens the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (PCLOB) by allowing members to be reappointed to consecutive terms and to continue serving after their terms have expired, should they so choose.

The USA Freedom Act was first passed in 2015 as the House's unified response to the unauthorized disclosures and subsequent publication in the media in June 2013, regarding the National Security Agency's collection from Verizon of the phone records of all of its American customers, which was authorized by the FISA Court pursuant to Section 215 of the Patriot Act.

Public reaction to the news of this massive and secret data gathering operation was swift and negative.

There was justifiable concern on the part of the public and a large percentage of the Members of this body that the extent and scale of this NSA data collection operation, which exceeded by orders of magnitude anything previously authorized or contemplated, may constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy and threat to the civil liberties of American citizens.

To quell the growing controversy, the Director of National Intelligence declassified and released limited information about this program. According to the DNI, the information acquired under this program did not include the content of any communications or the identity of any subscriber.

The DNI stated that ''the only type of information acquired under the Court's order is telephony meta data, such as telephone numbers dialed and length of calls.''

The assurance given by the DNI, to put it mildly, was not very reassuring.

In response, many Members of Congress, including then Ranking Member Conyers, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and myself, introduced legislation in response to the disclosures to ensure that the law and the practices of the executive branch reflect the intent of Congress in passing the USA Patriot Act and subsequent amendments.

For example, I introduced H.R. 2440, the ''FISA Court in the Sunshine Act of 2013,'' bipartisan legislation, that provided much needed transparency without compromising national security to the decisions, orders, and opinions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or ''FISA Court.''

Specifically, my bill required the Attorney General to disclose each decision, order, or opinion of a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), allowing Americans to know how broad of a legal authority the government is claiming under the PATRIOT ACT and Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to conduct the surveillance needed to keep Americans safe.

These requirements were then incorporated in substantial fl part in the USA Freedom Act, which required the Attorney General to conduct a declassification review of each decision, order, or opinion of the FISA court that included a significant construction or interpretation of law and to submit a report to Congress within 45 days.

As I indicated, perhaps the most important reasons for supporting passage of the USA Freedom Reauthorization Act is the prohibition on domestic bulk collection, as well as its enhanced First Amendment protections, both of which seek to protect American citizens from the NSA' s abuse of power through unlawful collection of personal data.

I was also a longstanding supporter of the USA Freedom Act, particularly because Section 301 of the bill contained protections against ''reverse targeting,'' which became law when an earlier Jackson Lee Amendment was included in H.R. 3773, the RESTORE Act of 2007.

''Reverse targeting,'' a concept well known to members of this Committee but not so well understood by those less steeped in the arcana of electronic surveillance, is the practice where the government targets foreigners without a warrant while its actual purpose is to collect information on certain U.S. persons.

One of the main concerns of libertarians and classical conservatives, as well as progressives and civil liberties organizations, in giving expanded authority to the executive branch was the temptation for national security agencies to engage in reverse targeting may be difficult to resist in the absence of strong safeguards to prevent it.

The Jackson Lee Amendment, preserved in Section 301 of the USA Freedom Act, reduced even further any such temptation to resort to reverse targeting by making any information concerning a United States person obtained improperly inadmissible in any federal, state, or local judicial, legal, executive, or administrative proceeding.

Madam Speaker, I noted in an op-ed published way back in October 2007, that as Alexis DeTocqueville, the most astute student of American democracy, observed nearly two centuries ago, the reason democracies invariably prevail in any military conflict is because democracy is the governmental form that best rewards and encourages those traits that are indispensable to success: initiative, innovation, courage, and a love of justice.

I support the USA Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2020 because it will help keep us true to the Bill of Rights and strikes the proper balance between cherished liberties and smart security.

I urge my colleagues to support the USA Freedom Reauthorization Act.

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

I will just real quickly say that the gentlewoman is exactly right. People should be prosecuted. It was so bad in the Carter Page application. Here is what the former chief judge of the FISA court said:

> The frequency with which representations made by FBI personnel turned out to be unsupported or contradicted by information in their possession and with which they withheld information detrimental to their case calls into question whether information contained in other FBI applications is reliable.

Put in plain English: You lied so much, how can we trust any other representation you have made to the court?

That is what this legislation is designed to begin to address and protect American citizens who will be in front of this court.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), who has been a strong advocate in this area and former chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I am no stranger to this debate. In the aftermath of 9/11, I stood on this floor to advance the USA PATRIOT Act. I still believe, as I did at the time, in its necessity to protect our country from terrorist attacks.

In 2015, after abuses of the surveillance authorities were brought to light, I fought for reforms that resulted in the passage of the USA FREEDOM Act.

Today I rise in support of this reauthorization bill. The expiring provisions are still necessary to the national security of the United States. However, much like in 2015, we have been made aware of surveillance abuses that require our attention. I believe this bill offers substantial reforms to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, reforms that are imperative for accountability and the restoration of Americans' confidence in our intelligence system.

The FISA abuses in the Carter Page case were staggering. We learned about these when Inspector General Michael Horowitz released his report on December 9, 2019. I said at the time that Congress had the responsibility to fully examine his findings and to take corrective actions.

Unfortunately, we have not fully examined this report. Despite being released 3 months ago, we have not held one hearing on the House side. There is documented evidence of errors, missteps, and omissions that resulted in the degradation of Carter Page's constitutional rights, and, to date, the House majority has largely ignored it.

So I am glad that the majority is finally acknowledging the abuses in the Horowitz report by introducing corrective actions in this bill.

There are several good provisions for accountability in the bill. For instance, the Attorney General must now approve, in writing, the FISA investigation of an elected official or candidate for Federal office. Also, the legislation expands the use of an amicus in cases involving the political activities of U.S. citizens. The legislation creates checks to ensure that information being presented to the FISC is accurate.

It is impossible to legislate away bad behavior by malicious actors, but this legislation places much-needed safeguards to prevent another Carter Page-type scandal from happening again.

My colleagues who wish we should do more are right; we should do more. But with a deadline on Sunday, we must either act now or let these important national security authorities expire.

Since the inception of the PATRIOT Act, I have fought for oversight of powerful surveillance apparatus. I believe that the reforms presented in this bill are a good step to restoring the oversight.

The reauthorization reinforces essential and effective tools that have been in place since 9/11, while also strengthening the protection of citizen civil liberties in the United States.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act of 2020.

This bill strikes just the right balance between protecting our national security and strengthening civil liberties. It preserves critical tools used by authorities to investigate international terrorism and foreign intelligence matters, but also makes significant reforms to enhance privacy and transparency.

I would like to quickly highlight some of the important privacy protections included in the bill.

For example, the FBI may no longer be able to keep business records collected under FISA indefinitely. Those records would have to be destroyed after 5 years, except in very narrow circumstances.

The government will also have to provide notice to individuals whose business records are used in a criminal case or other proceeding unless the proceeding's adjudicator finds that disclosure would harm national security. Individuals who receive notice would then be able to challenge the legality of the government's collection, a right that should be maintained when intrusive national security authorities are used to gather evidence.

In addition to these privacy enhancements, the bill also requires greater transparency about how the government uses FISA. The bill imposes a 180-day clock on declassification of significant opinions issued by the FISA court and requires the government to look further in its historical records than it has done before.

Moreover, the bill enhances transparency in the intelligence community's annual public reports so we get a better sense of when the government conducts U.S. person queries into FISA data.

These are but some examples of the important transparency and private reforms contained in this bill. These reforms are all accomplished without negatively impacting our national security.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for it.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

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

The recurring theme that I have heard today is that we should be doing more to fix FISA. That is not unlike what James Madison described in the Federalist Papers when he described parchment barriers between the various departments of government, meaning the three branches of government, afraid that all of it could be sucked into the vortex of power—those are his words—of the legislative branch.

And here we are discussing parchment barriers for those who have basically abused the FISA process so far. We are putting more parchment barriers in place, but they don't mean anything. They don't mean anything if you never see someone prosecuted.

So let's talk about one of the things that has been touted, a lengthening of the time of sentencing from 5 years to 8 years if you are found to commit abuse. How about contempt proceedings that are being put in here?

But do you know what? We know FISA was abused. We know that people lied to the court, and we know something else. The Inspector General recommended criminal charges be filed on people.

These parchment barriers make no sense, have no strength and no efficacy when we don't see someone indicted, charged, or convicted. To say something is criminal in nature doesn't matter when you don't prosecute them.

If you want to deter somebody, you must see prosecution so, that way, you get specific deterrence for that individual or general deterrence to the rest of the people who are inclined to commit bad acts.

The flaws in this bill are that we don't see application of any of these reforms. So we can tout them all we wish—a whole litany of them—but until you actually hold people accountable, this bill has no efficacy. For that reason, I will be opposing.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to caution my colleagues about this false dilemma of security versus freedom and about supporting and defending our Constitution against all enemies foreign or domestic by abridging the rights and freedoms protected by our Constitution.

I want to applaud, frankly, the behind-the-scenes folks on the committees who worked hard to make this bill better than the status quo. Many of my colleagues will look at this, and, frankly, that has been the argument by the ranking member and the chairman that this bill really isn't that good of a bill, that it is really not what we should do, but it is better than the status quo.

Too often that is what happens here. I think that might leave people with the false perception that we couldn't do better. But the reality is there is bipartisan agreement and bicameral agreement on the Safeguarding Americans' Private Records Act.

The bill that the committee was going to move forward with was pulled. The committee process didn't take place because there was a bipartisan coalition of conservatives and progressives who had a plan to amend the bill. It may, in fact, have been a completely different bill.

We also didn't take it through committee. We also didn't allow any amendments, so numerous good amendments weren't even able to be considered, amendments like the confess your transgressions amendment that would say that, of all these agencies that report, the Director of National Intelligence would say: What has been done to discipline people who access these records in violation of statute?

My colleague, Mr. BIGGS, highlighted the real problem. There is one standard for everyday Americans and a different one for the powerful and connected. Our Justice Department needs to hold someone accountable. Whether it is in my district, in a Republican district, or one of my colleagues' districts, in a Democratic district, we get the same question: When is someone going to jail?

We need to know that the law is being followed, that Lady Justice does have a blindfold on, and that there is one standard. This falls far short of that, and it is not the standard that should be used against American citizens; therefore, it is not the standard that should be used to secure our country.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time the minority has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, to my colleagues on both sides who think that this bill doesn't go far enough, I can tell you that, probably 3 days ago, I was 100 percent in your camp. If you would have told me today I was going to stand up and speak in favor of this bill, I would have told you that is not true, yet here I am.

The reason is because I think we are dealing with some issues that are important to discuss:

One, there is no legislation that we can write that will make bad actors not be bad actors. There is no amicus provision or any provision that is going to allow for somebody who is going to lie to their own superiors to not lie to somebody else.

Two, the provisions of lone wolf and roving wiretaps are incredibly important to national security. There is not a lot of debate amongst those things.

Three, FISA and title 1 were originally designed because of abuses to civil rights. We know that title 1 has been abused, and that is why we are here.

But are we better off without title 1? I don't think so. We weren't before. We are better off with it.

So what does this bill actually do that is important, that is why a guy like me who believes in the Fourth Amendment, believes in the First Amendment, and believes in the privacy of our citizens, why would I stand here? Because it increases transparency; it moves it through the process faster; it puts real compliance checks in place; and it holds people accountable both through a contempt proceeding and enhanced criminal penalties.

When we are dealing with something as important as civil liberties, I think we have to ask the question: Are we better off tomorrow than we are today? This bill puts us in a better position tomorrow than it did yesterday.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, as the gentleman from North Dakota just articulated, the bill is better than where we are currently—no call detail records, amicus kicks in if there is a First Amendment concern of any American citizen who is in front of the court. The penalties are real: You lie to the court, you omit information from the court, or you go leak information about the application you submitted to the court, there are enhanced penalties.

There is the transcript provision. There is now a transcript that will be given to the intelligence community. That is a good step, knowing that somebody is going to be looking at what you are doing and is going to see it in a real timeframe is important.

The annual assessment from the IG, the same IG who just told us 3 months ago that the FBI went to the court in the Carter Page application and lied 17 times, that individual, Mr. Horowitz, will be doing an annual assessment; compliance office within the Department of Justice so that there are more people looking at the application on the front end, hopefully, we don't have as many problems; and finally, as the chairman indicated, no cell site GPS location indication without a warrant—those are victories for the American citizen. It is not as much as we would like, but it is a darn good first step.

Madam Speaker, I urge people to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I just want to say that I am in complete agreement with the ranking minority member that this is a very good bill, that we do a lot of things that we ought to do, that we don't do a lot of things, unfortunately, that we should do, but we did what we could.

Undoubtedly, the ranking member and I have different ideas. Some of the things which he thinks we did not enough I think we did too much and vice versa, but we did have some of the things he thinks that we shouldn't have done I wish we had done. But we did manage to reach agreement.

As I said, I believe it is a very good bill. It is not as protective of civil liberties as I would like to see it, but we got as far as we possibly could, and so I urge everyone to vote for this bill.

I know there will be some dissent on our side of the aisle based on civil liberties concerns. I can only say that, with most of those concerns that I have heard voiced, I agree with them, but we just couldn't get them.

Before I close, I want to recognize the staff on both sides of the aisle who have worked around the clock for the past few weeks to reach a compromise and bring this bill to the floor.

Although there are too many to name here, I should single out the following individuals: Aaron Hiller, Sophia Brill, and Sarah Istel from my staff; Wells Bennett, Nicolas Mitchell, Raffaela Wakeman, and William Wu from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence majority; Ryan Breitenbach and Bobby Parmiter from the Judiciary Republican side; Stephen Castor and Tyler Grimm from Mr. JORDAN's staff; and Laura Casulli, Meghan Green, and Allen Souza for the HPSCI Republicans.

□ 1545

The country should be proud of what we have all accomplished here, what they have accomplished here, and I thank each and every one of them.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I will simply say that it is our responsibility to work across the aisle and across the branches of the government to bring our national security in line with our values.

We have done so here, but that work is an ongoing project. It must not end today, because we have a long way to go yet.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) each will control 15 minutes.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act of 2020.

This bill makes a number of critical and important reforms to strengthen civil liberties and privacy protections under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act while simultaneously protecting the national security of the United States. In addition, the bill provides for greater transparency and increased oversight and accountability to ensure the integrity of the FISA process.

Over the past several weeks, Chairman NADLER and I, along with Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER, have worked with Members from across the caucus and the aisle to develop a set of reforms that our Democratic Caucus could be proud to support. This bill is a result of that effort. It builds on the achievements of the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015, which passed with 338 votes in the House and the overwhelming support of the Democratic Caucus to put in place long-sought reforms to FISA.

The three expiring provisions that this bill would reauthorize are vitally important to protecting national security. One of those measures, the roving wiretap provision, authorizes continued court-approved surveillance of targets, even if they change their phones or other devices. Its expiration, or that of the other two provisions, would be to no one's benefit. Our counterterrorism and national security activities would be severely hamstrung, and we would have lost the opportunity to press for reforms that we are seeking.

At the outside of this process, administration officials, like the Attorney General, along with Senate Republican leadership, made it clear that they preferred a clean and permanent reauthorization of these authorities. On a bipartisan basis, this bill rejects that demand, producing a bill that holds firm to our commitment to civil liberties, oversight, and transparency, and, importantly, has an important sunset.

Let me describe just a few of the reforms included in this legislation:

The bill would end, once and for all, NSA's authority to collect call detail records on an ongoing basis, and destroy all records previously obtained under these authorities.

This bill would require that the government get a warrant under FISA, if one would be needed in the law enforcement context.

This bill would prohibit the government from retaining business records for more than 5 years, with exceptions, such as an imminent threat to human life.

This bill would expand the appointment of amici in FISA court proceedings, permit amici to seek access to more information, and creating a framework for amicus to seek higher court review of questions of law to the FISA courts.

The bill would also strengthen the requirement for the declassification and release of FISA court opinions and apply the requirements retroactively to prior to the enactment of the 2015 USA FREEDOM Act.

Madam Speaker, I recognize there are additional reforms that Members would like to see in the bill. I sought additional reforms as well. As with any negotiation, no one side is getting everything they want, but I believe it is important to enhance transparency and privacy safeguards whenever possible.

But this is a strong result that makes substantial reforms that so many members of our caucus, myself included, have worked hard to secure for many years. And I will continue to work to secure further protections for privacy and civil liberties and to provide vigorous oversight of FISA.

Madam Speaker, I support the bill, which makes important reforms to the FISA process and urge Members to vote ''yes,'' and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, is a critical tool for thwarting terrorist plots and collecting vital intelligence on actors who are hostile to U.S. interests.

During the FBI's 2016 Russia collusion investigation, however, FBI officials grossly abused FISA to spy on an associate of a Presidential campaign they opposed.

The purpose of the bill before us today is to reauthorize expiring FISA authorities while ensuring that other

FISA tools can never again be turned against the American people for political purposes.

In 2017, in the course of our own investigation on Russia, House Intelligence Committee Republicans received strong indications that FISA had been severely abused in order to spy on Carter Page, a former associate of the Trump campaign.

As we investigated the matter, we were stonewalled at nearly every juncture by top officials of the FBI and the Department of Justice. Their denials of any wrongdoing were uniformly repeated by the media and by political figures, who were spreading the false accusation that Trump campaign officials colluded with the Russian Government to interfere in the 2016 Presidential election.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my Republican colleagues and staff on the committee who persisted amid the most determined obstruction of any investigation this House has seen in a long time.

I also want to thank our Republican colleagues on the House Oversight and Judiciary Committees who worked hard to uncover the full extent of this malfeasance.

The full scope of the abuse was eventually detailed by Inspector General Michael Horowitz, whose December 2019 report revealed 17 major mistakes and omissions, along with many lesser abuses.

Among many other abuses the Inspector General found, is that the FBI had used unverified allegations from the Steele dossier to get a FISA warrant on Carter Page; had misrepresented the reliability of those allegations to the court; had omitted exculpatory information from their submission; and had doctored an email to hide Page's prior cooperation with a U.S. intelligence agency.

H.R. 6172 is the first step in imposing reforms to address these gross abuses and restore accountability in the FISA process. These reforms include but are not limited to:

Requiring the Attorney General's approval in order to obtain a FISA warrant for any candidate for Federal office;

Imposing stronger penalties for those who conceal information from the FISA court or leak FISA-derived information; and

Providing clear authorization for Congress to access FISA materials so that elected officials can better oversee FISA cases without obstruction.

This legislation makes strong reforms that will protect the American people from government overreach while continuing to protect the homeland from terrorist threats.

Close Congressional oversight of the FISA process, which will be enhanced significantly by this bill, must continue in order to prevent future abuses. What happened to the Trump campaign in 2016 can never be allowed to happen again, not to a political campaign and not to an American citizen.

I believe I speak for all Republicans when I say that our work is not finished. We will continue to look for further ways to improve both privacy protections as well as FISA's effectiveness in defusing national security threats to our country.

Madam Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 6172, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, I thank and compliment the chairman and the ranking member—and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary—for doing such good and bipartisan work at this rather tense and polarized time around reauthorizing a number of authorities that have been, not just important, but essential to keeping the American public safe.

And they did that, of course, mindful of the need to balance those authorities and those activities with the very legitimate civil liberties interests that we all have, and with our obligation to the Constitution, which we all swear an oath to support and defend.

Madam Speaker, as the chairman said, this bill will reauthorize, even as it imposes additional oversight, a couple of very important authorities, while ending the authority that I think in the last several years was most problematic to me, to many people in this Chamber, and to the American people, which was the bulk collection of telephone metadata.

That was a debate that led to the original USA FREEDOM Act of 2015, to those reforms, and gets us to where we are today where Americans can know that the NSA, a foreign intelligence agency, will not be collecting their records, their metadata. And I believe that that is a very substantial achievement in today's bill.

I would like to take a moment, though, to wrestle with a charge that was leveled by my friends and colleagues on the progressive side, and their recommendation with respect to this bill. Their statement called these authorities ''sweeping unconstitutional surveillance.'' And, with respect, I would say that none of that is true.

Sweeping. Let's talk about sweeping for a second. I guess we could argue about exactly what that means, but of the authorities that are being discussed, we are ending the metadata program. The lone-wolf authority, which allows us to surveil a potential terrorist who is not affiliated with a designated terrorist group, has never been used. That leaves, of course, the roving wiretap authority, which is used in a pointed and careful way and has been used to save lives and prosecute terrorists. That is not, I would suggest with respect, sweeping.

So constitutional, the charge that this is unconstitutional is something that we should examine and take seriously. In this time of overheated rhetoric, I think it is important that we be very clear and very specific in the words that we use. So let me just say about the charge that there is anything unconstitutional in these authorities:

No provision has ever been held to be unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, by the FISA court itself, or by any other court.

And it is not just the courts, these authorities have been subject to review by the President's Civil Liberties Oversight Board, and they have not deemed any of these authorities unconstitutional.

They have been subject to Congressional scrutiny and, of course, most famously and most recently, subject to review by the Inspector General, who—yes—discovered very significant deficiencies in the way a FISA application dealing with an American citizen was dealt with.

My friends who are concerned about the possibility of the unconstitutional activity should remember, not a single authority has ever been deemed to be unconstitutional. And over and over again, the FISA court, and most recently Inspector General Horowitz, has pushed back hard on misbehavior, on negligence in this area.

So what we are left with here is balance. And as the chairman and as the ranking member have said, the reforms that are made in this bill with respect to empowering an amicus, with respect to giving the President's Civil Liberties Oversight Board additional authorities strike that balance.

Madam Speaker, I close by urging my colleagues to accept that we have made a lot of progress, that this was all about preserving civil liberties, and to vote in favor of H.R. 6172, the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act of 2020.

□ 1600

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I want to thank the gentleman, the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee. He warned the American public when he was chair. He warned them and told them that FISA was not used correctly, that the power of the government overstretched their arms.

But even when the other elements of government said no, they did not, even when others got on to that exact same position and told us everything was fine with FISA, it was not until the inspector general got his report that the truth was known.

I thank Congressman DEVIN NUNES for being the truth, telling it to the American public, and staying with it when others wanted to lie.

That is why we are here today. That is why this will not continue or ever happen again.

Madam Speaker, at the heart of our Constitution is a simple idea, the idea

of checks and balances. These principles protect Americans' freedoms by creating safeguards against the potential of government overreach of power.

Unfortunately, in 2016, those checks and balances were not in place to stop individuals at the highest level of the FBI and Justice Department from spying on Carter Page, an American citizen who could have been one of us.

They used the secretive FISA courts, which are meant to keep Americans safe from foreign enemies, to attempt to undermine their domestic political opponent at that time, then-candidate Donald Trump.

After years of thorough and independent investigation, we now know the truth: what happened in 2016 was politically motivated; it was completely unjustified; and it must never happen again.

This bipartisan legislation addresses the need for greater accuracy and accountability in the FISA process. It does not damage the legitimate authorities our intelligence community relies on to keep us safe, but it does strengthen protections for civil liberties.

Among its many reforms, this legislation increases the punishment for unauthorized disclosure of FISA applications, authorizes an amicus to be appointed to cases involving political activity, and enhances oversight by Congress and creates a new Office of Compliance.

These reforms are an astonishing accomplishment in a period of divided government. That just tells you how important FISA reforms and checks and balances truly are.

Outside this Chamber, there are quotes from famous Americans who dedicated their lives to preserving American freedom.

One of those individuals, Patrick Henry, was so passionate about his defense of freedom that he famously said: ''Give me liberty or give me death.'' We can learn a lot from Henry's total devotion to the American cause.

We can learn a lot from those who are willing to stand up to oppressive Big Government, who would use an arm illegally against the check and balance just to try to have an outcome in a political race.

We could thank those like DEVIN, who stood for the American public and the truth, or those in other committees who helped work on this, the JIM JORDANS, the DOUG COLLINSes, that we would not be here today and getting a new compliance office, a check and balance to make sure what happened in 2016 cannot happen again.

I do urge all my colleagues to vote ''yes.'' I do urge that this is a turning point, that even though in these committees they could have told us, and they did, that there was nothing wrong, that we had to continue to fight to get an inspector general to have the truth.

Now, we have a check and balance that we will not have to wait for that. Even if somebody tries to use it in the wrong manner, it cannot happen again.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I am especially thankful to Chairman SCHIFF for yielding me this time since I have reached a different conclusion on the bill than he has.

I would like to quote from the American Civil Liberties Union letter received today. The American Civil Liberties Union strongly urges us to vote ''no'' on this bill.

They say: ''Over the last several years, it has been abundantly clear that many of our surveillance laws are broken.'' But that, ''disappointingly, the reforms contained in H.R. 6172 are minimal—in many cases merely representing a codification of the status quo. In addition,'' the ACLU says, ''the bill contains provisions that would be a step back from even our flawed current law.''

The ACLU goes on to say that ''the bill fails to require that individuals receive appropriate notice and access to information when FISA information is used against them,'' that ''the bill fails to fully address deficiencies with the FISA court that have led to illegal surveillance,'' that ''the bill fails to appropriately limit the types of information that can be collected under section 215,'' that ''the bill fails to appropriately raise the standard for collecting information under section 215,'' and that ''the bill fails to appropriately limit the retention of information collected under section 215.''

I agree with the chairman that the roving wiretap provision in the act is important and should be renewed. But I cannot support the bill that is before us today, and I say that with tremendous respect for Chairman SCHIFF. We have had very candid and useful discussions. I appreciate the effort that he has put into this.

I have put in a lot of effort, too. But in the end, we have a bill that I think should not be supported. I intend to vote ''no,'' with tremendous respect for the chairman and the effort that he has put into this.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend yielding to me, and I appreciate my colleague, Ms. LOFGREN's comments.

Any law that is based on a lie has a good chance of being a problem. The lie starts with the initial FISA, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. Yet, it is not foreign.

Now, since I have been here, whether it is the PATRIOT Act or reauthorizing the FISA court, we are told: Look, American citizens have nothing to worry about because the only American citizen that gets caught up through the FISA court is somebody that is dealing with a known foreign terrorist or a known foreign organization engaged in terrorism. You know, just avoid dealing with terrorists, and you are going to be okay.

The problem is, I keep hearing, this is a good first step. No, this isn't the first step. This is the last step, and as my friend Ms. LOFGREN said, it doesn't go far enough.

As my friend MICHAEL CLOUD said, under the current bill, they ignored the penalty for lying to the judge, which was a 5-year sentence. Now, under the new law, they can ignore an 8-year sentence. That doesn't really help preserve anybody's rights.

This was not done in the committee. It did not have proper debate. The secret court had the bill pulled away from the full committee, so we couldn't debate it. We couldn't discuss it, and it was pulled into a secret negotiation that many of us were not part of.

Look, having the Attorney General sign it doesn't work either, and it shouldn't be a special category for Federal elected officials. In fact, what it should be is all Americans.

Acting Attorney General Rosenstein, he signed off on one of the applications himself. Obviously, that is not a deterrent.

We need to fix the FISA court. This doesn't do it, and I will vote ''no'' until we have adequate reforms that do.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Madam Speaker, let me state a fact. FISA has been abused by those who are trusted with authority, and we can't let it happen again.

This is what we know are also facts: An opposing campaign paid a foreign citizen to dig up dirt on President Trump and his campaign associates. These allegations—produced, by the way, by a foreign citizen—came to be known as the Steele dossier. The campaign then fed these bogus allegations through the administration, to include leadership at the FBI, the CIA, the Department of Justice, and even the State Department. Then, the FBI shamefully used these bogus allegations as the basis for a secret wiretap, of course, on the famous Mr. Carter Page.

The FBI deliberately hid the fact that these allegations were both known to be bogus and the fact that the campaign had paid for them. The application on Mr. Page cited a news article corroborating these allegations, but the FBI hid from the court the fact that they knew the source of these articles was the author of the dossier.

We discovered that the FBI and DOJ investigators in this case demonstrated enormous bias against the Trump campaign with such words as: we will stop him; he won't become President; viva la resistance.

Finally, the inspector general revealed that an FBI attorney altered a

document to deceive the court regarding Mr. Page's relationship with another agency.

These are shocking abuses of power, and the reforms in this bill will stop them from ever happening again.

I am proud to have been the author of the bill that is the basis for some of these reforms.

It requires an amicus review for applications against U.S. citizens when their First Amendment rights are in question.

It requires the court to maintain a transcript. I have read this FISA application. It begs for questions to be asked. We don't know if the judges were curious or asked obvious questions because we don't have a transcript.

It requires the government to keep a log.

It enhances penalties for up to 8 years for those who improperly surveil or deceive the court. It allows agencies to take immediate action, including termination, of those who do.

Madam Speaker, it is incumbent on us, as an institution, to ensure these abuses simply don't happen again. The USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act will accomplish this.

Let me end by saying this: To those who oppose this bill, if you vote against this bill, you keep the status quo. FISA remains in place. The ability to abuse FISA doesn't change.

Vote ''yes'' on this bill or accept future abuse. That is the choice we have before us. I hope that we don't do that.

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

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act of 2020.

I would also like to associate myself with the comments of my friend and colleague from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

I also acknowledge and applaud the efforts of the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), whose tenacity brought this to bear. I appreciate his leadership on this issue.

This is a bipartisan piece of legislation that makes urgent and necessary reforms to the FISA process, which, as Inspector General Horowitz found 3 months ago, was misused to conduct illegal surveillance on Carter Page, a U.S. person.

This bill enhances requirements on the FBI and DOJ to ensure all applications are accurate and complete. This bill creates a compliance officer at the FBI who is directly responsible for making sure FBI agents are following the law.

This bill heightens criminal penalties to deter bad actors and other layers of review to root them out.

Finally, the bill reauthorizes three counterterrorism tools that are significantly important to our national security.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support this bill, and I urge a ''yes'' vote from my colleagues.

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

Just a couple of comments for some of my colleagues who I know are concerned that this doesn't go far enough.

One of the concerns they have is that there is an ongoing investigation led by the U.S. attorney out of Connecticut, and there is a lot of consternation on our side of the aisle that nothing has been done yet.

I want to assure my colleagues that even if that gets to a point where people are held accountable for what we believe to be criminal activity, these reforms in this new piece of legislation where we opened up title I, we believe that we have all the reforms that are necessary to prevent this malfeasance from happening again in the future.

□ 1615

If this doesn't work and if this does happen again, I think then you will have what some people want, which is a complete elimination of the court and this entire system.

I hope that we don't get to that point in this country, because these tools have worked well as long as the people who are conducting and using these surveillance capabilities don't decide to turn them on political opponents.

So I want to, you know, assure my colleagues on this side of the aisle that we feel like these reforms are as far as we need to go at this time, no matter what the ultimate conclusion is of the U.S. attorney out of Connecticut on whether or not to bring charges against those who perpetrated these crimes and criminal activity.

Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close at this time.

In closing, the weaponization of FISA, as exhibited in 2016, should never have happened, and this bill aims to prevent future gross abuses from occurring again.

I would like to thank my staff, particularly Allen Souza, Laura Casulli, Meghan Green, Andrew House, and Betsy Hulme, for all their efforts to reach this bipartisan compromise. They worked many, many hours with Members of both parties and colleagues of both parties, staff of both parties, from the Judiciary Committee and the Republican and Democratic leadership, to reach this bipartisan compromise.

I am also fairly confident, with the remarks that have been made on the Senate side, that this will be a rare opportunity where we actually pass a bill, and it appears like the Senate is prepared to accept a complete House-produced product, which I think means a lot to everyone involved in this process, that that rarely happens, especially in this day and age.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of H.R. 6172, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to, for my Democratic colleagues, provide a reality check on some of what they have heard during this debate.

It is important to remember that the inspector general report—which, by the way, doesn't go to the expiring provisions that we are here to authorize today. But the inspector general report found no evidence of spying on the Trump campaign.

The inspector general found no evidence of political bias influencing decisionmaking in the investigation of the Trump campaign and its connections to Russia during the 2016 election.

The inspector general found that the investigation, in fact, was properly predicated, that investigation into many of the more than 100 unexplained and often falsely denied contacts between the Trump campaign and the Russians during the 2016 campaign, including a notorious secret meeting in Trump Tower between the President's son, son-in-law, and campaign chairman with a Russian delegation that was set up by a series of emails in which a Russian delegation offered dirt on Hillary Clinton to the Trump campaign, and the President's son, on behalf of that campaign, said that he would love it and set up that secret meeting. Now, my colleagues don't think that is collusion; the American people do.

Bob Mueller, for his part, much as his report has been misrepresented, makes it clear in the very first pages of the report that he does not address the issues of collusion, only whether he can prove criminal conspiracy.

So it is important, with that reality check, to once again return to the bill before us. With respect to the bill before us, we do make important changes to strengthen the privacy protections, the civil liberties protections. We also retain the important tools necessary to help protect the country, the business records provision, the lone-wolf provision, as well as the roving wiretaps.

The roving wiretap provision, for example, allows the government, when someone, for example, in the midst of planning a crime of terrorism uses phones disposably and goes from one phone to another, it is not necessary to go and get a new warrant every time they change phones. The warrant can follow the individual rather than the phone.

The business records provision has also been very important in terms of our efforts at foreign intelligence gathering as well as counterterrorism. Those authorities would be retained, but new protections would be put in place such that business records couldn't be retained more than 5 years unless certain exceptions applied, protections where, if business records gathered in the FISA context are used in a criminal proceeding, there is notice given to people that they are being used in a criminal proceeding.

There is expansion of the amicus authorities so that we have the amicus

involved in a broader scope of cases so the court has the advantage of independent judgment.

Some of those reforms come out of the inspector general's recommendations and looking into the FISA application involving Carter Page. Many of those recommendations have nothing to do with Carter Page and are longstanding interests of the privacy community in trying to strengthen some of the privacy protections.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank Representative LOFGREN and Representative JAYAPAL. We worked extensively, have spent hours ourselves, our staff, consulting and trying to make this a better and stronger bill. While I regret that we couldn't get it to the point where those two esteemed Members felt they could support the bill, nonetheless, their input made this bill better, and I am grateful for their hard work and advocacy on behalf of a stronger privacy and civil liberties protection.

This vote today is the culmination of many months of negotiations. Therefore, with our diverse Caucus, with our friends in the other party who, as you have heard today, we have strong disagreements over the Russia investigation, the Trump campaign's conduct, as well as the FISA process, but, nonetheless, in the interest of our Nation's security, we were able to get to common ground on this measure, giving the government the critical tools it needs to protect the country while advancing civil liberties and privacy rights.

This bill creates a much-needed change to the way government uses FISA, ensures the government is more transparent and accountable, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, in 2016, our nation's premier law enforcement agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, weaponized its authority to illegally surveil a U.S. citizen for political purposes.

What happened to Carter Page, then-candidate Trump, and the Trump campaign was wrong, and it is our responsibility to ensure it never happens again. The USA Freedom Reauthorization Act achieves that, but our work is far from done.

While this bill doesn't include every reform sought by Republicans, it does accomplish our central goal: To institute necessary safeguards to protect the civil liberties of every American and reauthorize critical counterterrorism provisions.

This bipartisan legislation also protects U.S. citizens from being spied on for political purposes by requiring that the Attorney General approve any investigation of an elected official or federal candidate. This provision directly addresses the abuses against Carter Page and the Trump campaign.

Some have claimed that provision prioritizes politicians over Americans. It does not. That provision addresses the real abuse documented by House Republicans and the DOJ Inspector General—abuse that strikes at the core of our democratic republic.

In addition to multiple other reforms, this legislation makes it a crime to willfully make a false statement to the court, and increases penalties for those who abuse the system. These provisions are aimed like a laser at the abuses that occurred in 2016 and 2017.

Madam Speaker, Congress must continue to conduct vigorous oversight and work with our law enforcement and intelligence communities to restore the American people's trust in these critical institutions.

Our government's primary duty is to protect its citizens and their constitutional rights, and every American should have confidence we're fulfilling that role.

I urge my colleagues to support this vitally important legislation.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill 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 bill.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. 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 278, nays 136, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—278

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bera
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Cheney
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeLauro
Delgado
Demings
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dunn
Engel
Escobar
Estes
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (TX)
Gibbs
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Holding
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McEachin
McHenry
McKinley
Meeks
Meuser
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Porter
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Torres Small (NM)
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Watkins
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Woodall
Young

NAYS—136

Abraham
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Budd
Burchett
Carter (GA)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Connolly
Correa
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Danny K.
DeFazio
DeGette
DelBene
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan
Emmer
Eshoo
Espaillat
Flores
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
García (IL)
Gianforte
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gooden
Graves (LA)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harris
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hollingsworth
Huffman
Huizenga
Jayapal
Jeffries
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kim
King (IA)
Lamborn
Lee (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Luján
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Marchant
Massie
Mast
McClintock
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Neguse
Norman
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Perry
Pingree
Pocan
Posey
Pressley
Raskin
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rose, John W.
Roy
Rush
Schakowsky
Schweikert
Serrano
Smith (MO)
Smith (WA)
Takano
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Van Drew
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Beyer
Brownley (CA)
Collins (GA)
Fortenberry
Gaetz
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Lewis
Meadows
Miller
Mullin
Palazzo
Ratcliffe
Rooney (FL)
Speier

□ 1703

Messrs. WEBER of Texas, BLUMENAUER, LONG, Mses. VELÁZQUEZ, ESHOO, BARRAGÁN, SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. WATERS, Messrs. GREEN of Texas, RUSH, and Ms. PRESSLEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. KELLER, TIMMONS, and NORCROSS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUCK OF COLORADO

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk to correct the name of the bill to the ''Federal Initiative to Spy on Americans (FISA) Act.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''A bill to be known as the Federal Initiative to Spy on Americans (FISA) Act''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 6 of rule XVI, the amendment is not debatable.

The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BUCK of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 35, noes 376, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

AYES—35

Abraham
Amash
Babin
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Budd
Burchett
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Duncan
Estes
Gohmert
Griffith
Harris
Hice (GA)
Kelly (PA)
Massie
McClintock
Mooney (WV)
Perry
Posey
Roe, David P.
Rose, John W.
Roy
Rush
Schweikert
Van Drew
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wright
Yoho
Young

NOES—376

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Fulcher
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—18

Beyer
Brownley (CA)
Collins (GA)
Fortenberry
Gaetz
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Lewis
Lipinski
Meadows
Miller
Mullin
Palazzo
Palmer
Ratcliffe
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Speier

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1713

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JAYAPAL). Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of 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, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. MCCAUL. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McCaul moves to commit the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

After paragraph (5) of section 1, insert the following:

(6) For more than two decades, Qassem Soleimani posed a deadly threat to American personnel and interests as commander of the Quds Force of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, which is responsible for Iran's extraterritorial military and clandestine operations. His activities to fund and train Iran's terrorist proxies in Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Bahrain, Yemen, and Afghanistan led

to the deaths of more than 600 United States troops.

(7) In late 2019, Soleimani began escalating Iranian-supported attacks on Americans, including the assault on the United States Embassy in Baghdad and a rocket attack that killed an American citizen and wounded four United States servicemembers in Iraq. Prior to his death, Soleimani was traveling around the Middle East coordinating further attacks on Americans.

(8) Removing Qassem Soleimani from the battlefield has increased the safety and security of American troops, diplomats, and citizens, of our partners and allies, including the State of Israel, and of the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, here we are, once again, debating war powers when the simple fact is we are not engaged in hostilities against Iran.

Why are we wasting precious floor time when all the American people really care about today is coronavirus? Today the WHO declared it a pandemic. That is the biggest threat to our Nation today.

So, why are my colleagues launching more partisan political attacks against this President for taking justified military action to protect Americans against one of the world's most dangerous terrorists?

That is why my motion states that Soleimani was a terrorist and that the world is safer without him, just like the world was safer when President Obama ordered the strike on bin Laden when Republicans and Democrats came together to praise his decision. President Obama conducted thousands of unauthorized strikes in Libya unrelated to protecting Americans, and at that time Leader PELOSI said that she was satisfied he had the authority for those strikes.

Soleimani was a mastermind of terror in the Middle East for two decades, and that is why President Obama designated him as a terrorist.

Soleimani funded, trained, and equipped Iran's terrorist proxies in Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Yemen, and Afghanistan.

Soleimani is the one who convinced Russia to fight for Assad.

Tens of thousands of innocent people in Syria are dead today, victims of war crimes, because of Soleimani.

Soleimani played a key role in the crackdown of protesters in Iraq that killed hundreds of Iraqis.

Most importantly, Madam Speaker, he has the blood of over 600 American soldiers on his hands.

Under Soleimani's command, Iran tried to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador to the United States in a Washington, D.C., restaurant less than 4 miles from where we are standing today.

The danger he posed to the United States was not just a thing of the past. He was directing a campaign of terror and violence against us in Iraq, which killed one American and injured four other servicemen.

He orchestrated the attack on our Embassy in Baghdad.

Look at this picture. This was not simply a brush fire, Madam Speaker. They stormed and attacked our Embassy under Soleimani's orders.

What more evidence do we need than this?

Soleimani was not done after his attack on our Embassy. He wasn't on a vacation when he went to meet with his top lieutenants in Damascus, Lebanon, and Baghdad. Secretary Pompeo testified to our committee that Soleimani was in the region actively plotting to kill Americans. He was going to report back to Tehran, to the Ayatollah, to plan future attacks.

What if our President had done nothing and our Embassy was attacked again like in 1979 with diplomats taken hostage? What if the President did nothing? What if more United States troops were killed? What then would the other side of the aisle be saying?

Madam Speaker, the enemies of our country are watching this debate right now, and they need to know darn well that, if you kill or injure Americans, you will pay the price.

Like President Reagan, I am a firm believer in peace through strength. When we show strength like we did with this necessary strike, our enemies back down.

So, Madam Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to drop their partisanship, to stand as Americans as we did when President Obama struck bin Laden, and to support this simple fact that the world is a better place without Soleimani.

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I doubt that there is a person on this floor who disagrees with the premises that Mr. MCCAUL just stated. Soleimani was a bad person. I said during the course of debate on the Slotkin amendment, which referenced exactly that premise, that no one lamented the loss of Mr. Soleimani—no one. That is not what this bill is about, nor is that what this amendment is about.

This bill, which is called a partisan bill by Mr. MCCAUL, had 15 percent of the Republicans in the United States Senate vote for it.

This bill, called a partisan bill, says the bill we are voting on, the bill we are going to pass, says that 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. That is what the bill that we are asking this body to vote for says.

Madam Speaker, does that sound to you like a partisan document?

Now, Madam Speaker, the purpose of this motion is to kill this bill. This is a Senate bill. It will send it back to committee. It will not allow it to pass with an amendment, and it will preclude it from going to the President of the United States.

Now, what this issue is about is our Constitution, about the power of this body, about the responsibility of this body, and about the authority of this body to declare or not declare war. That is what this bill is about.

There may be some in this body who want to shrink from that responsibility and send it to the President of the United States, but our Founders believed that was not what our democracy ought to be. It ought to be the Representatives of the people who take them to war, not a President—any President, Democratic or Republican—to take us to war.

This is about our responsibility. It commends President Trump, and it commends our Armed Forces, and it allows them to defend themselves if attacked. But it stands for the proposition that I hope all Members are for, that we, the Representatives of the American people, ought to decide on their behalf whether they or their sons and daughters go to the point of the spear at war—not just one person.

There are a lot of countries in this world where one person makes the decision. They are called dictators. Our Founding Fathers did not want dictators running America.

And I say to my colleagues, of course, our Republican friends who are offered this amendment never vote for an MTR, because—and I will not read the litany of quotes from so many of you—an MTR is simply to delay and defeat. Your quotes, not mine.

So I ask all of us, without exception, vote against this MTR, vote to send this bill to the President of the United States, supported by 15 percent of the Republicans in the United States Senate. It is not a partisan bill. It doesn't attack President Trump. In fact, it says, ''our troops,'' and ''President Trump ought to be commended.'' It is in the bill.

Don't tell me this is a partisan act. It is not. It is an act of responsibility, and to our oath of office, and to the Constitution of the United States. Vote ''no.''

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to commit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of S.J. Res. 68, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 212, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

AYES—198

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cunningham
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
Meuser
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Phillips
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Torres Small (NM)
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wild
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—212

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

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—18

Beyer
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brownley (CA)
Collins (GA)
Fortenberry
Gaetz
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Lewis
Lipinski
McHenry
Meadows
Miller
Mullin
Palazzo
Ratcliffe
Rooney (FL)
Speier

□ 1735

Ms. JACKSON LEE changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 186, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

AYES—227

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

NOES—186

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess

Byrne	Hudson	Roby
Calvert	Huizenga	Rodgers (WA)
Carter (GA)	Hurd (TX)	Roe, David P.
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Cheney	Johnson (SD)	Rose (NY)
Cline	Jordan	Rose, John W.
Cloud	Joyce (OH)	Rouzer
Cole	Joyce (PA)	Roy
Comer	Katko	Rutherford
Conaway	Keller	Scalise
Cook	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Crawford	Kelly (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Shimkus
Curtis	King (NY)	Simpson
Davidson (OH)	Kinzinger	Smith (MO)
Davis, Rodney	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Smucker
Duncan	Lamborn	Spano
Dunn	Latta	Stauber
Emmer	Lesko	Stefanik
Estes	Long	Steil
Ferguson	Loudermilk	Steube
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Stewart
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Flores	Luria	Taylor
Foxx (NC)	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Fulcher	Marshall	Thornberry
Gallagher	Mast	Timmons
Gianforte	McAdams	Tipton
Gibbs	McCarthy	Turner
Gohmert	McCaul	Van Drew
Gonzalez (OH)	McClintock	Wagner
Gooden	McHenry	Walberg
Granger	McKinley	Walden
Graves (LA)	Meuser	Walker
Graves (MO)	Mitchell	Walorski
Green (TN)	Moolenaar	Waltz
Grothman	Mooney (WV)	Watkins
Guest	Murphy (FL)	Weber (TX)
Guthrie	Murphy (NC)	Webster (FL)
Hagedorn	Newhouse	Wenstrup
Harris	Norman	Westerman
Hartzler	Nunes	Williams
Hern, Kevin	Olson	Wilson (SC)
Herrera Beutler	Palmer	Wittman
Hice (GA)	Pence	Womack
Higgins (LA)	Perry	Woodall
Hill (AR)	Posey	Wright
Holding	Reschenthaler	Yoho
Hollingsworth	Rice (SC)	Young
Horn, Kendra S.	Riggleman	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—16

Beyer	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Brownley (CA)	Lewis	Ratcliffe
Collins (GA)	Lipinski	Rooney (FL)
Fortenberry	Meadows	Speier
Gaetz	Miller	
Gosar	Mullin	

□ 1742

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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 76. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to ''Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability''.

□ 1745

DIGNITY IN AGING ACT OF 2019

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4334) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2020 through 2024, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCANLON). The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Supporting Older Americans Act of 2020''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
Sec. 3. References.
Sec. 4. Definitions.

TITLE I—MODERNIZING DEFINITIONS AND PROGRAMS UNDER THE ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

Sec. 101. Reauthorization.
Sec. 102. Person-centered, trauma-informed services.
Sec. 103. Aging and Disability Resource Centers.
Sec. 104. Assistive technology.
Sec. 105. Vaccination.
Sec. 106. Malnutrition.
Sec. 107. Sexually transmitted diseases.
Sec. 108. Addressing chronic pain management.
Sec. 109. Screening for suicide risk.
Sec. 110. Screening for fall-related traumatic brain injury; addressing public health emergencies and emerging health threats; negative health effects associated with social isolation.
Sec. 111. Clarification regarding board and care facilities.
Sec. 112. Person-centered, trauma-informed services definition.
Sec. 113. Traumatic brain injury.
Sec. 114. Modernizing the review of applications and providing technical assistance for disasters.
Sec. 115. Increased focus of Assistant Secretary on negative health effects associated with social isolation.
Sec. 116. Notification of availability of or updates to policies, practices, and procedures through a uniform e-format.
Sec. 117. Evidence-based program adaptation.
Sec. 118. Business acumen provisions and clarification regarding outside funding for area agencies on aging.
Sec. 119. Demonstration on direct care workers.
Sec. 120. National resource center for older individuals experiencing the long-term and adverse consequences of trauma.
Sec. 121. National Resource Center for Women and Retirement.
Sec. 122. Family caregivers.
Sec. 123. Interagency coordination.
Sec. 124. Modernizing the Interagency Coordinating Committee on Healthy Aging and Age-Friendly Communities.
Sec. 125. Professional standards for a nutrition official under the Assistant Secretary.
Sec. 126. Report on social isolation.
Sec. 127. Research and evaluation.

TITLE II—IMPROVING GRANTS FOR STATE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS ON AGING

Sec. 201. Social determinants of health.
Sec. 202. Younger onset Alzheimer's disease.
Sec. 203. Reauthorization.
Sec. 204. Hold harmless formula.
Sec. 205. Outreach efforts.
Sec. 206. State Long-Term Care Ombudsman program minimum funding and maintenance of effort.
Sec. 207. Coordination with resource centers.
Sec. 208. Senior legal hotlines.
Sec. 209. Increase in limit on use of allotted funds for State administrative costs.
Sec. 210. Improvements to nutrition programs.
Sec. 211. Review of reports.
Sec. 212. Other practices.
Sec. 213. Screening for negative health effects associated with social isolation and traumatic brain injury.
Sec. 214. Supportive services and senior centers.
Sec. 215. Culturally appropriate, medically tailored meals.
Sec. 216. Nutrition services study.
Sec. 217. National Family Caregiver Support program.
Sec. 218. National Family Caregiver Support program cap.

TITLE III—MODERNIZING ACTIVITIES FOR HEALTH, INDEPENDENCE, AND LONGEVITY

Sec. 301. Reauthorization.
Sec. 302. Public awareness of traumatic brain injury.
Sec. 303. Falls prevention and chronic disease self-management education.
Sec. 304. Demonstration to address negative health impacts associated with social isolation.
Sec. 305. Technical assistance and innovation to improve transportation for older individuals.
Sec. 306. Grant program for multigenerational collaboration.

TITLE IV—SENIOR COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Sec. 401. Priority for the senior community service employment program.
Sec. 402. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE V—ENHANCING GRANTS FOR NATIVE AMERICANS

Sec. 501. Reauthorization.

TITLE VI—MODERNIZING ALLOTMENTS FOR VULNERABLE ELDER RIGHTS PROTECTION ACTIVITIES AND OTHER PROGRAMS

Sec. 601. Reauthorization; vulnerable elder rights protection activities.
Sec. 602. Volunteer State long-term care ombudsman representatives.
Sec. 603. Prevention of elder abuse, neglect, and exploitation.
Sec. 604. Principles for person-directed services and supports during serious illness.
Sec. 605. Extension of the Supporting Grandparents Raising Grandchildren Act.
Sec. 606. Best practices for home and community-based ombudsmen.
Sec. 607. Senior home modification assistance initiative.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 701. Technical corrections.

SEC. 3. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided in this Act, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to,

or a repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to that section or other provision of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.).

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the terms ''area agency on aging'', ''Assistant Secretary'', ''greatest social need'', ''older individual'', and ''Secretary'' have the meanings given such terms in section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3002).

TITLE I—MODERNIZING DEFINITIONS AND PROGRAMS UNDER THE ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

SEC. 101. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 216 (42 U.S.C. 3020f) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 216. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of carrying out this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for administration, salaries, and expenses of the Administration $43,937,410 for fiscal year 2020, $46,573,655 for fiscal year 2021, $49,368,074 for fiscal year 2022, $52,330,158 for fiscal year 2023, and $55,469,968 for fiscal year 2024.

''(b) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) to carry out section 202(a)(21) (relating to the National Eldercare Locator Service), $2,180,660 for fiscal year 2020, $2,311,500 for fiscal year 2021, $2,450,190 for fiscal year 2022, $2,597,201 for fiscal year 2023, and $2,753,033 for fiscal year 2024;

''(2) to carry out section 215, $1,988,060 for fiscal year 2020, $2,107,344 for fiscal year 2021, $2,233,784 for fiscal year 2022, $2,367,811 for fiscal year 2023, and $2,509,880 for fiscal year 2024;

''(3) to carry out section 202 (relating to Elder Rights Support Activities under this title), $1,371,740 for fiscal year 2020, $1,454,044 for fiscal year 2021, $1,541,287 for fiscal year 2022, $1,633,764 for fiscal year 2023, and $1,731,790 for fiscal year 2024; and

''(4) to carry out section 202(b) (relating to the Aging and Disability Resource Centers), $8,687,330 for fiscal year 2020, $9,208,570 for fiscal year 2021, $9,761,084 for fiscal year 2022, $10,346,749 for fiscal year 2023, and $10,967,554 for fiscal year 2024.''.

SEC. 102. PERSON-CENTERED, TRAUMA-INFORMED SERVICES.

Section 101(2) (42 U.S.C. 3001(2)) is amended by inserting ''(including access to person-centered, trauma-informed services as appropriate)'' after ''health''.

SEC. 103. AGING AND DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTERS.

Section 102(4) (42 U.S.C. 3002(4)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', in collaboration with (as appropriate) area agencies on aging, centers for independent living (as described in part C of chapter 1 of title VII of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 796f et seq.)), and other aging or disability entities'' after ''provides'';

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by inserting ''services, supports, and'' after ''plan for long-term''; and

(B) by inserting ''and choices'' after ''desires''; and

(3) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''part C of title VII of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 796f et seq.), and other community-based entities,'' and inserting ''part C of chapter 1 of title VII of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and other community-based entities, including other aging or disability entities,''.

SEC. 104. ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 102(8) (42 U.S.C. 3002(8)), by adding at the end the following:

''(C) The term 'State assistive technology entity' means the agency, office, or other entity designated under subsection (c)(1) of section 4 of the Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (29 U.S.C. 3003) to carry out State activities under such section.'';

(2) in section 306 (42 U.S.C. 3026)—

(A) in subsection (a)(6)—

(i) in subparagraph (G), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) in subparagraph (H), by striking ''appropriate;'' and inserting ''appropriate; and''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(I) to the extent feasible, coordinate with the State agency to disseminate information about the State assistive technology entity and access to assistive technology options for serving older individuals;''; and

(B) in subsection (b)(3)—

(i) in subparagraph (K)—

(I) by aligning the margins of the subparagraph with the margins of subparagraph (J); and

(II) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (L) as subparagraph (M); and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (K) the following:

''(L) assistive technology devices and services; and''; and

(3) in section 411(a) (42 U.S.C. 3032(a))—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', aligned with evidence-based practice,'' after ''applied social research''; and

(B) in paragraph (10), by inserting ''consistent with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d)'' after ''other technologies''.

SEC. 105. VACCINATION.

Section 102(14) (42 U.S.C. 3002(14)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''immunization status,'' after ''oral health,''; and

(2) in subparagraph (D), by inserting ''infectious disease, and vaccine-preventable disease, as well as'' after ''cardiovascular disease),''.

SEC. 106. MALNUTRITION.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 102(14)(B), as amended by section 105(1), by inserting ''(including screening for malnutrition)'' after ''nutrition screening''; and

(2) in section 330(1), by striking ''and food insecurity'' and inserting '', food insecurity, and malnutrition''.

SEC. 107. SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED DISEASES.

Section 102(14)(D) (42 U.S.C. 3002(14)(D)), as amended by section 105(2), is further amended by inserting ''prevention of sexually transmitted diseases,'' after ''vaccine-preventable disease,''.

SEC. 108. ADDRESSING CHRONIC PAIN MANAGEMENT.

Section 102(14)(D) (42 U.S.C. 3002(14)(D)), as amended by section 107, is further amended by inserting ''chronic pain management,'' after ''substance abuse reduction,''.

SEC. 109. SCREENING FOR SUICIDE RISK.

Section 102(14)(G) (42 U.S.C. 3002(14)(G)) is amended by inserting ''and screening for suicide risk'' after ''depression''.

SEC. 110. SCREENING FOR FALL-RELATED TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY; ADDRESSING PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCIES AND EMERGING HEALTH THREATS; NEGATIVE HEALTH EFFECTS ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIAL ISOLATION.

Section 102(14) (42 U.S.C. 3002(14)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (H) through (J), and subparagraphs (K) and (L), as subparagraphs (I) through (K), and subparagraphs (M) and (O), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following:

''(H) screening for fall-related traumatic brain injury and other fall-related injuries, coordination of treatment, rehabilitation and related services, and referral services related to such injury or injuries;'';

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (K), as redesignated by paragraph (1), the following:

''(L) services that are a part of responses to a public health emergency or emerging health threat;''; and

(4) in subparagraph (M), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(5) by inserting after subparagraph (M), as redesignated by paragraph (1), the following:

''(N) screening for the prevention of negative health effects associated with social isolation and coordination of supportive services and health care to address negative health effects associated with social isolation; and''; and

(6) in subparagraph (O), as redesignated, by striking ''(A) through (K)'' and inserting ''(A) through (N)''.

SEC. 111. CLARIFICATION REGARDING BOARD AND CARE FACILITIES.

Section 102(35)(C) (42 U.S.C. 3002(35)(C)) is amended by striking ''for purposes of sections 307(a)(12) and 712,''.

SEC. 112. PERSON-CENTERED, TRAUMA-INFORMED SERVICES DEFINITION.

Section 102 (42 U.S.C. 3002) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (41) through (54) as paragraphs (42) through (55), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (40) the following:

''(41) The term 'person-centered, trauma-informed', with respect to services, means services provided through an aging program that—

''(A) use a holistic approach to providing services or care;

''(B) promote the dignity, strength, and empowerment of victims of trauma; and

''(C) incorporate evidence-based practices based on knowledge about the role of trauma in trauma victims' lives.''.

SEC. 113. TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

Section 102 (42 U.S.C. 3002), as amended by section 112, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (55) as paragraph (56); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (54) the following:

''(55) The term 'traumatic brain injury' has the meaning given such term in section 393B(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–1c(d)).''.

SEC. 114. MODERNIZING THE REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS AND PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR DISASTERS.

(a) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—Section 202 (42 U.S.C. 3012) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a)(4) to read as follows:

''(4) administer the grants provided by this Act, but not approve an application submitted by an applicant for a grant for an activity under a provision of this Act for which such applicant previously received a grant under such provision unless the Assistant Secretary determines—

''(A) the activity for which such application was submitted is being operated, or was operated, effectively to achieve its stated purpose; and

''(B) such applicant has complied with the assurances provided to the Assistant Secretary with the application for such previous grant.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(h) The Assistant Secretary shall publish, on an annual basis, a list of centers and demonstration projects funded under each title of this Act. The Assistant Secretary shall ensure that this information is also directly provided to State agencies and area agencies on aging.''.

(b) ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF OLDER INDIVIDUALS IN DISASTERS.—Section 202(a) (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (30), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (31), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(32) provide technical assistance to, and share best practices with, State agencies and area agencies on aging on how to collaborate and coordinate activities and develop long-range emergency preparedness plans with local and State emergency response agencies, relief organizations, local and State governments, Federal agencies as appropriate, and any other institutions that have responsibility for disaster relief service delivery;''.

SEC. 115. INCREASED FOCUS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY ON NEGATIVE HEALTH EFFECTS ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIAL ISOLATION.

Section 202(a) (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)), as amended by section 114(b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(33) with input from aging network stakeholders, including caregivers, develop objectives, priorities, and a long-term plan for supporting State and local efforts involving education about prevention of, detection of, and response to negative health effects associated with social isolation among older individuals, and submit a report to Congress on this effort by January 2021; and''.

SEC. 116. NOTIFICATION OF AVAILABILITY OF OR UPDATES TO POLICIES, PRACTICES, AND PROCEDURES THROUGH A UNIFORM E-FORMAT.

Section 202(a) (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)), as amended by sections 114(b) and 115, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(34) provide (to the extent practicable) a standardized notification to State agencies, area agencies on aging, providers of services under this Act, and grantees or contract awardees under this Act, through an electronic format (e-mail or other electronic notification), of the availability of, or updates to, policies, practices, and procedures under this Act.''.

SEC. 117. EVIDENCE-BASED PROGRAM ADAPTATION.

(a) FUNCTIONS OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—Section 202 (42 U.S.C. 3012) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(28), by inserting before the semicolon '', including information and technical assistance on delivery of such services in different settings''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(9)(B), by inserting before the semicolon '', including delivery of such services in different settings''.

(b) EVIDENCE-BASED DISEASE PREVENTION AND HEALTH PROMOTION SERVICES.—Section 361(a) (42 U.S.C. 3030m(a)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting ''provide technical assistance on the delivery of evidence-based disease prevention and health promotion services in different settings and for different populations, and'' before ''consult''.

SEC. 118. BUSINESS ACUMEN PROVISIONS AND CLARIFICATION REGARDING OUTSIDE FUNDING FOR AREA AGENCIES ON AGING.

(a) ASSISTANCE RELATING TO GROWING AND SUSTAINING CAPACITY.—Section 202(b)(9) (42 U.S.C. 3012(b)(9)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), as amended by section 117(a)(2), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) activities for increasing business acumen, capacity building, organizational development, innovation, and other methods of growing and sustaining the capacity of the aging network to serve older individuals and caregivers most effectively;''.

(b) CLARIFYING PARTNERSHIPS FOR AREA AGENCIES ON AGING.—Section 306 (42 U.S.C. 3026) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) Nothing in this Act shall restrict an area agency on aging from providing services not provided or authorized by this Act, including through—

''(1) contracts with health care payers;

''(2) consumer private pay programs; or

''(3) other arrangements with entities or individuals that increase the availability of home- and community-based services and supports.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 307(a) (42 U.S.C. 3027(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (26); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (27) through (30) as paragraphs (26) through (29).

SEC. 119. DEMONSTRATION ON DIRECT CARE WORKERS.

Section 411(a) (42 U.S.C. 3032(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (13) and (14) as paragraphs (14) and (15), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following:

''(13) in coordination with the Secretary of Labor, the demonstration of new strategies for the recruitment, retention, or advancement of direct care workers, and the soliciting, development, and implementation of strategies—

''(A) to reduce barriers to entry for a diverse and high-quality direct care workforce, including providing wages, benefits, and advancement opportunities needed to attract or retain direct care workers; and

''(B) to provide education and workforce development programs for direct care workers that include supportive services and career planning;''.

SEC. 120. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER FOR OLDER INDIVIDUALS EXPERIENCING THE LONG-TERM AND ADVERSE CONSEQUENCES OF TRAUMA.

Section 411(a) (42 U.S.C. 3032(a)), as amended by section 119, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (14) and (15) as paragraphs (15) and (16), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

''(14) the establishment and operation of a national resource center that shall—

''(A) provide training and technical assistance to agencies in the aging network delivering services to older individuals experiencing the long-term and adverse consequences of trauma;

''(B) share best practices with the aging network; and

''(C) make subgrants to the agencies best positioned to advance and improve the delivery of person-centered, trauma-informed services for older individuals experiencing the long-term and adverse consequences of trauma;''.

SEC. 121. NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER FOR WOMEN AND RETIREMENT.

Section 215 (42 U.S.C. 3020e–1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(k)(1) The Assistant Secretary shall, directly or by grant or contract, operate the National Resource Center for Women and Retirement (in this subsection referred to as the 'Center').

''(2) The Center shall—

''(A) provide tools, such as basic financial management, retirement planning, and other tools that promote financial literacy and help to identify and prevent exploitation (including fraud), and integrate these with information on health and long-term care;

''(B) annually disseminate a summary of outreach activities provided, including work to provide user-friendly consumer information and public education materials;

''(C) develop targeted outreach strategies;

''(D) provide technical assistance to State agencies and to other public and nonprofit private agencies and organizations; and

''(E) develop partnerships and collaborations to address program objectives.''.

SEC. 122. FAMILY CAREGIVERS.

(a) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 202 (42 U.S.C. 3012), as amended by section 114, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) The Assistant Secretary shall carry out the RAISE Family Caregivers Act (42 U.S.C. 3030s note).''.

(b) SUNSET.—Section 6 of the RAISE Family Caregivers Act (42 U.S.C. 3030s note) is amended by striking ''3 years'' and inserting ''4 years''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2(3) of the RAISE Family Caregivers Act (42 U.S.C. 3030s note) is amended by inserting '', acting through the Assistant Secretary for Aging'' before the period at the end.

SEC. 123. INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall, in performing the functions of the Administration on Aging under section 202(a)(5) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)(5)) related to health (including mental and behavioral health) services, coordinate with the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—

(1) in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of evidence-based policies, programs, practices, and other activities pertaining to the prevention of suicide among older individuals, including the implementation of evidence-based suicide prevention programs and strategies identified by the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other entities, as applicable; and

(2) in providing and incorporating technical assistance for the prevention of suicide among older individuals, including technical assistance related to the Suicide Prevention Technical Assistance Center established under section 520C of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–34).

(b) PROGRAM DESIGN.—Section 202(a)(5) (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)(5)) is amended by inserting ''cultural experiences, activities, and services, including in the arts,'' after ''education),''.

SEC. 124. MODERNIZING THE INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON HEALTHY AGING AND AGE-FRIENDLY COMMUNITIES.

(a) FEDERAL AGENCY CONSULTATION.—Section 203(b) (42 U.S.C. 3013(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (18), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (19), by striking the period at the end and inserting '', and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(20) section 393D of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–1f), relating to safety of seniors.''.

(b) MODERNIZATION.—Section 203(c) (42 U.S.C. 3013(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''the Federal officials'' and inserting ''other Federal officials'';

(B) by striking ''Committee on Aging'' and inserting ''Committee on Healthy Aging and Age-Friendly Communities''; and

(C) by inserting ''and the development of a national set of recommendations, in accordance with paragraph (6), to support the ability of older individuals to age in place and access homelessness prevention services, preventive health care, promote age-friendly communities, and address the ability of older individuals to access long-term care supports, including access to caregivers and home- and community-based health services'' before the period;

(2) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following: ''The first term, after the date of enactment of the Supporting Older Americans Act of 2020, shall start not later than 1 year after such date of enactment.'';

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''The Committee shall'' and inserting ''The recommendations described in paragraph (1) may include recommendations for'';

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''share information with and establish an ongoing system to'' and inserting ''ways to''; and

(ii) by striking ''for older individuals and recommend improvements'' and all that follows through ''accessibility of such programs and services'' and inserting ''that impact older individuals'';

(C) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''identify, promote, and implement (as appropriate),'';

(ii) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(iii) in clause (ii), by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) best practices identified in coordination with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institute on Aging, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, the Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and other Federal agencies, as appropriate, to reduce and prevent falls among older individuals, that incorporate evidence-based falls prevention programs and home modifications, which recommendations shall supplement and not unnecessarily duplicate activities authorized under section 393D of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–1f), relating to safety of seniors;'';

(D) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting ''ways to'' before ''collect'';

(ii) by striking ''older individuals and''; and

(iii) by striking ''the individuals to ensure'' and all that follows through ''information'' and inserting ''older individuals to ensure that such information is accessible'';

(E) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''work with'' and all that follows through ''member agencies to ensure'' and inserting ''ways to ensure'';

(F) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''seek input'' and all that follows through ''foundations'' and inserting ''seeking input from and consulting with nonprofit organizations, academic or research institutions, community-based organizations, philanthropic organizations, or other entities supporting age-friendly communities'';

(G) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''identify'' and inserting ''identifying''; and

(H) by amending subparagraph (G) to read as follows:

''(G) ways to improve coordination to provide housing, health care, and other supportive services to older individuals.'';

(4) in paragraph (7)(A)(i), by striking ''services for older individuals'' and inserting ''services that impact older individuals''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) In this subsection, the term 'age-friendly community' means a community that—

''(A) is taking measurable steps to—

''(i) include adequate and accessible housing, public spaces and buildings, safe and secure paths, variable route transportation services, and programs and services designed to support health and well-being;

''(ii) respect and include older individuals in social opportunities, civic participation, volunteerism, and employment; and

''(iii) facilitate access to supportive services for older individuals;

''(B) is not an assisted living facility or long-term care facility; and

''(C) has a plan in place to meet local needs for housing, transportation, civic participation, social connectedness, and accessible public spaces.''.

(c) ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT.—Section 205(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3016(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) The Assistant Secretary may provide technical assistance, including through the regional offices of the Administration, to State agencies, area agencies on aging, local government agencies, or leaders in age-friendly communities (as defined, for purposes of this subparagraph, in section 203(c)(9)) regarding—

''(i) dissemination of, or consideration of ways to implement, best practices and recommendations from the Interagency Coordinating Committee on Healthy Aging and Age-Friendly Communities established under section 203(c); and

''(ii) methods for managing and coordinating existing programs to meet the needs of growing age-friendly communities.''.

SEC. 125. PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS FOR A NUTRITION OFFICIAL UNDER THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

Section 205(a)(2)(D)(ii) (42 U.S.C. 3016(a)(2)(D)(ii)), as redesignated by section 124(c)(1), is amended to read as follows:

''(ii) be a registered dietitian or registered dietitian nutritionist.''.

SEC. 126. REPORT ON SOCIAL ISOLATION.

(a) PREPARATION OF REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, in carrying out activities under section 206(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3017(a)), prepare a report on programs authorized by such Act (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), and supported or funded by the Administration on Aging, that include a focus on addressing the negative health effects associated with social isolation through targeting older individuals identified as being in greatest social need, as appropriate.

(2) IMPACT.—Such report shall identify—

(A) whether social isolation is being adequately addressed under such programs, including, to the extent practicable—

(i) the prevalence of social isolation in rural areas and in urban areas;

(ii) the negative public health effects associated with social isolation; and

(iii) the role of preventive measures or of services, including nutrition services, in addressing the negative health effects associated with social isolation among older individuals; and

(B) public awareness of and efforts to address the negative health effects associated with social isolation.

(3) TYPES OF PROGRAMS.—Such report shall identify whether programs described in paragraph (1)—

(A) support projects in local communities and involve diverse sectors associated with such communities to decrease the negative health effects associated with social isolation among older individuals and caregivers;

(B) support outreach activities to screen older individuals for negative health effects associated with social isolation; and

(C) include a focus on decreasing the negative health effects associated with social isolation.

(4) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Such report shall, as appropriate, include recommendations for reducing the negative health effects associated with social isolation and to address any negative health effects identified under clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (A), and subparagraph (B), of paragraph (2).

(b) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—

(1) INTERIM STATUS REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit an interim report, to the committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), and the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate, on the status of the evaluation underway to develop the final report required under this section.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a final report that meets the requirements of this section to the committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), and the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate.

SEC. 127. RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.

(a) CENTER.—Section 201 (42 U.S.C. 3011) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g)(1) The Assistant Secretary shall, as appropriate, coordinate the research and evaluation functions of this Act under a Research, Demonstration, and Evaluation Center for the Aging Network (in this subsection referred to as the 'Center'), which shall be headed by a director designated by the Assistant Secretary from individuals described in paragraph (4).

''(2) The purpose of the Center shall be—

''(A) to coordinate, as appropriate, research, research dissemination, evaluation, demonstration projects, and related activities carried out under this Act;

''(B) to provide assessment of the programs and interventions authorized under this Act; and

''(C) to increase the repository of information on evidence-based programs and interventions available to the aging network, which information shall be applicable to existing programs and interventions and help in the development of new evidence-based programs and interventions.

''(3) Activities of the Center shall include, as appropriate, conducting, promoting, coordinating, and providing support for—

''(A) research and evaluation activities that support the objectives of this Act, including—

''(i) evaluation of new and existing programs and interventions authorized by this Act; and

''(ii) research on and assessment of the relationship between programs and interventions under this Act and the health outcomes, social determinants of health, quality of life, and independence of individuals served under this Act;

''(B) demonstration projects that support the objectives of this Act, including activities to bring effective demonstration projects to scale with a prioritization of projects that address the needs of underserved populations, and promote partnerships among aging services, community-based organizations, and Medicare and Medicaid providers, plans, and health (including public health) systems;

''(C) outreach and dissemination of research findings; and

''(D) technical assistance related to the activities described in this paragraph.

''(4) The director shall be an individual with substantial knowledge of and experience in aging and health policy, and research administration.

''(5) Not later than October 1, 2020, and at 5-year intervals thereafter, the director shall prepare and publish in the Federal Register for public comment a draft of a 5-year plan that—

''(A) outlines priorities for research, research dissemination, evaluation, demonstration projects, and related activities;

''(B) explains the basis for such priorities; and

''(C) describes how the plan will meet the needs of underserved populations.

''(6) The director shall coordinate, as appropriate, research, research dissemination, evaluation, and demonstration projects, and related activities with appropriate agency program staff, and, as appropriate, with other Federal departments and agencies involved in research in the field of aging.

''(7) Not later than December 31, 2020, and annually thereafter, the director shall prepare, and submit to the Secretary, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate, and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, a report on the activities funded under this section and title IV.

''(8) The director shall, as appropriate, consult with experts on aging research and evaluation and aging network stakeholders on the implementation of the activities described under paragraph (3) of this subsection.

''(9) The director shall coordinate, as appropriate, all research and evaluation authorities under this Act.''.

(b) EVALUATION.—Section 206 (42 U.S.C. 3017) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) through (g) as subsections (c) through (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) Not later than July 1, 2020, the Secretary shall provide, directly or through grant or contract, for an evaluation of programs under this Act, which shall include, to the extent practicable, an analysis of the relationship of such

programs, including demonstration projects under title IV of this Act, to health care expenditures under the Medicare program established under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) and the Medicaid program established under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.). The Secretary shall oversee analyses of data obtained in connection with program evaluation to evaluate, where feasible, the relationship of programs under this Act to health care expenditures, including under the Medicare and Medicaid programs.''.

(c) REPORT ON HEALTH CARE EXPENDITURES.—Section 207 (42 U.S.C. 3018) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) The Assistant Secretary shall provide the evaluation required under section 206(b) to—

''(1) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

''(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

''(3) the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate;

''(4) the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives; and

''(5) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.''.

TITLE II—IMPROVING GRANTS FOR STATE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS ON AGING

SEC. 201. SOCIAL DETERMINANTS OF HEALTH.

Section 301(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 3021(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) measure impacts related to social determinants of health of older individuals.''.

SEC. 202. YOUNGER ONSET ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE.

The Act (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 302(3) (42 U.S.C. 3022(3)), by inserting ''of any age'' after ''an individual''; and

(2) in section 711(6) (42 U.S.C. 3058f(6)), by inserting ''of any age'' after ''individual''.

SEC. 203. REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) GRANTS FOR STATE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS ON AGING.—Subsections (a) through (e) of section 303 (42 U.S.C. 3023) are amended to read as follows:

''(a)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part B (relating to supportive services) $412,029,180 for fiscal year 2020, $436,750,931 for fiscal year 2021, $462,955,987 for fiscal year 2022, $490,733,346 for fiscal year 2023, and $520,177,347 for fiscal year 2024.

''(2) Funds appropriated under paragraph (1) shall be available to carry out section 712.

''(b)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out subpart 1 of part C (relating to congregate nutrition services) $530,015,940 for fiscal year 2020, $561,816,896 for fiscal year 2021, $595,525,910 for fiscal year 2022, $631,257,465 for fiscal year 2023, and $669,132,913 for fiscal year 2024.

''(2) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out subpart 2 of part C (relating to home delivered nutrition services) $268,935,940 for fiscal year 2020, $285,072,096 for fiscal year 2021, $302,176,422 for fiscal year 2022, $320,307,008 for fiscal year 2023, and $339,525,428 for fiscal year 2024.

''(c) Grants made under part B, and subparts 1 and 2 of part C, of this title may be used for paying part of the cost of—

''(1) the administration of area plans by area agencies on aging designated under section 305(a)(2)(A), including the preparation of area plans on aging consistent with section 306 and the evaluation of activities carried out under such plans; and

''(2) the development of comprehensive and coordinated systems for supportive services, and congregate and home delivered nutrition services under subparts 1 and 2 of part C, the development and operation of multipurpose senior centers, and the delivery of legal assistance.

''(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part D (relating to disease prevention and health promotion services) $26,587,360 for fiscal year 2020, $28,182,602 for fiscal year 2021, $29,873,558 for fiscal year 2022, $31,665,971 for fiscal year 2023, and $33,565,929 for fiscal year 2024.

''(e) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part E (relating to family caregiver support) $193,869,020 for fiscal year 2020, $205,501,161 for fiscal year 2021, $217,831,231 for fiscal year 2022, $230,901,105 for fiscal year 2023, and $244,755,171 for fiscal year 2024.''.

(b) NUTRITION SERVICES INCENTIVE PROGRAM.—Section 311(e) (42 U.S.C. 3030a(e)) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section (other than subsection (c)(1)) $171,273,830 for fiscal year 2020, $181,550,260 for fiscal year 2021, $192,443,275 for fiscal year 2022, $203,989,872 for fiscal year 2023, and $216,229,264 for fiscal year 2024.''.

SEC. 204. HOLD HARMLESS FORMULA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 304(a)(3)(D) (42 U.S.C. 3024(a)(3)(D)) is amended to read as follows:

''(D)(i) In this subparagraph and paragraph (5)—

''(I) the term 'allot' means allot under this subsection from a sum appropriated under section 303(a) or 303(b)(1), as the case may be; and

''(II) the term 'covered fiscal year' means any of fiscal years 2020 through 2029.

''(ii) If the sum appropriated under section 303(a) or 303(b)(1) for a particular covered fiscal year is less than or equal to the sum appropriated under section 303(a) or 303(b)(1), respectively, for fiscal year 2019, amounts shall be allotted to States from the sum appropriated for the particular year in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), and subparagraphs (A) through (C) as applicable, but no State shall be allotted an amount that is less than—

''(I) for fiscal year 2020, 99.75 percent of the State's allotment from the corresponding sum appropriated for fiscal year 2019;

''(II) for fiscal year 2021, 99.50 percent of that allotment;

''(III) for fiscal year 2022, 99.25 percent of that allotment;

''(IV) for fiscal year 2023, 99.00 percent of that allotment;

''(V) for fiscal year 2024, 98.75 percent of that allotment;

''(VI) for fiscal year 2025, 98.50 percent of that allotment;

''(VII) for fiscal year 2026, 98.25 percent of that allotment;

''(VIII) for fiscal year 2027, 98.00 percent of that allotment;

''(IX) for fiscal year 2028, 97.75 percent of that allotment; and

''(X) for fiscal year 2029, 97.50 percent of that allotment.

''(iii) If the sum appropriated under section 303(a) or 303(b)(1) for a particular covered fiscal year is greater than the sum appropriated under section 303(a) or 303(b)(1), respectively, for fiscal year 2019, the allotments to States from the sum appropriated for the particular year shall be calculated as follows:

''(I) From the portion equal to the corresponding sum appropriated for fiscal year 2019, amounts shall be allotted in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), and subparagraphs (A) through (C) as applicable, but no State shall be allotted an amount that is less than the percentage specified in clause (ii), for that particular year, of the State's allotment from the corresponding sum appropriated for fiscal year 2019.

''(II) From the remainder, amounts shall be allotted in accordance with paragraph (1), subparagraphs (A) through (C) as applicable, and paragraph (2) to the extent needed to meet the requirements of those subparagraphs.''.

(b) REPEAL.—Section 304(a)(3)(D) (42 U.S.C. 3024(a)(3)(D)) is repealed, effective October 1, 2029.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 304(a)(5) (42 U.S.C. 3024(a)(5)) is amended by striking ''of the prior year'' and inserting ''as required by paragraph (3)''.

SEC. 205. OUTREACH EFFORTS.

Section 306(a)(4)(B) (42 U.S.C. 3026(a)(4)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)(VII), by inserting '', specifically including survivors of the Holocaust'' after ''placement''; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking ''(VI)'' and inserting ''(VII)''.

SEC. 206. STATE LONG-TERM CARE OMBUDSMAN PROGRAM MINIMUM FUNDING AND MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.

The Act (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by amending section 306(a)(9) (42 U.S.C. 3026(a)(9)) to read as follows:

''(9) provide assurances that—

''(A) the area agency on aging, in carrying out the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman program under section 307(a)(9), will expend not less than the total amount of funds appropriated under this Act and expended by the agency in fiscal year 2019 in carrying out such a program under this title; and

''(B) funds made available to the area agency on aging pursuant to section 712 shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local funds expended to support activities described in section 712;''; and

(2) by amending section 307(a)(9) (42 U.S.C. 3027(a)(9)) to read as follows:

''(9) The plan shall provide assurances that—

''(A) the State agency will carry out, through the Office of the State Long-Term Care Ombudsman, a State Long-Term Care Ombudsman program in accordance with section 712 and this title, and will expend for such purpose an amount that is not less than the amount expended by the State agency with funds received under this title for fiscal year 2019, and an amount that is not less than the amount expended by the State agency with funds received under title VII for fiscal year 2019; and

''(B) funds made available to the State agency pursuant to section 712 shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local funds expended to support activities described in section 712.''.

SEC. 207. COORDINATION WITH RESOURCE CENTERS.

(a) AREA PLANS.—Section 306(a) (42 U.S.C. 3026(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (16), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (17), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(18) provide assurances that the area agency on aging will collect data to determine—

''(A) the services that are needed by older individuals whose needs were the focus of all centers funded under title IV in fiscal year 2019; and

''(B) the effectiveness of the programs, policies, and services provided by such area agency on aging in assisting such individuals; and

''(19) provide assurances that the area agency on aging will use outreach efforts that will identify individuals eligible for assistance under this Act, with special emphasis on those individuals whose needs were the focus of all centers funded under title IV in fiscal year 2019.''.

(b) STATE PLANS.—Section 307(a) (42 U.S.C. 3027(a)), as amended by section 118(c), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(30) The plan shall contain an assurance that the State shall prepare and submit to the Assistant Secretary annual reports that describe—

''(A) data collected to determine the services that are needed by older individuals whose needs were the focus of all centers funded under title IV in fiscal year 2019;

''(B) data collected to determine the effectiveness of the programs, policies, and services provided by area agencies on aging in assisting such individuals; and

''(C) outreach efforts and other activities carried out to satisfy the assurances described in paragraphs (18) and (19) of section 306(a).''.

SEC. 208. SENIOR LEGAL HOTLINES.

Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report containing—

(1) information on which States or localities operate senior legal hotlines;

(2) information on how such hotlines operated by States or localities are funded;

(3) information on the usefulness of senior legal hotlines in the coordination and provision of legal assistance; and

(4) recommendations on additional actions that should be taken related to senior legal hotlines.

SEC. 209. INCREASE IN LIMIT ON USE OF ALLOTTED FUNDS FOR STATE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.

Section 308 (42 U.S.C. 3028) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in paragraphs (1) and (2), by striking ''subsection (b)(1)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in each of paragraphs (1) and (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''clause (ii)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (B)''; and

(II) by striking ''greater of'' and all that follows through ''or'' and inserting the following: ''greater of—

''(i) 5 percent of the total amount of the allotments made to a State under sections 304(a)(1) and 373(f); or

''(ii)''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''such allotment'' and inserting ''such total amount''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$750,000''.

SEC. 210. IMPROVEMENTS TO NUTRITION PROGRAMS.

Section 308(b)(4) (42 U.S.C. 3028(b)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) The State, in consultation with area agencies on aging, shall ensure the process used by the State in transferring funds under this paragraph (including requirements relating to the authority and timing of such transfers) is simplified and clarified to reduce administrative barriers and direct limited resources to the greatest nutrition service needs at the community level. Such process shall be modified to attempt to lessen the administrative barriers of such transfers, and help direct limited resources to where they are needed the most as the unmet need for nutrition services grows.''.

SEC. 211. REVIEW OF REPORTS.

Section 308(b) (42 U.S.C. 3028(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) The Assistant Secretary shall review the reports submitted under section 307(a)(30) and include aggregate data in the report required by section 207(a), including data on—

''(A) the effectiveness of the programs, policies, and services provided by area agencies on aging in assisting older individuals whose needs were the focus of all centers funded under title IV in fiscal year 2019; and

''(B) outreach efforts and other activities carried out to satisfy the assurances described in paragraphs (18) and (19) of section 306(a), to identify such older individuals and their service needs.''.

SEC. 212. OTHER PRACTICES.

Section 315 (42 U.S.C. 3030c–2) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) RESPONSE TO AREA AGENCIES ON AGING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon request from an area agency on aging, the State shall make available any policies or guidance pertaining to policies established under this section.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall require a State to develop policies or guidance pertaining to policies established under this section.''.

SEC. 213. SCREENING FOR NEGATIVE HEALTH EFFECTS ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIAL ISOLATION AND TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

Section 321(a)(8) (42 U.S.C. 3030d(a)(8)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''screening and'' and inserting ''screening, screening for negative health effects associated with social isolation,''; and

(2) by inserting '', and traumatic brain injury screening'' after ''falls prevention services screening''.

SEC. 214. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AND SENIOR CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 321(a) (42 U.S.C. 3030d(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (24), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (25) as paragraph (26); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (24) the following:

''(25) services that promote or support social connectedness and reduce negative health effects associated with social isolation; and''.

(b) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—Section 321(a)(7) (42 U.S.C. 3030d(a)(7)) is amended by inserting ''cultural experiences (including the arts),'' after ''art therapy,''.

SEC. 215. CULTURALLY APPROPRIATE, MEDICALLY TAILORED MEALS.

Section 339(2)(A)(iii) (42 U.S.C. 3030g–21(2)(A)(iii)) is amended by inserting '', including meals adjusted for cultural considerations and preferences and medically tailored meals'' before the comma at the end.

SEC. 216. NUTRITION SERVICES STUDY.

Subpart 3 of part C of title III (42 U.S.C. 3030g–21 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 339B. NUTRITION SERVICES IMPACT STUDY.

''(a) STUDY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall perform a study to assess how to measure and evaluate the discrepancy between available services and the demand for such services in the home delivered nutrition services program and the congregate nutrition services program under this part, which shall include assessing various methods (such as those that States use) to measure and evaluate the discrepancy (such as measurement through the length of waitlists).

''(2) CONTENTS.—In performing the study, the Assistant Secretary shall—

''(A) consider means of obtaining information in rural and underserved communities; and

''(B) consider using existing tools (existing as of the date the Assistant Secretary begins the study) such as the tools developed through the Performance Outcome Measurement Project.

''(3) ANALYSIS.—The Assistant Secretary shall analyze and determine which methods are the least burdensome and most effective for measuring and evaluating the discrepancy described in paragraph (1).

''(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

''(1) PREPARATION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Supporting Older Americans Act of 2020, the Assistant Secretary shall prepare recommendations—

''(A) on how to measure and evaluate, with the least burden and the most effectiveness, the discrepancy described in subsection (a)(1) (such as measurement through the length of waitlists); and

''(B) about whether studies similar to the study described in subsection (a) should be carried out for programs carried out under this Act, other than this part.

''(2) ISSUANCE.—The Assistant Secretary shall issue the recommendations, and make the recommendations available as a notification pursuant to section 202(a)(34) and to the committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over this Act, and the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate.''.

SEC. 217. NATIONAL FAMILY CAREGIVER SUPPORT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS FOR NATIONAL FAMILY CAREGIVER SUPPORT PROGRAM.—Section 372(a) (42 U.S.C. 3030s(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

''(1) CAREGIVER ASSESSMENT.—The term 'caregiver assessment' means a defined process of gathering information to identify the specific needs, barriers to carrying out caregiving responsibilities, and existing supports of a family caregiver or older relative caregiver, as identified by the caregiver involved, to appropriately target recommendations for support services described in section 373(b). Such assessment shall be administered through direct contact with the caregiver, which may include contact through a home visit, the Internet, telephone or teleconference, or in-person interaction.''.

(b) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—Section 373 (42 U.S.C. 3030s–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''which may be informed through the use of caregiver assessments,'' after ''provided,'';

(2) in subsection (e)(3), in the first sentence, by inserting '', including caregiver assessments used in the State,'' after ''mechanisms'';

(3) by redesignating subsections (e) through (g) as subsections (f) through (h), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) BEST PRACTICES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Supporting Older Americans Act of 2020 and every 5 years thereafter, the Assistant Secretary shall—

''(1) identify best practices relating to the programs carried out under this section and section 631, regarding—

''(A) the use of procedures and tools to monitor and evaluate the performance of the programs carried out under such sections;

''(B) the use of evidence-based caregiver support services; and

''(C) any other issue determined relevant by the Assistant Secretary; and

''(2) make available, including on the website of the Administration and pursuant to section 202(a)(34), best practices described in paragraph (1), to carry out the programs under this section and section 631.''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(i) ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.—The Assistant Secretary may award funds authorized under this section to States, public agencies, private nonprofit agencies, institutions of higher education, and organizations, including tribal organizations, for conducting activities of national significance that—

''(1) promote quality and continuous improvement in the support provided to family caregivers and older relative caregivers through programs carried out under this section and section 631; and

''(2) include, with respect to such programs, program evaluation, training, technical assistance, and research.

''(j) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR CAREGIVER ASSESSMENTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Supporting Older Americans Act of 2020, the Assistant Secretary, in consultation with stakeholders with appropriate expertise and, as appropriate, informed by the strategy developed under the RAISE Family Caregivers Act (42 U.S.C. 3030s note), shall provide technical assistance to promote and implement the use of caregiver assessments. Such technical assistance may include sharing available tools or templates, comprehensive assessment protocols, and best practices concerning—

''(1) conducting caregiver assessments (including reassessments) as needed;

''(2) implementing such assessments that are consistent across a planning and service area, as appropriate; and

''(3) implementing caregiver support service plans, including conducting referrals to and coordination of activities with relevant State services.''.

(c) REPORT ON CAREGIVER ASSESSMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall issue a report on the use of caregiver assessments by area agencies on aging, entities contracting with such agencies, and tribal organizations. Such report shall include—

(A) an analysis of the current use of caregiver assessments, as of the date of the report;

(B) an analysis of the potential impact of caregiver assessments on—

(i) family caregivers and older relative caregivers; and

(ii) the older individuals to whom the caregivers described in clause (i) provide care;

(C) an analysis of the potential impact of using caregiver assessments on the aging network;

(D) an analysis of how caregiver assessments are being used to identify the specific needs, barriers to carrying out caregiving responsibilities, and existing supports of family caregivers and older relative caregivers, with particular consideration to supporting—

(i) a caregiver specified in this subparagraph who is caring for individuals with disabilities, or, if appropriate, with a serious illness; and

(ii) caregivers with disabilities;

(E) recommendations for furthering the use of caregiver assessments, as appropriate, including in rural or underserved areas; and

(F) recommendations for assisting State agencies and area agencies on aging, particularly in rural or underserved areas, in implementing the use of caregiver assessments.

(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 6 months after the issuance of the report specified in paragraph (1), the Assistant Secretary shall submit the report to the committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over this Act, and the Special Committee on Aging of the Senate.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the terms ''caregiver assessment'' and ''older relative caregiver'' have the meanings given such terms in section 372(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030s(a));

(B) the term ''family caregiver'' has the meaning given the term in section 302 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3022); and

(C) the terms ''State agency'' and ''tribal organization'' have the meanings given the terms in section 102 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3002).

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 631(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3057k–11(b)) is amended by striking ''(c), (d), and (e)'' and inserting ''(c), (d), and (f)''.

SEC. 218. NATIONAL FAMILY CAREGIVER SUPPORT PROGRAM CAP.

(a) FEDERAL SHARE.—Subsection (h)(2), as redesignated by section 217(b)(3) of this Act, of section 373 (42 U.S.C. 3030s–1) is amended by striking subparagraph (C).

(b) MONITORING THE IMPACT OF THE ELIMINATION OF THE CAP ON FUNDS FOR OLDER RELATIVE CAREGIVERS.—

(1) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives a report on the impact of the amendment made by subsection (a) to eliminate the limitation on funds that States may allocate to provide support services to older relative caregivers in the National Family Caregiver Support Program established under part E of title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030s et seq.). Each such report shall also be made available to the public.

(2) CONTENTS.—For purposes of reports required by paragraph (1), each State that receives an allotment under such National Family Caregiver Support Program for fiscal year 2020 or a subsequent fiscal year shall report to the Assistant Secretary for the fiscal year involved the amount of funds of the total Federal and non-Federal shares described in section 373(h)(2) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030s–1(h)(2)) used by the State to provide support services for older relative caregivers and the amount of such funds so used for family caregivers.

TITLE III—MODERNIZING ACTIVITIES FOR HEALTH, INDEPENDENCE, AND LONGEVITY

SEC. 301. REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 411(b) (42 U.S.C. 3032(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out—

''(1) aging network support activities under this section, $14,514,550 for fiscal year 2020, $15,385,423 for fiscal year 2021, $16,308,548 for fiscal year 2022, $17,287,061 for fiscal year 2023, and $18,324,285 for fiscal year 2024; and

''(2) elder rights support activities under this section, $15,613,440 for fiscal year 2020, $16,550,246 for fiscal year 2021, $17,543,261 for fiscal year 2022, $18,595,857 for fiscal year 2023, and $19,711,608 for fiscal year 2024.''.

SEC. 302. PUBLIC AWARENESS OF TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

Section 411(a)(12) (42 U.S.C. 3032(a)(12)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''impairments'' and inserting ''impairments,''; and

(2) by striking '', and mental disorders'' and inserting '', mental disorders, and traumatic brain injury''.

SEC. 303. FALLS PREVENTION AND CHRONIC DISEASE SELF-MANAGEMENT EDUCATION.

Section 411(a) (42 U.S.C. 3032(a)), as amended by sections 119 and 120, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (15) and (16) as paragraphs (17) and (18), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (14) the following:

''(15) bringing to scale and sustaining evidence-based falls prevention programs that will reduce the number of falls, fear of falling, and fall-related injuries in older individuals, including older individuals with disabilities;

''(16) bringing to scale and sustaining evidence-based chronic disease self-management programs that empower older individuals, including older individuals with disabilities, to better manage their chronic conditions;''.

SEC. 304. DEMONSTRATION TO ADDRESS NEGATIVE HEALTH IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIAL ISOLATION.

Section 411(a)(42 U.S.C. 3032(a)), as amended by sections 119, 120, and 303, is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (17), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (18) as paragraph (19); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (17), the following:

''(18) projects that address negative health effects associated with social isolation among older individuals; and''.

SEC. 305. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND INNOVATION TO IMPROVE TRANSPORTATION FOR OLDER INDIVIDUALS.

Section 416(b)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3032e(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting before the semicolon '', call center, website or Internet-based portal, mobile application, or other technological tools'';

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (G); and

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D)(i) improving the aggregation, availability, and accessibility of information on options for transportation services for older individuals, including information on public transit, on-demand transportation services, volunteer-based transportation services, and other private transportation providers; and

''(ii) providing older individuals with the ability to schedule trips both in advance and on demand, as appropriate;

''(E) identifying opportunities to share resources and reduce costs of transportation services for older individuals;

''(F) coordinating individualized trip planning responses to requests from older individuals for transportation services; and''.

SEC. 306. GRANT PROGRAM FOR MULTIGENERATIONAL COLLABORATION.

Section 417 (42 U.S.C. 3032f) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—The Assistant Secretary shall award grants to and enter into contracts with eligible organizations to carry out projects, serving individuals in younger generations and older individuals, to—

''(1) provide opportunities for older individuals to participate in multigenerational activities and civic engagement activities that contribute to the health and wellness of older individuals and individuals in younger generations by promoting—

''(A) meaningful roles for participants;

''(B) reciprocity in relationship building;

''(C) reduced social isolation and improved participant social connectedness;

''(D) improved economic well-being for older individuals;

''(E) increased lifelong learning; or

''(F) support for caregivers of families by—

''(i) providing support for older relative caregivers (as defined in section 372(a)) raising children (such as support for kinship navigator programs); or

''(ii) involving volunteers who are older individuals who provide support and information to families who have a child with a disability or chronic illness, or other families in need of such family support;

''(2) coordinate multigenerational activities and civic engagement activities, including multigenerational nutrition and meal service programs;

''(3) promote volunteerism, including by providing opportunities for older individuals to become a mentor to individuals in younger generations; and

''(4) facilitate development of, and participation in, multigenerational activities and civic engagement activities.'';

(2) by striking subsection (g);

(3) by redesignating subsections (b) through (f) as subsections (c) through (g), respectively;

(4) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) GRANT AND CONTRACT PERIODS.—Each grant awarded and contract entered into under subsection (a) shall be for a period of not less than 36 months.'';

(5) by amending subsection (c), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

''(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible organization shall use funds made available under a grant awarded, or a contract entered into, under this section to carry out a project described in subsection (a).

''(2) PROVISION OF PROJECTS THROUGH GRANTEES.—In awarding grants and entering into contracts under this section, the Assistant Secretary shall ensure that such grants and contracts are for the projects that satisfy each requirement under paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a).'';

(6) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting '', intent to carry out, or intent to partner with local organizations or multiservice organizations to carry out,'' after ''record of carrying out'';*

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) eligible organizations proposing multigenerational activity projects that utilize shared site programs, such as collocated child care and long-term care facilities.'';

(7) by amending subsections (f) and (g), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

''(f) ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONS.—Organizations eligible to receive a grant or enter into a contract under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) be a State, an area agency on aging, or an organization that provides opportunities for older individuals to participate in activities described in such subsection; and

''(2) have the capacity to conduct the coordination, promotion, and facilitation described in such subsection through the use of multigenerational coordinators.

''(g) EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Supporting Older Americans Act of 2020, the Assistant Secretary shall, through data submitted by organizations carrying out projects through grants or contracts under this section, evaluate the activities supported through such grants and contracts to determine—

''(A) the effectiveness of such activities;

''(B) the impact of such activities on the community being served and the organization providing the activities; and

''(C) the impact of such activities on older individuals participating in such projects.

''(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 6 months after the Assistant Secretary completes the evaluation under paragraph (1), the Assistant Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate a report that assesses such evaluation and contains, at a minimum—

''(A) the names or descriptive titles of the projects funded under subsection (a);

''(B) a description of the nature and operation of such projects;

''(C) the names and addresses of organizations that conducted such projects;

''(D) a description of the methods and success of such projects in recruiting older individuals as employees and as volunteers to participate in the projects;

''(E) a description of the success of the projects in retaining older individuals participating in such projects as employees and as volunteers;

''(F) the rate of turnover of older individuals who are employees or volunteers in such projects;

''(G) a strategy for disseminating the findings resulting from such projects; and

''(H) any policy change recommendations relating to such projects.''; and

(8) in subsection (h)(2)(B)(i), by striking ''individuals from the generations with older individuals'' and inserting ''older individuals''.

TITLE IV—SENIOR COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 401. PRIORITY FOR THE SENIOR COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM.

(a) PRIORITY.—The Act (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 503(a)(4)(C) (42 U.S.C. 3056a(a)(4)(C))—

(A) in clause (iii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in clause (iv), by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(v) eligible individuals who have been incarcerated within the last 5 years or are under supervision following release from prison or jail within the last 5 years;'';

(2) in section 514(e)(1) (42 U.S.C. 3056l(e)(1)), by inserting ''eligible individuals who have been incarcerated or are under supervision following release from prison or jail,'' after ''need,''; and

(3) in section 518 (42 U.S.C. 3056p)—

(A) in subsection (a)(3)(B)(ii)—

(i) in subclause (IV), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(ii) in subclause (V), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(VI) have been incarcerated within the last 5 years or are under supervision following release from prison or jail within the last 5 years.''; and

(B) in subsection (b)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(H) has been incarcerated within the last 5 years or is under supervision following release from prison or jail within the last 5 years.''.

(b) TRANSITION PERIOD.—This section shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 402. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 517(a) (42 U.S.C. 3056o(a)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $428,000,000 for fiscal year 2020, $453,680,000 for fiscal year 2021, $480,900,800 for fiscal year 2022, $509,754,848 for fiscal year 2023, and $540,340,139 for fiscal year 2024.''.

TITLE V—ENHANCING GRANTS FOR NATIVE AMERICANS

SEC. 501. REAUTHORIZATION.

Title VI (42 U.S.C. 3057 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in part D (42 U.S.C. 3057l et seq.)—

(A) by amending section 643 (42 U.S.C. 3057n) to read as follows:

''SEC. 643. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title—

''(1) for parts A and B, $37,102,560 for fiscal year 2020, $39,298,714 for fiscal year 2021, $41,626,636 for fiscal year 2022, $44,094,235 for fiscal year 2023, and $46,709,889 for fiscal year 2024; and

''(2) for part C, $10,759,920 for fiscal year 2020, $11,405,515 for fiscal year 2021, $12,089,846 for fiscal year 2022, $12,815,237 for fiscal year 2023, and $13,584,151 for fiscal year 2024.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 644. FUNDING SET ASIDE.

''Of the funds appropriated under section 643(1) for a fiscal year, not more than 5 percent shall be made available to carry out part D for such fiscal year, provided that for such fiscal year—

''(1) the funds appropriated for parts A and B are greater than the funds appropriated for fiscal year 2019; and

''(2) the Assistant Secretary makes available for parts A and B no less than the amount of resources made available for fiscal year 2019.'';

(2) by redesignating part D, as so amended, as part E; and

(3) by inserting after part C the following:

''PART D—SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR HEALTHY AGING AND INDEPENDENCE

''SEC. 636. PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary may carry out a competitive demonstration program for making grants to tribal organizations or organizations serving Native Hawaiians with applications approved under parts A and B, to pay for the Federal share of carrying out programs, to enable the organizations described in this subsection to build their capacity to provide a wider range of in-home and community supportive services to enable older individuals to maintain their health and independence and to avoid long-term care facility placement.

''(b) SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), supportive services described in subsection (a) may include any of the activities described in section 321(a).

''(2) PRIORITY.—The Assistant Secretary, in making grants under this section, shall give priority to organizations that will use the grant funds for supportive services described in subsection (a) that are for in-home assistance, transportation, information and referral, case management, health and wellness programs, legal services, family caregiver support services, and other services that directly support the independence of the older individuals served.

''(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed or interpreted to prohibit the provision of supportive services under part A or B.''.

TITLE VI—MODERNIZING ALLOTMENTS FOR VULNERABLE ELDER RIGHTS PROTECTION ACTIVITIES AND OTHER PROGRAMS

SEC. 601. REAUTHORIZATION; VULNERABLE ELDER RIGHTS PROTECTION ACTIVITIES.

Section 702 (42 U.S.C. 3058a) is amended by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

''(a) OMBUDSMAN PROGRAM.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out chapter 2, $18,066,950 for fiscal year 2020, $19,150,967 for fiscal year 2021, $20,300,025 for fiscal year 2022, $21,518,027 for fiscal year 2023, and $22,809,108 for fiscal year 2024.

''(b) OTHER PROGRAMS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out chapters 3 and 4, $5,107,110 for fiscal year 2020, $5,413,537 for fiscal year 2021, $5,738,349 for fiscal year 2022, $6,082,650 for fiscal year 2023, and $6,447,609 for fiscal year 2024.''.

SEC. 602. VOLUNTEER STATE LONG-TERM CARE OMBUDSMAN REPRESENTATIVES.

Section 712(a)(5) (42 U.S.C. 3058g(a)(5)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(E) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION FOR VOLUNTEER OMBUDSMAN REPRESENTATIVES.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as prohibiting the program from providing and financially supporting recognition for an individual designated under subparagraph (A) as a volunteer to represent the Ombudsman program, or from reimbursing or otherwise providing financial support to such an individual for any costs, such as transportation costs, incurred by the individual in serving as such volunteer.''.

SEC. 603. PREVENTION OF ELDER ABUSE, NEGLECT, AND EXPLOITATION.

Section 721(b)(12) (42 U.S.C. 3058i(b)(12)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ''community outreach and education,'' after ''technical assistance,''; and

(2) in subparagraph (F)—

(A) by striking ''studying'' and inserting ''implementing''; and

(B) by inserting '', programs, and materials'' after ''practices''.

SEC. 604. PRINCIPLES FOR PERSON-DIRECTED SERVICES AND SUPPORTS DURING SERIOUS ILLNESS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Administration for Community Living.

(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ''covered agency'' means—

(A) a State agency or area agency on aging; and

(B) a Federal agency other than the Department of Health and Human Services, and a unit of that Department other than the Administration on Aging, that the Assistant Secretary determines performs functions for which the principles are relevant, and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

(3) PRINCIPLES.—The term ''principles'' means the Principles for Person-directed Services and Supports during Serious Illness, issued by the Administration for Community Living on September 1, 2017, or an updated set of such Principles.

(4) STATE AGENCY.—The term ''State agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3002).

(b) DISSEMINATION.—The Administrator shall disseminate the principles to appropriate stakeholders within the aging network, as determined by the Assistant Secretary, and to covered agencies. The covered agencies may use the principles in setting priorities for service delivery and care plans in programs carried out by the agencies.

(c) FEEDBACK.—The Administrator shall solicit, on an ongoing basis, feedback on the principles from covered agencies, experts in the fields of aging and dementia, and stakeholders who provide or receive disability services.

(d) REPORT.—Not less often than once, but not more often than annually, during the 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall prepare and submit to Congress a report describing the feedback received under subsection (c) and indicating if any changes or updates are needed to the principles.

SEC. 605. EXTENSION OF THE SUPPORTING GRANDPARENTS RAISING GRANDCHILDREN ACT.

Section 3(f) of the Supporting Grandparents Raising Grandchildren Act (Public Law 115–196) is amended by striking ''3'' and inserting ''4''.

SEC. 606. BEST PRACTICES FOR HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED OMBUDSMEN.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall issue a report updating the best practices for home and community-based ombudsmen that were included in the report entitled ''Best Practices for Home and Community-Based Ombudsmen'', issued by the National Direct Service Workforce Resource Center of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and prepared by the Research and Training Center at the University of Minnesota and The Lewin Group (January 2013).

SEC. 607. SENIOR HOME MODIFICATION ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and issue a report that includes—

(1) an inventory of Federal programs, administered by the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, or any other Federal agency or department determined appropriate by the Comptroller General, that support evidence-based falls prevention, home assessments, and home modifications for older individuals and individuals with disabilities;

(2) statistical data, for recent fiscal years, on the number of older individuals and individuals with disabilities served by each Federal program described in paragraph (1) and the approximate amount of Federal funding invested in each such program;

(3) a demographic analysis of individuals served by each such program for recent fiscal years;

(4) an analysis of duplication and gaps in populations supported by the Federal programs described in paragraph (1);

(5) what is known about the impact of the Federal programs described in paragraph (1) on health status and health outcomes in populations supported by such programs;

(6) a review of Federal efforts to coordinate Federal programs existing prior to the date of enactment of this Act that support evidence-based falls prevention, home assessments, and home modifications for older individuals and individuals with disabilities and any considerations for improving coordination, which may include an indication of the Federal agency or department that is best suited to coordinate such Federal programs; and

(7) information on the extent to which consumer-friendly resources, such as a brochure, are available through the National Eldercare Locator Service established under section 202(a)(21) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)(21)), are accessible to all area agencies on aging, and contain information on evidence-based falls prevention, home assessments, and home modifications for older individuals attempting to live independently and safely in their homes and for the caregivers of such individuals.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 701. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 102(37)(A) (42 U.S.C. 3002(37)(A)), by striking ''paragraph (5)'' and inserting ''paragraph (26)'';

(2) in section 202(a)(23) (42 U.S.C. 3012(a)(23)), by striking ''sections 307(a)(18) and 731(b)(2)'' and inserting ''sections 307(a)(13) and 731'';

(3) in section 202(e)(1)(A) (42 U.S.C. 3012(e)(1)(A)), by moving the left margin of clause (i) 2 ems to the left;

(4) in sections 203(c)(7) (42 U.S.C. 3013(c)(7)), 207(b)(2)(B) (42 U.S.C. 3018(b)(2)(B)), and 215(i) (42 U.S.C. 3020e–1(i)), by striking ''Committee on Education and the Workforce'' each place it appears and inserting ''Committee on Education and Labor'';

(5) in section 207(b)(3)(A) (42 U.S.C. 3018(b)(3)(A)), by striking ''Administrator of the Health Care Finance Administration'' and inserting ''Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services'';

(6) in section 304(a)(3)(C) (42 U.S.C. 3024(a)(3)(C)), by striking ''term'' and all that follows through ''does'' and inserting ''term 'State' does'';

(7) in section 304(d)(1)(B), by striking ''(excluding'' and all that follows through ''303(a)(3))'';

(8) in section 306(a) (42 U.S.C. 3026(a))—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''the number of older individuals at risk for institutional placement residing in such area,'' before ''and the number of older individuals who are Indians''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''who are victims of'' and inserting ''with'';

(9) in section 339(2)(A)(ii)(I) (42 U.S.C. 3030g–21(2)(A)(ii)(I)), by striking ''Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences'' and inserting ''National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine'';

(10) in section 611 (42 U.S.C. 3057b), by striking ''(a)'';

(11) in section 614(c)(4) (42 U.S.C. 3057e(c)(4)), by striking ''(a)(12)'' and inserting ''(a)(11)''; and

(12) in section 721(i) (42 U.S.C. 3058i(i), by striking ''section 206(g)'' and inserting ''section 206(h)''.

Ms. BONAMICI (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING SCORING SENSATION RAKIYAH SELLERS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a scoring sensation in my district, Rakiyah Sellers. The senior guard at College of Saint Elizabeth scored her 1,000th career point in February.

She began her basketball career at the Ivy Hill Elementary School in Newark, New Jersey. From there, she continued to shine as a standout player for the Lady Jaguars of Newark's Arts High School.

Her scoring milestone came in a Colonial States Athletic Conference semifinal. Her team, College of Saint Elizabeth, beat Notre Dame of Maryland University 76–51.

In the conference final, Rakiyah had 4 points, 2 assists, 2 blocks, and 3 steals. Unfortunately, her Eagles of Saint Elizabeth lost to the Keystone Giants 72–61, but that does not dim her accomplishment. She is a shining star of Newark, and I am proud to highlight her today.

HONORING LIFE OF DR. DAVID L. RICE

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

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate and honor the life of Dr. David L. Rice.

Dr. Rice was the founding and first president of the University of Southern Indiana, where he worked from 1967 until his retirement in 1994.

Before his time at the University of Southern Indiana, Dr. Rice earned a bachelor of science in agriculture and a master of science and a doctor of philosophy in education, all from Purdue University.

While studying at Purdue, he met his wife, Betty J. Fordice, and the two were shortly wedded to one another. The following year of their marriage, Dr. Rice answered the called for his country and served in the United States Army infantry in Korea.

After serving in the military, Dr. Rice returned to Indiana, where he taught public school while pursuing his advanced degrees at Purdue.

In 1967, Dr. Rice was appointed to lead the Evansville campus of Indiana State University. By 1985, under his leadership, the campus became its own separate university, the University of Southern Indiana.

During his tenure, the University of Southern Indiana grew in enrollment

from 992 students to 7,443, expanded the curriculum from 2-year degree programs to a comprehensive range of baccalaureate and master's degree programs. He did such an exemplary job, they honored him by naming the library after him.

Dr. Rice was also very dedicated to bettering his community. He was a member of countless groups and organizations, such as being on the board of the Evansville Museum of Arts, History and Science, and starting an organization called Leadership Everyone. The group looks to develop leaders in the community who are committed to utilizing inclusion and creativity in order to bring positive change.

Dr. Rice's legacy of service and achieving excellence will live on through all the lives he impacted and through the David L. Rice and Betty Fordice Rice Presidential Scholarship.

Most importantly, his memory will live on through his family. Dr. Rice is survived by his wife of 69 years, Betty ''Janey'' Fordice Rice, and their two children, along with six grandchildren.

NOW IS TIME TO ACT ON CORONAVIRUS

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

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to share my sympathies for lives lost due to the coronavirus and to offer my gratitude to the first responders, healthcare professionals, and others working to respond to this public health emergency.

Now is the time for action.

Last week, Congress approved $8.3 billion in funding to ensure the Federal Government steps up to the scale and seriousness of this growing crisis: public health funding, support to State and local health agencies, investments in R&D for vaccines, and a measure I led to help our small businesses that are already feeling the impact.

This week, the Federal Government should go further to help workers and families across the country. I am proud the House will be moving to ensure paid sick days and economic assistance for impacted workers, to increase capacity of the medical system, to protect first responders, to make testing more widespread and free, and to ensure access to food for the most vulnerable Americans.

There is no time to waste. The House should act now to ensure the safety and security of the American people.

RECOGNIZING ACHIEVEMENTS OF HAROLD AGNEW

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the achievements of Harold Agnew, from Knoxville, Tennessee.

At 91 years young, Harold continues to be active in our community through his job as a barber and a gospel musician.

Harold was raised on a farm in South Carolina but came to call Knoxville home in his adult years. For 61 years, Harold has been a barber and still works 6 days a week at Gam's Barbershop in Mechanicsville.

Anyone who has had their hair cut by Harold will notice something unique about him. He is a gifted singer who sings gospel tunes as he works. He is a member of the group known as Brother Agnew and the Angel Voices, which released their latest album called ''Serving the Lord'' in November 2019.

At 91 years old, Harold has a cheerful personality and optimistic attitude. He continues to live his life to the fullest, with no intention of taking a step back from his day job.

One of the lyrics from his recent songs is, ''but sometimes a nobody is your somebody.'' Harold believes everyone matters, regardless of who you are. That is a message we can all believe in.

Congratulations, Harold, on all your success. Keep being an outstanding member of our great community.

HONORING PETE TAYLOR, CENTRAL VIRGINIAN OF THE WEEK

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the commitment, selflessness, and advocacy of Peyton ''Pete'' Taylor, the owner of a community pharmacy in our district and our Central Virginian of the Week.

Mr. TAYLOR graduated from pharmacy school in 1979. After graduating, he began operating Goochland Pharmacy to serve our community and provide patients with healthcare services tailored to their needs.

Despite the evolving pharmaceutical landscape over the past decades, Mr. TAYLOR remains committed to providing personalized service to those in his community. His deep concern for the rising costs of prescription drugs has made him a vocal advocate for the needs of his customers in the Goochland community.

Mr. TAYLOR's knowledge of the challenges facing small business pharmacies has been a vital resource to my team and me, and I am grateful for his thoughtful engagement.

Mr. TAYLOR truly has the best interests of his community at heart, and I thank him for his 40 years of dedicated service to Goochland and the greater Seventh District.

RECOGNIZING ENTREPRENEUR ANGIE RUFF

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

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Women's History Month, a time to highlight the many often-overlooked female contributions to our national history.

Great women have undoubtedly helped make America great. From the classroom to the boardroom, from Capitol Hill to outer space, their impact is undeniable.

Now, across our land, women-owned businesses are thriving in our booming economy above all others. Over the past 5 years, these businesses have grown by 21 percent, compared to 9 percent across all other sectors.

An example of this entrepreneurial spirit is seen in Lakeland, Florida's own Angie Ruff. Mrs. Ruff opened a dry food manufacturing business in 2018. Through her dedication and passion for creating good local jobs, her warehouse has since tripled in size, and her head count quadrupled. The future for her and other entrepreneurs like her looks bright.

It is because of individuals like Angie Ruff, who are making history, that I am proud to represent Florida's 15th District on the House Small Business Committee, and it is because of dedicated women like her that we can proudly say: America is back and open for business.

HONORING SEEING EYE DOGS

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

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor The Seeing Eye and Seeing Eye dogs for being named the State dog of New Jersey.

Seeing Eye dogs are New Jersey's cutest export. But that alone does not capture the inspiring and important work behind an organization that has partnered more than 17,000 service dogs in North America.

The Seeing Eye is the world's oldest guide dog school, dedicated to enhancing the independence, dignity, and self-confidence of people who are blind.

Headquartered in Morristown, they breed, raise, and train service dogs, and work with blind individuals to handle and care for their dogs.

They conduct research on canine health and development, and they helped to lead the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

I have seen the care the organization puts into pairing each individual with the right dog, fundamentally transforming their owners' lives.

I would like to thank The Seeing Eye for 91 years of leadership and State Senator Tony Bucco and the late Senator Anthony M. Bucco for their work to make the Seeing Eye dog New Jersey's State dog.

HONORING EAGLE SCOUT THOMAS SCOTT JEFFERSON

(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, this past Saturday, I was proud to attend the Eagle Scout Court of Honor for Thomas Scott Jefferson in Whitesboro, south Jersey. TJ is a member of Whitesboro Troop 104.

TJ not only was an exemplary student, maintaining a 4.0 GPA throughout high school, but he was also a committed volunteer at CCWI, a homework club, among other after-school activities.

He is currently studying classical performance voice at William Paterson University. He has an avid love for the arts, performing and starring in numerous plays, operas, and choirs.

TJ has become recognized for his singing voice, and he has continued to perform not only across the region but even training on Broadway in New York City.

We are so proud of you, TJ. I look forward to big things from you. I am confident you will live up to the name ''Thomas Jefferson.''

Congratulations to you and to your family. Some people look to sports or movie stars or, heaven forbid, politicians as role models. But it is individuals like you that inspire me.

You are one of my heroes. I know your future is bright, and may God bless you.

□ 1800

THE NEED FOR PAID SICK LEAVE

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

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Speaker, last night, I was so pleased to hold a telephone townhall with my colleague, Representative CHRIS PAPPAS, New Hampshire public health officials, and over 10,000 Granite Staters to provide an update on the impact of the coronavirus.

I continue to hear from constituents who are concerned, and a recurring theme for many is a lack of access to paid sick leave, which complicates our ability to address this public health crisis.

When faced with an illness or medical issue, many Americans face a challenging decision to put their job and their income at risk or risk their own health and the health of their colleagues and their community.

I am proud to support ROSA DELAURO's legislation to expand access to paid sick leave so that workers are able to follow the directives of public health officials and stay home from work when they are feeling ill.

As Congress continues to address policies to protect the American people against the spread of the coronavirus, I urge consideration of this important bill.

MATERNAL HEALTH CRISIS

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the historic bipartisan legislative package introduced this week to address the United States' urgent maternal health crisis. I am referring to the Black Maternal Health Momnibus.

Each year, 700 women in our country die from pregnancy complications, but 3 in 5 of those deaths could be prevented.

The United States' maternal mortality rate is exponentially higher than that of any other developed country, and Black women are three times more likely to die from pregnancy-related complications than White women, a glaring disparity that we cannot ignore.

In my community, organizations like The Foundation for Delaware County and the Maternity Care Coalition have stepped up to address this crisis, but we must do more.

I am proud to join Congresswomen LAUREN UNDERWOOD and ALMA ADAMS, Senator KAMALA HARRIS, and other congressional leaders in introducing the Black Maternal Health Momnibus.

The momnibus provides a comprehensive approach to maternal health, and particularly Black maternal health, by funding community-based organizations, investing in social determinants that influence maternal health outcomes, and growing and diversifying the prenatal workforce.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation for all our families.

CHINA AWARENESS

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

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, what I would like to do for the next few minutes is talk about an awareness campaign, and that is to make people aware of China and what China is doing.

We all know about China, a big country, wealthy country, a country that has come out of poverty and has become an industrial powerhouse. They have become a world power. Yet a lot of people don't understand what China really is doing.

When one really studies the history of China and sees where they are going, it is pretty remarkable that many of our countries around the world and our companies around the world do business with China.

The Communist Party took over in 1949, and that is when Mao Zedong came to power. He laid out a vision that I think any world leader would be proud of. He laid out a 100-year plan. In fact, they call it the 100-year marathon.

We have seen a remarkable advancement of China, but, unfortunately, it was at the expense of many along the roadways.

We look at what they have done; and their goal, if you listen to what Xi Jinping has said when he came to power, was he wanted to remove any Western influence from China.

This was not too long after Tiananmen Square, where people in China were promoting liberties and democracies, and then the Tiananmen Square massacre happened where thousands of people were run over by tanks in the streets as the world watched. Yet China has taken that history and swept it under the rug and pretends it didn't happen. But we know. We have seen the videos.

Since that time, Xi Jinping has come out with a very strong statement. In fact, in 2017, in the Sixteenth Chinese Communist Party Congress, he made a statement, and it is a warning, and it should be a wake-up call for all people who are buying products from China.

In that statement, he said: The era of China has arrived. No longer will China be made to swallow their interests around the world. It is time for China to take the world center stage.

As we looked into that—and we have talked to people from Hong Kong and from China—their intent is very real, it is very true, and it is very out front. They are not trying to hide anything. Their goal is to be a world dominant power, or the world dominant power.

What we are seeing today in the world is a tectonic shift in world powers that we haven't seen since World War II. China has made very clear what their intent is.

Then they have marched on a campaign since 1949. Deng Xiaoping, in the eighties, said that it could not compete with American or Japanese technology and manufacturing, but what they could do is they could corner the market on rare earth metals.

As China came into the modern world, America and other countries helped China in technology, science, research, in advancement of weaponry, thinking that China would come along and become more Western democracy in their thinking. That is the furthest from the truth.

As China moved on, Deng Xiaoping's vision came to realization. They talked about cornering the market on rare earth metals. Well, today, they control virtually 100 percent of the rare earth metals that are needed in our electronics, in our cell phones, in our missile guidance systems and our satellites.

China has gone on to corner the market in the APIs in our pharmaceuticals. The APIs are the active pharmaceutical ingredients. They control approximately 85 to 90 percent of that. They control the majority of the minerals and vitamins that go into our livestock feed.

So their intent is very clear, yet they hide behind policies that favor China.

In the WTO, when they became a member of that in the nineties, they entered with a developing nation status. Today, they are the second largest economy in the world. They are building five aircraft carriers. They have got a space program. They have expanded around the world through their One Belt, One Road initiative. Yet, today, in the WTO, they claim developing nation status.

It is time that we let everybody know these things and wake up the American people and our manufacturers. China has risen, yet it has been at the expense of other nations. It is been through coercion, intimidation, not honoring contracts, and not honoring laws that are world norms.

A good example of that is what is going on in the South China Sea. They have reclaimed landmasses, and they went ahead and built facilities on these to the point where they have military installations, runway strips, military barracks, offensive and defensive weapons on there, military radar systems. Xi Jinping, when he was here visiting President Obama in 2015, said they have no intention of militarizing those structures; yet, today, they are militarized.

China has encroached on the ASEAN nations in the East China Sea, in the South China Sea, and they have gone into the exclusive economic zones in those areas, not honoring the world norms or the laws of the sea. In fact, the Philippines took them to court.

At the court arbitration, China lost the case. They said they had no claims to the nine-dash lines that China claims that the Philippines challenged them on. The Philippines won, yet China ignored that ruling and kept doing the dredging of the landmasses, destroying thousands of acres of coral reefs and laying claim to that area.

China has used their heavy hands with our corporations when somebody does something unfavorable to what China wants. An example is the Marriott Hotel employee who had mentioned something favorable about Taiwan. That person got fired.

We have seen that over and over again with different industries. Just recently, the manager of the Houston Rockets tweeted in favor of the protestors in Hong Kong to stay strong for liberties and freedoms, and we all know what China did. The NBA backed down to placate China. We have seen this with corporation after corporation. We have seen Nike do this. We have seen other corporations do this.

I think today, in the modern world today and what we are going through with the coronavirus—another gift from China—is the supply chain that they control of so many products that the world is dependent on, and I think this is a wake-up call that we need to remove manufacturing from China. We can't do it as a government, but our manufacturers can.

We have drafted a policy. It is called ''Manufacture the ABC Method,'' and that is manufacturing anywhere but China.

When we make a product in China, China benefits from it. China introduces their Chinese Communist Party members within their corporation. Many times, our corporations have to give up their intellectual property. So China benefits from this by the theft of that property plus the production of that property. They counterfeit so many of our manufacturers' products, and our manufacturers go out of business.

We have met with many manufacturers that went over there initially for cheaper labor. Within 5 years, China has copied that product. That product is competing against the original manufacturer. It is being sold cheaper, and it is of an inferior quality, so it ruins the reputation of the manufacturer and they wind up going out of business. Then China just keeps producing. We see it over and over again, that they keep doing that.

We see constant abuses of human rights that we have seen over and over again, and these have been reported in the news. So many times we stand up for human rights around the world, and if we really, truly believe that as a nation, we believe in those values of liberty and freedom, that all people are created equal, that they have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, they have the right of due process, they have the right to a court of law, if we believe in those things, we have to look at our trade policies.

Why are we trading with a country that blatantly ignores those?

I think I want to just pivot to Hong Kong.

I think everybody in the world agrees that Hong Kong is a province of China. In 1997, Great Britain and China came to an agreement that they would allow Hong Kong to go back to China over a 50-year process, and that was going to be from 1997 to 2047.

Hong Kong had the ability and the guarantee that they would be a semi-autonomous region, a portion of China, that they would have an independent judiciary system, they would have their own election process.

Yet 22 years into that process, we see the heavy hand of Xi Jinping and the heavy hand of the Chinese Communist Party. 22 years into that agreement, Xi Jinping came out publicly and said, as far as he was concerned, that agreement is null and void.

We saw the extradition bill that was brought up by their chief executive officer, Carrie Lam, and we know that she didn't bring that up by herself. That was at the direction of Beijing.

What that law did is it was robbing liberty and freedom from the people of Hong Kong. And it is sad, because the people of Hong Kong have always known liberty and freedom in today's modern world. But, unfortunately, the people of China—Xi Jinping and the Chinese Communist Party—they, unfortunately, have never experienced liberty and freedom because they have lived under a communist, repressive regime that we have seen only grow stronger.

We did a floor speech down here on Tiananmen Square on the anniversary last summer, and shortly after that, within weeks, there were the protests in Hong Kong about the extradition bill.

□ 1815

And when you have 2 million people coming out in the streets in a province of China that has less than 8 million people, you have got a quarter of your population, and it was young people, it was old people, it was educated people, it was business people, mothers, fathers, children, and they are all protesting against the heavy-hand of China, because what they saw was freedom and liberty being taken away from them.

If that was an isolated case, that would be one thing, but what we have seen with China is the intimidation, the erasing of cultures, as they have done with the Tibetans, as they have tried to do with other ethnic minorities in their country, whether it is the Uighurs, the East Turkistan region, the Kyrgyz. And we see this over and over again, yet they make no apologies for it.

China is One Belt One Road. Or the Belt and Road Initiative is often referred to as One Belt One Road, and it goes one way, and that goes to the Chinese Communist Party.

They do predatory lending practices that put other countries in debt where they can't pay it back, and China winds up taking strategic ports. They have strategically done this around the world. They are in the Western Hemisphere and they are marching on.

The purpose of this Special Order tonight is to get people to pay attention to what China is doing. Who are we going to do business with in the future?

We have got a country that their goal is to take over the world. Xi Jinping says, and their philosophy is, you cannot have two suns in the sky at the same time, meaning one has to come down; and in their philosophy that would be us. Again, those are very confrontational points of view that they are pursuing, and they are pursuing them rapidly.

We have seen the intimidation of corporations with them. We have seen the intimidation of China and their heavy-hand with other countries.

The Czech Republic was going to have their Speaker of the House go to Taiwan to do some business there. China told them if they went there, the Czech Republic, their auto company, could no longer do business in China.

We have seen them do this with Mercedes Benz. If they don't buy Chinese batteries, they can no longer market in China, even though the majority of the Mercedes Benz Corporation is controlled by a Chinese individual.

We have seen the race for the 5G phone network with Huawei, with ZTE, in 2012, in this country. In this body here, in the House Intelligence Committee and the Senate Intelligence Committee, both ZTE and Huawei, in 2012, were deemed a national security risk. Yet, they keep going on and claim to be private enterprises. Yet, we know that the Chinese Communist Party and Government have invested heavily in those companies.

And what they are doing is, they are using their technology that will be able to be invaded through the backdoor by the Chinese Communist Party to be able to spy on people. Today, China has the most CCT cameras, closed-circuit television cameras, to where today in modern China they are using these television cameras to grade their citizens. They have good citizen scores. If you don't do what the Chinese Communist Party tells you, you can't travel, you can't bank, you can't go to the restaurants.

It is 1984, George Orwell's story is happening right now.

And what they are doing is they are doing that to suppress people. They have offered that technology around the world. They are using it in Hong Kong. They have offered that to Maduro in Venezuela to control his people. The Iranian ayatollahs want to use that technology. Vladimir Putin wants to use it.

And what we are finding is any authoritarian or despotic government wants that technology so that they can control their citizens. If you look in the Xinjiang region, which is East Turkistan. East Turkistan has been an Asian area of China for over 100 years. Yet, when the Communist Party came in they took it over, recently they renamed it Xinjiang, which means New Territory. And I bring that up because it is home to a Muslim population, the Uighurs, the Kyrgyzstans, the Kyrgyz, that are being suppressed by China.

I think we have all heard of the concentration camps that are going up all over China. We have done hearings—I sit on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I chaired the Asia Pacific Subcommittee last year, the ranking member this year, and we have had hearing after hearing on the human rights suppression, just the terrible things that they are doing over there.

When we looked into it, we have enough reports to feel this is true. What they are doing is, China has interned over a million Uighurs, and other ethnic groups, the Kyrgyz, the Turkistans, they have put them into these so-called re-education camps, but they are not re-education camps, they are concentration camps.

They have armed crematoriums around the country associated with these camps. And my question when we were in the Foreign Affairs Committee doing this hearing: Why do you need an armed crematorium? You know, the people that are supposed to be there are supposed to have passed away.

But we recently met with some people that—I found it very interesting. The people we met with were from East Turkistan. They had a Cossack person with them who had just won an award from Mike Pompeo and First Lady Melania Trump, for her courage, Women of Courage Award.

And what we found as we were listening to the story is, this family, an educated family, the husband was a schoolteacher, the wife was a practicing medical doctor. I mean, they were model citizens.

Well, the husband saw what was happening to his relatives, what was happening in the Xinjiang area, so he got passports, took himself and his kids out. The wife, the doctor, applied for a passport, China would not allow her to go. They felt she needed to go to the re-education camp. This is a lady that is a doctor that was practicing. China puts them in there, saying it was a threat to our country, she was a terrorist, they need to be re-educated.

What China is trying to do is erase other cultures. We have just seen this over and over again. And so when we spoke to these people that were in our office this week, I asked them, I said: Do you have reports of abuses? And they went on and on about the abuses. How they strap people in chairs, they electrocute them, they torture them, pull out their fingernails. The women were being raped, people were being—I can't say murdered, because they said they would disappear and never be seen again.

These are things—you know, it is not just hearsay. We have reports from all kinds of magazines, all kinds of researchers.

Here is one from Radio Free Asia, ''China Secretly Transferring Uyghur Detainees from Xinjiang to Shaanxi, Gansu Province Prisons.'' And it goes on talking about ethic Uighurs held in political ''re-education camps.'' I am going to put quotes around that because they are not re-education camps, they are concentration camps, because the Chinese Communist Party is the highest of the hierarchy, there can be nothing higher than that. And if you have a religion, and you have a deity above that, that puts the Chinese Communist Party and people like Xi Jinping in fear because they don't know how to control free thought. These people are being sent to prisons in those provinces.

''China to address an overflow in overcrowded camps, where up to 1.1 million Uyghurs and other Muslim ethnic minorities accused of harboring strong religious views and politically incorrect ideas have been held since April of 2017.'' This is something that has been going on not just 3 years, but longer than that, but it is coming to light.

We have asked their ambassadors, have they had the Western Press in there, free and open presses? And they said: Oh, no, there is no need. These aren't going on. But we know they are going on. This is just one report.

I have another one here, Madam Speaker, information concerning China killing prisoners to harvest organs. This is something we have heard over and over again. We have had hearings on this. This is a multi-billion-dollar industry in China. It happens to anybody that doesn't agree with the Communist Party. They get picked up, they get imprisoned. Health checks are done. In fact, this person that was in our office is a medical doctor, she would do the health checks on these young Muslim men, and they would get a red check if they were healthy. And in the darkness of night, they would disappear, never to be seen again.

The China Tribunal, which was a tribunal put together to look into this, has published its final judgment. ''The China Tribunal concluded 'that forced organ harvesting has been committed for years throughout China on a significant scale, and the tribunal has had no evidence that the significant infrastructure associated with China's transplantation industry has been dismantled and absent a satisfactory explanation as to the source of readily available organs concludes that forced organ harvesting continues till today.' ''

I don't know how a civilized world can tolerate such atrocities. And when I see the armed crematoriums or the Uighurs being taken from their homes, forced from their homes, forced into a concentration camp, and then being rented out or sold as chattel to manufacturers, and this is well-documented, I don't know how we can tolerate that or how we can look at our trade policies to do those kind of deals with a country that works like that.

If they treat their own people that way, how do we expect they are going to treat any of us?

We have talked about Tibet. We have talked about Xinjiang, East Turkistan, the purging of individuals, the social credit scores, the coercion and intimidations.

I haven't touched on the theft of intellectual property. There is over $600 billion of intellectual property theft that goes on and erodes economies all over the world.

I want to read an article here just briefly. ''China Compels Uighurs to Work in Shoe Factory That Supplies Nike.'' And I don't bring Nike's name out to put a ding on Nike. It says: ''The workers in standard-issue blue jackets stitch and glue and press together about 8 million pairs of Nikes each year at the Qingdao Taekwang Shoes Company, a Nike supplier for more than 30 years and one of the American brand's largest factories.

''They churn out pair after pair of Shox, with their springy shock absorbers in the heels, and the signature Air Max, plus seven other lines of sport shoes.

''But hundreds of these workers did not choose to be here: They are ethnic Uighurs from China's western Xinjiang region''—which again means New Territory, they renamed from East

Turkistan—''sent here by local authorities in groups of 50 to toil far from home.

''After intense international criticism of the Communist Party's campaign to forcibly assimilate the mostly Muslim Uighur minority by detaining more than a million people in re-education camps, party officials said last year that most have 'graduated' ''—graduated from a work camp.

And, again, if you talk to these people—I have talked to pharmacists, I have talked to lawyers, I have talked to engineers, I have talked to doctors, they didn't need to be re-educated. What China wanted to do was intimidate them, and basically brainwash them from their habits of a religion, of practicing their religion, and become good model Chinese citizens that bow down to the Communist Party.

''But there is new evidence to show that the Chinese authorities are moving Uighurs into government-directed labor around the country as part of the central government's 'Xinjiang Aid' initiative.

''For the party, this would help meet its poverty-alleviation goals''—and, again, this is a doctor. They are saying, we need to alleviate their poverty goals—''but also allow it to further control the Uighur population and break familial''—

The Uighur workers, they are afraid or unable to interact—the Uighur workers at these facilities are afraid or unable to interact with anyone in this town where they went to north of Qingdao, beyond the most superficial of transactions at the stalls or in the local stores where they go. They won't talk to anybody.

□ 1830

They won't talk to anybody. The people at these towns say: ''Everyone knows the Uighurs did not come here on their own free will. They were brought here,'' said one of the fruit sellers at her stall. ''The Uighurs had to come because they didn't have an option. The government sent them here,'' another vendor told the reporters. They were sent forcibly.

The report that we read did not ask their names out of concern for their safety, so they could not discuss the issues.

Like I said, we met with Mrs. Sayragul Sauytbay, an ethnic Kazakh from East Turkistan that, today, is now called, as I said, Xinjiang. She is the one who shared this. She is a true freedom fighter.

As we move on and we look at what China is doing, they have controlled so much of the supply chain.

Then we see what happened with the coronavirus. The coronavirus came out. It started off in Hubei province in Wuhan. The epicenter was supposedly a fish market or a fresh market.

With my science background, if you have an epicenter, you want to do your forensics and study it from an epidemiological standpoint. China didn't do that.

We had a hearing where we had two epidemiologists there. They did not do the proper epidemiological studies, yet they destroyed any evidence that was there.

Then the doctors that tried to report this wound up being put in prison, in jail. They came down with the virus, and then they died.

China has done this over and over again.

Then that virus spread around the world. This will be reported, I am sure, in history as the Chinese plague that they tried to hide and conceal like they did SARS and MERS.

As we look at this as a nation and we make trade agreements and we work with these countries around the world, we should look at whom we are trading with.

We have a standard that is known around the world. We have a rule of law honoring our contracts, and when we look to do business with people, we should do business with people we know, like, and trust, and I don't think those apply to China.

When you see the heavy hand of what China is doing, I just think, as a nation, with our trade agreements and with our businesses going over there, we all need to relook at what we are doing. If they will treat Hong Kong that way with those students over there and then the threat of taking over Taiwan and their goal of taking over the world, I think that is something we all need to look at and say: Do you know what? We need to diversify.

That is why we are kind of proud to talk about the manufacturing policy, the ABC method, anywhere but China. Go to Vietnam. Go to Indonesia. Go to anywhere but a country that wants to take us over.

I want to close on two things here. One is we had the students of Hong Kong who led the protests. They came to our office and they brought me this plaque. It says: ''Democracy Now. Stand With Hong Kong.'' They brought this plaque up, and as I have been able to travel around the world and I have seen how other countries look at America and they look at the ideals and the principles of this country, that is what they want.

It made me think that America is bigger than a Presidency. It is bigger than a Republican or a Democratic Party. It is those ideals, and it is those ideals that these students in Hong Kong who brought us this plaque are willing to take a chance and protest the Chinese Communist Party. They burned their flag and held up the American flag because that represents liberties and freedoms.

Taiwan is a different subject. Taiwan has never been part of the People's Republic of China, the Communist Party, nor will they ever be. They have their own borders. They have their own military, their own economy, their Western democracy, yet China wants to claim them as their own.

I think this is a wake-up call for China. If you have got a quarter of a population in a province who knows they are part of China, you can't do that to Taiwan because, when you look at the agreement we have with Taiwan, we have an agreement to make sure they have the equipment to protect themselves in a defensive manner.

I want to end with what we started with. When we looked at the students from Hong Kong, it made me think. I think we have all seen pictures of grass. It is green, tender, new shoots. They are very tender. If we were to compare that with pavement, this is hard road. This is asphalt.

If I were to ask you which one is tougher, which one is stronger, I think we would all say the asphalt is; right? But if we say this is freedom and liberty and this is repression from communism, which one is more powerful, liberties and freedoms will break through that force that is trying to suppress them.

That is what is going on in the world, and that is why China will never succeed long-term in what they are doing. That is why the people of Xinjiang, the Uighurs, will win, because they have the strength of a blade of grass that can grow through the asphalt.

I think I shared that the other day. These are the people who are standing up strong through that suppression. These are the people who have been there.

My heart goes out to those people because I can look back at our country when it was formed. We were under the suppression of another power, and we decided that we weren't going to live there because we are not designed that way as people.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and I want people to think when they go to buy something and it says ''Made in China,'' find a different source. Buy it somewhere else. Encourage your manufacturers, your Nikes, your basketball teams to go somewhere else. Don't go to a country that is doing virtually genocide today.

If we look back to World War II when Eisenhower went to Auschwitz and the concentration camps and they saw the death and destruction and he said, ''Never again,'' we as a nation have a responsibility to move everything that we can so that the Chinese Communist Party has to change their way.

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

AND STILL I RISE

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise, and still I rise. And I rise as a very proud American, proud of my country, proud to be a part of

this great Nation. I am also proud to be a liberated Democrat, unbought, unbossed, speak truth to power, speak truth about power, a liberated Democrat. And I rise tonight with a very special message at this time in the history of our country.

We find ourselves now in a state of fear. Unfortunately, too much of what we have based our response on to the novel coronavirus has been fear, not facts. We should act on facts, not fear. My hope is that after I say a few words tonight, I will at least cause some persons to rethink some of what they have already concluded.

I am a person who believes that there is a philosophy, an adage, if you will, of live and let live. This is not my philosophy, live and let live. It simply says: You go your way and live your life; I will go my way and live my life.

If this philosophy prevailed, I would not be in the Congress of the United States of America because a good many people did not embrace live and let live. Dr. King did not embrace it.

A good many people embrace a philosophy that I now embrace, and that is live and help live. It is because of other people who made great sacrifices that I am able to stand here in the well of the Congress of the United States of America. It was a live and help live philosophy that made it possible for me to be here. There were persons who lived and some who died so that I would have this opportunity.

I can bring Schwerner, Goodman, and Chaney to your attention. Schwerner and Goodman were not African Americans, by the way. They lost their lives in the cause of freedom along with Goodman, who was an African American. They were trying to help somebody. That was a live and help live philosophy.

There was John Shillady in Austin, Texas, an NAACP fieldworker, who was beaten by a mob. He was trying to help Black people.

In a sense, there is a debt that I owe, and whenever I have the opportunity, I try to repay it. So tonight, with our country in this state of fear, I would like to ask some things of people and share some thoughts.

The first thing that I want to address is what we expect from others.

We now expect others who are sick to stay home. If you are sick and you think that you have a virus and you are concerned, we want you to stay home. Of course, see your physician, get an opinion from your physician, but if you are ill and you may be contagious, we believe that you should stay home.

That is what we are saying to people across the length and breadth of the country. We believe that this is a patriotic thing to do, to stay home. Do what you can from home. Work from home.

Well, that can work for a lot of people. It can work for Members of Congress because we will be paid if we work from home. We will be paid, and we will be appreciated for staying home because we don't want to spread an illness from one person to another by being in the workplace. That works quite well for Members of Congress.

But what about the person who works for minimum wage? $7.25 an hour is still the minimum wage, the Federal minimum wage in this country. A good many places pay more than $7.25 an hour, but it is the Federal standard for the minimum wage.

$7.25 an hour, that is not a lot of money for most of the people who work here, but to a good many people it is the means by which they maintain their dignity and keep food, clothing, and shelter for themselves and others.

A good many of them are not in jobs that will pay them if they stay home. They are being patriotic Americans. They are doing what we are asking, but they won't get paid. They have to make a choice: Do they stay home and do that which we deem to be prudent and necessary, or do they come to work so that they will be able to put food on the table, so that they will have the shelter necessary to protect them from the environment? Will they have the necessary clothing so that they may continue to traverse through the elements?

But even at $7.25 an hour, there is another case to be made, because some workers make less than the minimum wage of $7.25 an hour. These are the persons who work and they receive tips. They make $2.13 an hour. We expect them to stay home if they are sick.

Many of them work in the food service industry. They will serve our food. We want them to stay home if they are ill because we don't want them to contaminate the food. But these persons who serve our food, $2.13 an hour, patriotic Americans, if they stay home and they are not paid, they have a choice: Do they stay home or do they come to work ill?

I say to the employers: Please give consideration to your minimum wage workers, $7.25 an hour. Perhaps it is $15 an hour. Give some consideration to them. And especially those who are working for $2.13 an hour. Give them some consideration. Help them through this time of crisis, because they are helping us through this time of crisis.

They are there for us by staying home. They are doing the patriotic thing. We should do the patriotic thing and give them some consideration.

I plan to support legislation, hopefully, that will emanate from this House that would give persons some amount of money.

□ 1845

I think that we are at a point in our history when people who are going to have to stay at home are going to have to be accorded some sort of emolument because we don't want them to come to work and contaminate others. We don't expect them to do that which we would deem to be unpatriotic, so we have to help them.

I heard a person this morning talk about $1,000 for persons who need help or $1,000 to persons in general, some amount. I am not sure what the exact amount should be, but I do know we have to give some consideration to persons who are working for minimum wages and especially persons who are working for $2.13 an hour, for tips.

There are those who contend that if you are working for $2.13 an hour, you will get a lot of money in those tips, and you will be able to do what some will say, that ''I did.'' That is not me saying the ''I,'' but I am now speaking the words of others. They will say: ''I was able to work my way through college on tips.'' Well, good for you. A good many others are not able to do such. A good many others are barely getting by on $2.13 an hour.

I talk to people when I eat at these various cafeterias, and I have spoken to people who work in cafeterias in Houston, Texas, who tell me that they have gone home and made not more than $2.13 for each of the hours. They didn't get any tips. There are days when they get no tips.

I would hope that they would get an abundance of tips, but the truth is, there are days when they do not. And they deserve some help because they are doing what we are asking when they stay at home. So, if they stay at home and don't come to work, I would hope that we would give them some consideration.

Live and help live. That is the philosophy I embrace. That is the philosophy that will cause an employer to conclude that he or she, or the company, should help people who we are asking to stay at home.

Live and help live, not live and let live: ''I am going to live my life. You stay at home. Sorry. Can't help you.''

No, let's help those persons who have to stay at home because they are ill and are wage earners. Live and help live.

Live and help live is a philosophy that I think we should embrace when we speak of persons who are of different ethnicities. More specifically, now, I am going to talk about persons of Asian ancestry.

I am standing here tonight to speak up on behalf of persons of Asian ancestry, and I am going to speak on their behalf as it relates to the novel coronavirus because ugly things are happening to persons of Asian ancestry.

I am here because I want to live and help live. I want to help them through this time of crisis when they are having to experience xenophobia and nativism.

I have here some examples of what persons of Asian ancestry are experiencing, and I am here to live and help them live. I believe that somebody helped me to get where I am, and I have a debt that I owe, that I pray that I will be able to repay.

Tonight, I would call to everybody's attention a person in New York, a

woman on a subway who was attacked by persons who said that she was diseased. They used a word that I would not use—the b-word is what it is called in this forum tonight—because she had on a face mask.

People have assumed that this is beneficial. It may not be. Many scientists—the persons who are supposed to know, the persons who deal with these things, who have studied these things—are saying to us that the mask doesn't help people, in general. It does help the persons who are aiding and assisting us, perhaps the physicians and nurses.

Be that as it may, if a person chooses to wear the mask and happens to be of Asian ancestry, that person ought not be attacked, that person ought not be spoken to in harsh language.

People have a right in this country to wear the type of face gear that they choose. If they choose to wear a mask, so be it.

We ought to respect people and not assume things and say things about them because of their ethnicity, because of their ancestry.

Another example, a person who is of the Hmong ancestry was checking in at a hotel and was told that Asians are not welcome. That is not a live-and-help-live philosophy. That is a form of nativism and xenophobia that is invidious, that is harmful to our society and harmful to this person trying to check into a hotel.

I remember a time in this country when there were certain places that I could not check into simply because of the hue of my skin. I was not allowed. There were signs that said: ''No coloreds allowed.'' Those were the polite signs. There were some that had words that I will not repeat.

But I remember this. And when I remember this, I relate to persons of Asian ancestry told that they can't come into a given business place simply because of who they are.

I am here because I believe in live and help live, and I want to help them through this time of crisis.

In California, a 16-year-old high school student was sent to the emergency room after being attacked by bullies who accused him of having the coronavirus simply because of his ethnicity.

I have been attacked in my life, chased because of my ethnicity. I reflect on this, and it causes me to understand the plight of this person.

I stand here tonight to speak up, to speak on behalf of people of Asian ancestry who are being assaulted, who are being accused, who are being denied simply because of who they are.

I have an indication that even just looking Asian has been enough to incite attackers, to hurl insults and accuse individuals of being disease carriers.

Friends, this is a time for us to band together and come together as a Nation. This is not a time for us to engage in this sort of phobia, this xenophobia, this nativism. This is not the time.

This disease is not something that is related to any ethnicity. It is not related to any party. It doesn't assault or attack Republicans or Democrats because they happen to be of a certain party. It doesn't matter what your gender is.

This disease attacks you because you are a human being and because you have been exposed to it in such a way as to allow it to enter your body.

We ought to see each other now as people of one race, the human race. We ought to see each other as people who we should help live.

We should embrace the philosophy of live and help live. Help the minimum wage worker. Help those who are not as fortunate as we are. Help those who may not be of the same hue as you. Help those who have been accused and attacked. This is a time for us to send a message that we won't tolerate it.

I am here because I believe that Asian Americans, those of Asian ancestry, should not have to defend themselves by themselves.

I think that it is important for persons who are not of Asian ancestry to send a message that we stand with them, and we stand against the Islamophobia that might ensue, the homophobia, all the various invidious phobias that can ensue from persons deciding that they are going to attack people because they are different.

I have moved on from the Asian ancestry now to persons who are different. In this country, we ought not attack people simply because they are different.

I believe that the differences that we have can make a difference in the culture, and it makes us richer for having these various differences. They are good for the country.

Please, let us send a message that we will not tolerate persons being assaulted because of who they are, that we will not tolerate persons being denied the opportunity to have access to various places within our society that we ordinarily would have access to simply because we happen to have the bill of fare. If we can pay our way in, pay for the hotel room, then I think we ought to allow people to have access.

More important than all of these, I think that it is important for us to treat each other with dignity and respect simply because we are people of the same creator. That creator, I believe, expects us to treat each other the same, regardless of our hues, regardless of our various differences.

This is an opportunity for us to pull together. I believe that this is a great adversity, but I also believe that it provides us a great opportunity to come together and stand up for each other.

Let us live and help live. Let us not live and let live, simply leave people to find their way as best they can.

Let's help people through life. I am here because somebody helped me, and I want to be there to help others.

I promise that I will do what I can to be of service to man, to humans, more specifically, to men and women in this society.

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

PUTTING ECONOMIC REPORTS IN CONTEXT

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, we try to come here every week to do sort of a combination of economic reports and what we believe is a solution to long-term debt.

Often, we sort of get a little, shall we say, technical, if not a bit geeky. But, tonight, I am going to try to do a little bit of that but also try to put it in context to where I think we are.

We in the Joint Economic Committee, and also even some of the staff from the Ways and Means Committee—and bless their souls for tolerating my questions. They have been very helpful, but there is still a lot of things we don't know. But I want to start off with encouragement.

About 20 minutes ago, I got off the phone with my father. My father is in his mid-eighties, still doing pretty darn well but still has some health issues.

How do you turn to a family member like that—he is blessed to live in Scottsdale, Arizona, which is just a beautiful, beautiful place—and say, ''Father, for the next few weeks, you may want to not go to the different activities,'' which I know he loves, the art shows, the art walks, and all of these other things that are activities in our community.

For the next few weeks, because of the things we are learning about the coronavirus, the populations that appear to be most at risk are those with a series of health issues. Do you have heart issues? Do you have diabetes? Do you have lung issues? Particularly, are you in your seventies or, in my father's case, mid-eighties?

Sort of the moral outreach I am going to ask everyone to think about is my call to him: ''Hey, we have family in the neighborhood. If we can convince you to maybe spend a little bit more time around the house and avoid crowds and some of your activities, we will be happy to make sure food and things are dropped off at the house. If you need your pharmaceuticals picked up, we will be happy to go out and do that. We will try to be good family and be supportive.''

Why don't we take that same concept, as both Democrats and Republicans, and say to the VFW, the Legion, my Knights of Columbus club, or some of the other things in our community: Are you reaching out to the seniors in your community?

□ 1900

Are you reaching out to those who may have certain health issues?

If they are making the decision to follow what our county and State health departments are suggesting, what the CDC, HHS, and the others are suggesting, that, if you are in those more statistically vulnerable populations, you are going to stay home, avoid the crowds, those things, at least for a few weeks, what do we as a community do? What do those organizations do to reach out to their friends and their members and let them know they are loved and let them know we care, but also provide a little bit of that human contact, even if it is through the phone, even if it is through FaceTime.

We were having the conversation of putting my little daughter a little more so he could FaceTime and have that contact with his granddaughter, but also picking up the food, the pharmaceuticals, and other things so that we don't create a situation where we take a vulnerable population and make them isolated from everyone else; so just a little moment of kindness, a little moment of thought.

If it is our grandparents or the friend from over at the VFW and they happen to be in those age brackets, they have what they call morbidity, comorbidities—and I always mispronounce that, so forgive me—what do we as a community do to try to actually reach out and be supportive and be helpful?

These are the sorts of things that those of us who are Members of Congress go to, all these briefings. We hear all the statistics. We are moving money around. We are trying to get the manufacturing and testing of all these things where they need to go. And a lot of good things are happening.

We know there are a lot of really smart people going as fast as they can, but now is the moment also for a lot of us in our communities to reach out and say: Look, the experts are saying, at least for the next few weeks, maybe the best thing is, if you are in that defined vulnerable population, stay home.

How do we, as their friends and neighbors, make sure that they are not feeling locked away and isolated, that they are still loved and they are still part of our community? It is also our moral obligation to reach out and help our neighbors, bringing things to their doorstep.

So, actually, what I am calling for—that is not Republican or Democrat; it is actually being human—is that idea of let's make that happen.

This evening I am going to do a telephone townhall in our district. That is actually going to be one of the themes. We have already been on the phone reaching out to a number of the veterans service organizations because we know, in a lot of their organizations, their mean ages are much, much older.

So how do we get the younger veterans now to actually be that contact with the world for those older veterans who may be choosing to isolate for a little bit?

Madam Speaker, math is math. We see the data that so many who are young seem to be doing just great. Someone like myself, I am a fairly severe asthmatic. I worry a little bit. But we are washing our hands, and we are taking the basic precautions you would take during any severe flu season.

We actually now have a little timer in our office, and every couple of hours, we are washing the doorknobs and doing things like that. It is a little compulsive, but it is the right thing to do.

So I just ask all of us, don't be macabre, don't be looking down. This is just part of life. But let's treat it like adults. Let's respect the professionals and their talents and the information they are providing us and let's work through this. Let's do the right things. But also, let's not isolate those populations we are being told are vulnerable.

On one hand, we are saying: You really should stay out of crowds, stay out of these things for a few weeks. We have the moral obligation to make them know they are still loved and cared for.

All right. A couple of things I do want to go through because we are trying to get our head around what is happening economically.

The fact of the matter is we just don't know yet. We don't have enough inbound data. I can give you some great data where we were a week ago. Has that changed? I promise you it has changed. But how much?

The good news is we went into this March actually surprisingly economically healthy. Do you remember last Friday, the jobs report number?

Now, remember, that jobs report number is looking back over the last month and working out particularly over the last week and the hires. But when you are gaining over 273,000 new jobs, Madam Speaker, that is pretty amazing, particularly where we were in the cycle.

Forgive me for reaching back here. I hope I am not breaking a protocol, but I actually subscribe to an app called GDP Now. It is the Atlanta Fed's calculator.

On March 6—that is the last update—they were at 3.1 percent GDP for this quarter. That is wonderful.

Do I think we are going to end up there? Probably not. But it at least lets you know there was something really, really positive happening in the economy.

When you start seeing numbers like this where we were hitting 3.5 percent unemployment—and I am going to touch on that just because I am fascinated with labor force participation and what that means to economic growth, but also what it means to the numbers of people in our community who are choosing to come back into the labor force, come back to work.

These are people who quit. There are fancy economic terms of the marginally detached, but from a societal standpoint and from an economic standpoint, when those who are not looking all of a sudden start popping up in the data as coming back into the labor force, these are wonderful things. We were clicking along pretty darn well.

When you start looking at this February jobs report, we, as all Americans, should have been really happy with the economic robustness and stability.

I am also going to show another board and demonstrate how we are also the engine that is basically saving the rest of the world economically. We are pulling the rest of the world along where, just a few years ago, 3 years ago, the rest of the world was actually moving up and they were sort of pulling us along. Now that is somewhat reversed.

You always have to put that in context, Madam Speaker, because it gives you a sense of how strong the last couple years have been economically, particularly for labor markets.

I have been behind this mike a dozen times showing the wage charts and the miracle that has really happened the last couple years for the working poor.

It is a certain societal cruelty we have had for the last couple decades of our brothers and sisters who didn't have particular skills or may not have finished high school, the really smart economists were functionally writing them off. They were going to be part of the permanent underclass.

In many ways, if you sort of step back, there is a level of cruelty in just taking any American and saying: You don't have certain things we think the economy is going to look for. We are writing you off.

One of the great miracles we have had in the last couple years is that population, that bottom 10 percent of income earners—we refer to them as the working poor because they often have very moderate to low to none in the way of skills—their wages have actually been going up the fastest, double the mean of everyone else.

So part of our theme is also growth is moral. You can see it in society in how many people who have had a pretty rough decade seem to have come back the last couple of years.

But now we are going to have to face the issues of what do the next couple months look like with the coronavirus, what sort of disruption, what do we do as a body to maximize economic stability, also be rational, and then get back to the pattern that actually was helping so many Americans start to have these opportunities.

Madam Speaker, hopefully, that doesn't become partisan. Hopefully, that is just math and smart people coming up with ways, because those policies actually affect people's lives. That is the decision whether you can buy that new vehicle or buy a house or some of these other opportunities out there.

This slide is one we have been working on as a concept. It is a little noisy,

and these are really hard types of charts to read and look at, but it is really important.

We had lots of smart people a couple years ago basically saying that, as we are getting older as a society, we are never getting back to those days of the mid-1960s and labor force participation. It is just not going to happen.

Then we started to break apart some of the numbers, and we found this really interesting thing out there: We have, functionally, millions of Americans who were not looking—they basically had quit in previous years—who suddenly are coming back into the labor force.

So this is a slide of the share of newly employed from outside the labor force. So these are folks we don't consider traditionally as, well, they are part of our unemployment statistics or they are part of the rolling—they are getting unemployment benefits, or they have been looking, or even outside the marginally attached population. These are, functionally, folks who were not even looking.

What is stunning is you can see the wild ride we have had. Post the 2008 recession, this population had just sort of detached. They were in the mid-fifties of looking at working, coming into the labor force. Today, this population is starting to approach the mid-seventies, and it has substantially happened in just the last couple of years.

I want to argue that is a combination of lots of complex things, and it is something we don't talk about enough. Because there has been wage growth, the value of their labor has gone up.

You may actually get some things that are uncomfortable to talk about, Madam Speaker, and the numbers are difficult, so it is still theoretical. Some things have happened with immigration that have also made their labor, possibly, more valuable.

The other thing also is that work has changed, where, if you or I went back 10 or 15 years ago for parts of this population, they are not picking up bags of concrete. Now their work has changed. Is that part of it?

We have these fancy economists who come in and walk through all these different reasons, and we are trying to get our head around it, but the one thing we know is that there is something good happening in our society.

How do we as policymakers, those of us on the more conservative side, our brothers and sisters who might be on the more liberal side, and some of the people in the middle who call themselves moderate, how do we actually come up with ways to keep these good things happening? How do you do that in a society right now where our politics are often so polarizing?

I want to argue we actually have a moral obligation to figure out things that are working, figure out what is making them work, and do more of it.

This is a slide I am just putting up because it rounds out a discussion we were having a couple of weeks ago about what is happening in the world.

If you see the blue, Madam Speaker, that is the G–7. That actually has the United States in it. If you look at the orange, that is actually the G–7 without the United States. So call it the G–6, I guess. The green is the United States.

If we go back to the numbers that were coming out in 2017, you see the rest of the world through economic growth was very similar to the United States. They were helping us; we were helping them. But you can also see the last couple years the United States' economic growth has dramatically surpassed the rest of the industrialized world, the big economies.

There is this push-pull concept in economic growth. In the last couple years, we are basically—if you look at the last two sections of the graph, you start to understand that we are the engine that functionally has been keeping much of the rest of the world afloat. You can also see the incredible spike in growth and the continued growth post-tax reform.

The fact of the matter is what we did in the U.S. tax reform and the economic growth that it brought did things for the entire world. It is in the charts. It is in the data.

The other thing I want to put up, and I try to put this up about once a month just because it is that continuing conversation that we often get lost in our rhetoric and we get a piece of rhetoric in our head, we get behind microphones, we say it over and over and then, later on, find out that the math actually doesn't match the rhetoric.

This is actually what we call tax receipts. Many of you will think of it as revenues, but the proper term from the IRS and those of us on the Ways and Means Committee is ''receipts.'' These are revenues as they are booked into Treasury. It is just really, really important to get your head around this.

In 2017, '18, and '19, even though we are post-tax reform and we had lots of really smart people—Members of Congress and economists—who were saying that this chart was going to crash this way, it didn't. As a matter of fact, if you look at this chart, those are the highest receipts in U.S. history.

□ 1915

So I beg of us—at some point those folks who will spend their time attacking the tax reform—I understand it is an election year—attempt to tell the truth about the math. And the ultimate test is: Are we getting the revenues in or not?

Now, the mix of the revenues has changed. Corporate taxes are down. Individual taxes are way up, particularly payroll, because more Americans are working. But that was the idea. And it wasn't just a Republican idea. If you actually go back during the Obama years, President Obama's economic team actually recommended much of the same thing in corporate taxes.

The difference is, it happened over here, so, therefore, it must be vilified, even though that is truly unfair. This has been an economic concept for years. We finally got it delivered, and it is working.

This is the chart that I will often get the most phone calls about, and it is getting a little dated. We need to update it. The chart is not adjusted with constant dollars. That means over the next 30 years—this is a 30-year chart—you would probably reduce the numbers by a third, and that just means adjusting the purchasing power of today's dollar for an inflated dollar in the future.

The chart is very, very simple, though. And it is one where I am trying to communicate the future debt—and it is overwhelming—that is coming is demographics. It is those of us who are baby boomers; we are getting older. We have earned benefits. We have earned Social Security. We have earned Medicare. We just have a small problem. We didn't set aside the actual cash.

So here is a simple thought experiment with this chart:

This is Social Security. This is Medicare. If we would pull those out, 30 years from now—actually now, it is like 28 years—we would have $23 trillion in the bank. But if we roll Social Security and Medicare back in, Social Security and Medicare's shortfall is $103 trillion at the end of that 30 years, meaning when you add these two together, you are functionally at an $80 trillion debt.

And what is really hard for this body to talk about is saying we have made promises, we are going to have to find a way to keep them. So every week we try to come here and say, ''there is a way to do that.'' But you have to be willing to engage in something that sometimes is disharmonious around here, and sometimes just a little complicated. Because let's face it, as a body, we have difficulty doing one major concept, and our argument is you need to do dozens of things, and we almost need to do all of them immediately.

And what is so frustrating and heartbreaking is almost all of these turn partisan. And the ones that are technology we will find a way to make partisan and they are all absolutely necessary to create the economic growth, to create the price disruption in healthcare. As you just saw, most of that $80 trillion debt at the end of that 30 years is Medicare.

I use this slide over and over, but we are trying to make an argument. A tax code, a regulatory code, an immigration code that maximizes economic expansion, incentives to be in the labor force.

And think about that. We right now still have a problem with millennial males coming into the labor force. We have had a miracle in the last 20 months of millennial females coming back in. They are coming in like crazy. We still have a problem with millennial men.

How about people who are older? Can you design incentives in the Social Security, Medicare, and other benefits to stay or come back into the labor force with their talents?

The other one is: Are we willing to actually unleash technology? And these are the presentations I have enjoyed the most. Just last week, I was here on the floor showing things, technology-wise, that could crash the price of healthcare. We actually brought in a slide a couple of weeks ago saying there was a major success in being able to put in T-cells that grew pancreatic cells, and those pancreatic cells in a mouse looked like they were growing insulin.

Now, when you go from a mouse experiment to humans, it is a decade. But the previous slide, you saw the math for Medicare—and Medicare is the key driver of U.S. debt in the future—30 percent of Medicare's debt is just diabetes. As a body, let's make sure the resources, the talents, the mechanisms, the encouragement, all the things we can do to create those disruptions is not a cure for something like diabetes because it is good policy. It is the moral, ethical thing to do, and it is also an amazing change in U.S. debt if you just cured diabetes.

Now diabetes, it turns out, is complicated. There are autoimmune issues. There are lifestyle issues. There is 1 and 2. It is complicated. But that is the way we need to be thinking around here if we are going to have an impact.

Well, it turns out in that same discussion of technology, a couple of years ago, I became fascinated with the concept of a universal flu vaccine. And the Gates Foundation, I believe, has moved $60 million there. I believe Congress, a couple of years ago, we started to move some lines of research money into that concept. Now, we are told it is complicated, but we may be a couple of years away from actually having a universal flu vaccine.

So think about the societal economic disruption we believe we are stepping into right now. Now, it is not going to last forever, but it will last for a little while. Just that technology of something like a universal flu vaccine may become the solution that this type of viral—this economic disruption, societal health disruption, never happens again.

My argument is, I think, fairly elegant. We need to do all these growth and cost and technology disruptions. And if we do them, I believe we can make an argument that the ability to keep promises—our promises for Social Security, our promises for Medicare—there is a path. It is just uncomfortable to talk about these things, because when you use the word ''disruption,'' that often means someone's business model, someone's current technology.

We have used the example dozens of time here on the floor: ''How many of you went to Blockbuster Video last weekend?'' Of course not. The technology changed. Now, you hit a button at home and you stream your entertainment.

We need to make sure that those types of disruptions are now happening in environment and healthcare technology, and who knows what else. We also see some of them even now coming in energy generation.

So there is a path. We don't have to be dour as we think about the future of the United States. It is actually incredibly optimistic. But to make the optimism a reality, this body needs to stop being dysfunctional. We cannot spend another year of our lives like we did last year, functionally accomplishing nothing of value. We are better than that. We know there is a path. We actually know the math. Now, let's just get our act together.

OUR IMMIGRATION ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I think one more time we have to address what I feel 10 years from today will be viewed as the most significant issue that our Congress has to deal with, and that is immigration.

Madam Speaker, I want to mention the issue one more time, because a couple of weeks ago, I again went to the Arizona border to see what is going on, and I have since talked to a leader of the union of the Border Patrol agents.

I say this is the most important issue because our immigrants are going to determine where America is or what America is like 10 or 20 years from now. Donald Trump has made a lot of progress on the border, but we have to remember all of this progress—or almost all of this progress—is solely caused by our President.

First of all, let's recount the progress. He has begun to build the wall. When I was down in Arizona, I saw 12 miles of the wall along the Arizona border. While it is possible to get over the wall, it is very difficult.

The wall is 30-feet high. It is very difficult, and people, I think, only in the best of physical shape can get 30 feet up. There is sometimes concertina wire at the top, which causes some people, at least in Nogales, to get stuck at the top, and it is very difficult to get back down. So that is some progress.

We also have made progress, and we have reached agreement with Mexico, saying ''if you are coming here for asylum, you have to be held on the Mexican side of the border pending a hearing.'' Not only does this cause people not to be able to come across immediately but discourages people from Central America or Africa or South America from coming here in the first place. Because prior to President Trump becoming President or reaching an agreement with the Mexican Government, people would come here, say they were seeking asylum, and they would be placed somewhere in the United States and never show up at the hearing anyway. Therefore, this is the way we have many people who are going to wind up living in America.

And the third thing President Trump has done, is he has put in a public charge rule covering people coming here legally, saying, ''we do not want you in this country if you are going to wind up taking advantage of our public benefits.'' It is not too strict of a law. He allows people to stay for 1 or 2 months, if they are on food stamps during that period of time—but, obviously, given that we can pick whoever we want around the world, we do not—our country right now, which is running a trillion-dollar deficit—want to take more people who are taking money out of this system rather than putting money in this system.

So the question is: What should Congress do now that we have kind of begun to take control of our borders?

The first thing we have to do is we have to permanently change our asylum laws so that in the future when people come here, we know we are dealing with people who genuinely have to seek asylum. We should not be taking—per President Trump—people who have to cross several countries to get here.

If you are in Venezuela, and you are genuinely at risk for your life, what would you do? You would move to Colombia. You would move to Panama. You would move to Costa Rica. You won't go through six or seven countries to get to the United States.

Secondly, we have to hire more people at the border. As we put up our wall, and as we hold people south of the border who are seeking asylum, more people will try to sneak in the country. As more people try to sneak in the country, it is more important that we have border patrol agents.

Over time, the drug cartels, which run the southern border, become more and more sophisticated. They have spotters along the border. And, quite frankly, they have equipment that is superior sometimes to the equipment our own Border Patrol has.

As long as we continue to allow this to happen, the cartels south of the border break up families. And they break up families by using minors, 16-, 15-, 14-year-olds to smuggle drugs across the border. They use these young people as spotters, knowing full well that if they are caught, they will not wind up in American jails but just turned around and sent back south of the border again.

Another thing that we have to look at is we should pass a bill, which I have introduced in the past, saying no public benefits for people who are not American citizens. Historically, in this country, when people come here, many return to their country of origin. The reason they return to their country of origin is they are not able to find work here.

We ought to across-the-board say, ''no public benefits for people who are

not citizens.'' As far as the few situations in which help is needed, that can always be handled by the many generous Americans who do feel these people should stay in the country, but it should not be a guaranteed right.

The next thing we have to do—as long as people are coming into our country—is get rid of the rule, which is the birthright citizenship rule. Among westernized countries, United States and Canada are the only two countries who allow someone to become a citizen if you are born in the country. There is a reason other nations don't do this.

We want to properly vet the new families that are coming here. If we say that anybody who has a child in the United States becomes a citizen, the parents will follow, and our new generations will not be picked by appropriately vetting the future immigrants. They will be picked by whoever happens to come here.

Our intent has never been that if you get a green card, that if you are here on a student visa—much less sneak into the country illegally—that your children become citizens.

I think it is important that we deal with these issues promptly. And I say that because we will go back to the days of 140,000 people being apprehended at the border if we have a President who doesn't go ahead with these three commonsense measures that President Trump has taken time to deal with.

I implore the press to report any progress on these issues, and to summarize again and again for the American public the progress that is made by President Trump and what would happen if President Trump would leave. It would result in a permanent change of America.

Again, we want immigrants. President Trump has increased the number of people being legally sworn in this country over the last few years, but we have to pick our immigrants. And if we do not pick our immigrants, we are going to wind up permanently changing an America in which we do not like.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2310

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SEWELL of Alabama) at 11 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FORTENBERRY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for March 9 and the balance of the week on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1822.—An act to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect to the availability of broadband services, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 12, 2020, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4113. A letter from the FPAC-BC, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Agricultural Disaster Assistance Programs [Docket No.: FSA-2019-0011] (RIN: 0560-AI50) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4114. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a letter requesting emergency funding in the Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund at HHS to continue supporting critical response and preparedness activities; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4115. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled ''Annual National Defense Stockpile Operations and Planning Report'', pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h-2(a); June 7, 1939, ch. 190, Sec. 11(a) (as amended by Public Law 103-35, Sec. 204(d)); (107 Stat. 103); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4116. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2nd Quarter FY 2020 Quarterly Briefing on Progress of the Chemical Demilitarization Program, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1521(j); Public Law 99-145, Sec. 1412 (as amended by Public Law 112-239, Sec. 1421(a)); (126 Stat. 204); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4117. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Health Promotion [Docket ID: DOD-2019-OS-0111] (RIN: 0790-AK25) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4118. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's policy statement — Responsible Business Conduct: Self-Assessing, Self-Reporting, Remediating, and Cooperating received March 6, 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.

4119. A letter from the Attorney and Federal Register Liaison, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Government Participation in the Automated Clearing House [FISCAL-2019-0001] (RIN: 1510-AB32) received March 6, 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.

4120. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Public Unit and Nonmember Shares (RIN: 3313-AF00) received March 10, 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.

4121. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Administrative Review of Agency Decisions (RIN: 1212-AB35) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4122. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4123. A letter from the Attorney, Regulatory Affairs Division, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's direct final rule — Revisions to Safety Standard for Portable Bed Rails [Docket No.: CPSC-2011-0019] received March 10, 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.

4124. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Additions to Listing of Exempt Chemical Mixtures [Docket No.: DEA-505F] (RIN: 1117-ZA05) received March 6, 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.

4125. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administrator, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Lasmiditan in Schedule V [Docket No.: DEA-558] received March 6, 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.

4126. A letter from the Associate Chief, Mobility Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communication's Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule — Expanding Flexible Use of the 3.7 to 4.2 GHz Band [GN Docket No.: 18-122] received March 6, 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.

4127. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Standards for Business Practices and Communication Protocols for Public Utilities [Docket No.: RM05-5-025; Docket No.: RM05-5-026; Docket No.: RM05-5-027; Order No.: 676-I] received March 10, 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.

4128. A letter from the Chair, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting the Board's report titled ''Filling the Gaps: The Critical Role of Underground Research Laboratories in the U.S. Department of Energy Geologic Disposal Research and Development Program; Report to the United States Congress and the Secretary of Energy'', pursuant to Public Law 100-203; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4129. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report certifying that the export of the listed items to the People's Republic of China is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778 note; Public Law 105-261, Sec. 1512 (as amended by Public Law 105-277, Sec. 146); (112 Stat. 2174); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4130. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627) and 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257); ; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4131. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4132. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4133. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a final report titled ''Earmark Review: DMPED Can Improve Grant Management'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 455(d); (87 Stat. 803); ; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4134. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Cost-of-Living Adjustments and Identity Verification received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4135. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2020 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Gray Triggerfish [Docket No.: 121004518-3398-01; RTID 0648-XS023] received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4136. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; IFQ Program; Modify Medical and Beneficiary Transfer Provisions [Docket No.: 200206-0048] (RIN: 0648-BJ07) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4137. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 180831813-9170-02] (RTID: 0648-XY070) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4138. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Blueline Tilefish Fishery; 2020 Specifications [Docket No.: 200212-0053] (RIN: 0648-XX037) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4139. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — SER, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Electronic Reporting for Federally Permitted Charter Vessels and Headboats in Atlantic Fisheries [Docket No.: 200127-0032] (RIN: 0648-BG75) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4140. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Southeast Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Framework Amendment 7 [Docket No.: 200211-0052] (RIN: 0648-BI83) received March 10, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4141. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the 2019 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and Judicial Business of the United States Courts, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 604(a)(4); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4142. A letter from the Senior Director, Government Affairs and Corporate Communications, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting other materials as required by 49 U.S.C. 24315(A)(2); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4143. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 116th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Education and Labor, and Natural Resources.

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 Ms. OMAR (for herself, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TRONE, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WILD, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ):

H.R. 6187. A bill to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to grant certain waivers under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to address school closures due to COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself and Mr. KIM):

H.R. 6188. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that military working dogs be retired in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 6189. A bill to limit employers from requiring employees to use vacation leave before using sick leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, House Administration, 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. GARCÍA of Illinois (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 6190. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require all-cargo aircraft to be equipped with cockpit doors that meet certain safety requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself and Mr. PALAZZO):

H.R. 6191. A bill to establish a regulatory system for sustainable offshore aquaculture in the United States exclusive economic zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. BARR (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 6192. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to honor the 100th anniversary of completion of coinage of the ''Morgan Dollar'' and the 100th anniversary of commencement of coinage of the ''Peace Dollar'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself and Mr. ALLRED):

H.R. 6193. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage to provide benefits under such plan or such coverage for a 30-day refill of prescription drugs to individuals who reside in emergency areas during emergency periods; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 6194. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to treat certain programs of education converted to distance learning by reason of emergencies and health-related situations in the same manner as programs

of education pursued at educational institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 6195. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to eligible local educational agencies to encourage female students to pursue studies and careers in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. ROBY):

H.R. 6196. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide for third-party submission of evidence relating to a trademark application, to establish expungement and ex parte proceedings relating to the validity of marks, to provide for a rebuttal presumption of irreparable harm in certain proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 6197. A bill to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 6198. A bill to provide emergency paid leave benefits to certain individuals affected by COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 6199. A bill to provide for emergency transfers for unemployment compensation administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 6200. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide certain food assistance for eligible children during periods when their schools are closed due to a public health emergency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 6201. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 6202. A bill to require States to adopt contingency plans to prevent the disruption of Federal elections from the COVID-19 virus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself and Mr. COMER):

H.R. 6203. A bill to provide for certain waivers of program requirements under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to appropriately address safety measures with respect to COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 6204. A bill to provide for recovery by individuals who were stationed, lived, or worked at Camp Lejeune, for certain actions of omissions by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 6205. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to provide adjustment assistance to certain workers adversely affected by disruptions in global supply chains from the Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELGADO (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 6206. A bill to provide that the President may provide additional Federal assistance for an emergency related to a public health emergency, including a pandemic or virus threat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

H.R. 6207. A bill to provide for unemployment benefits to workers affected by the 2019 Novel Coronavirus; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CROW, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 6208. A bill to direct the President to develop a strategy to protect the space assets of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and 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 Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 6209. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a program to allow qualified group practices to furnish certain items and services at qualified skilled nursing facilities to individuals entitled to benefits under part A and enrolled under part B of the Medicare program to reduce unnecessary hospitalizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. WEXTON):

H.R. 6210. A bill ensuring that goods made with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China do not enter the United States market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Financial 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. NORMAN (for himself and Mr. BUDD):

H.R. 6211. A bill to prohibit the consideration in the House of Representatives of any legislation containing an earmark; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 6212. A bill to provide for the continuation of Department of Veterans Affairs educational assistance benefits during emergency situations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. MCBATH, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. TRONE, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 6213. A bill to provide for coverage (without cost sharing or utilization management requirements) under group health plans and individual and group health insurance coverage of testing for COVID-19; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RESCHENTHALER:

H. Res. 896. A resolution reaffirming support of fundamental United States principles at the United Nations and encouraging the World Health Organization to embrace technological advancements in tobacco control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

165. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 38, urging the United States Congress and the President to provide funding and other incentives to states to promote hydrogen fuel cell vehicle usage; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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 Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 6187.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 To make all laws that shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 6188.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 6189.

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

Commerce Clause—Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 6190.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 6191.

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

Its commerce clause power under Art. I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 6192.

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

Article 1, Section 8. ''The Congress shall have the power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.''

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 6193.

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

Article I Section 8 Clause 10 provides Congress with the power ''to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 6194.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states ''[t]he 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.''

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 6195.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 6196.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the power ''[t]o regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.''

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 6197.

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

Commerce Clause Power Under Article 1 section 8, Clause 3 of the US Constitution

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 6198.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which gives Congress the power to provide for the general welfare of the United States, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 6199.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 6200.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and wit the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 6201.

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

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law . . . .''

In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:

''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .''

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 6202.

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

Article I, Section IV, Clause I

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 6203.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 6204.

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

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 6205.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DELGADO:

H.R. 6206.

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

Article I

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 6207.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 6208.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 6209.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, The Congress shall have the power . . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 6210.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, and Clause 18

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6211.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 6212.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 6213.

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

Article I Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 510: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 587: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 712: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 733: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 779: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 884: Ms. GABBARD and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 945: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1043: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1084: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 1174: Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 1572: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 1695: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 1713: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1776: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.

H.R. 1858: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 1943: Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 1948: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1953: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1975: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 1987: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 2061: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 2148: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 2350: Mr. BYRNE and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 2438: Ms. GARCIA of Texas and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2457: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2561: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 2571: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 2577: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 2701: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 2772: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2807: Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 2896: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2912: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 3138: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 3211: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 3219: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 3222: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3277: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 3378: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 3466: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H.R. 3657: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 3742: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3772: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 3796: Mr. GOODEN and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 4052: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4070: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 4104: Mr. COHEN, Ms. BASS, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4138: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 4141: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 4161: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 4189: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 4211: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 4236: Ms. PINGREE and Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 4278: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 4307: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 4341: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 4439: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 4527: Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 4684: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 4697: Mr. LYNCH, Ms. PORTER, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. WILD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 4707: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 4807: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 4931: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4932: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 4945: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana and Mr. ALLRED.

H.R. 5010: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5046: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 5067: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 5166: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 5170: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 5236: Mr. MULLIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TRONE, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. ROSE of New York.
H.R. 5243: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 5248: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 5269: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 5288: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 5293: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 5421: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 5434: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 5447: Mr. RICHMOND and Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 5491: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 5516: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 5548: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 5572: Mrs. HAYES, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. KIM, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. REED, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 5598: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 5602: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.R. 5610: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 5660: Mr. OLSON and Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 5701: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 5711: Mr. NUNES and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 5739: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. WILD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 5757: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 5797: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 5845: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5858: Mr. RIGGLEMAN and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 5859: Mrs. LESKO, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 5870: Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 5873: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 5875: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 5885: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 5887: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 5957: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 5983: Ms. WATERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 5995: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 6033: Mr. GOMEZ.
H.R. 6050: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 6065: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 6094: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 6100: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 6112: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 6115: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 6129: Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 6133: Mr. HAGEDORN.
H.R. 6139: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 6141: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 6144: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 6145: Mr. MAST, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 6150: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 6152: Mr. WRIGHT and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 6164: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 6165: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 6181: Ms. HAALAND, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. NORTON.
H.J. Res. 2: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. ADAMS.
H. Res. 224: Mr. WRIGHT.
H. Res. 285: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. COMER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. FOXX of North Carolina, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. STANTON, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. ALLRED.
H. Res. 373: Mr. PAPPAS.
H. Res. 374: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ROUDA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, and Mr. COX of California.
H. Res. 861: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H. Res. 882: Mr. COX of California.
H. Res. 886: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. WATKINS.
H. Res. 893: Ms. JAYAPAL.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFTIS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFTIS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

H.R. 6201, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. NEAL

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 6201 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 6201 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. PETERSON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agriculture in H.R. 6201 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and Labor in H.R. 6201 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 6201 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

89. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico, relative to Joint Resolution No. 126, urging the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation providing for a five (5)-year transition period to enforce the provisions of the Farm Bill through which the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2156) is applied to Puerto Rico banning any type of animal fighting venture, including cockfights; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2020 No. 47

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Arise, O Judge of the Earth, and bring healing and help to our Nation and world. We praise You that Your plans succeed and Your precepts are sure.

Lord, You know our thoughts before we think them. Encourage our lawmakers to do Your will. Give them the wisdom to totally depend upon Your unfailing love, remembering that unless You help them, they labor in vain.

Lord, when doubts fill their minds, provide them with the renewed hope in the ultimate triumph of Your purposes.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LOEFFLER). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute in morning business.

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

LITHUANIA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, 30 years ago today, the freely elected Parliament of Lithuania declared the restoration of that country's independence. Lithuania's brave actions began the breakup of the Soviet Union, something all freedom-loving Americans ought to be celebrating.

The modern Republic of Lithuania is 102 years old as of last month, and the United States has maintained continuous diplomatic relations with Lithuania since 1992—in other words, since the period of time that the Soviet Union had jurisdiction over it. In these last 30 years, since the return of freedom, we have seen the partnership between our two countries become stronger than ever.

Lithuania is a close U.S. ally, a beacon of Western values, and very much on the frontlines of freedom. I thank Lithuania for its friendship, for its important contributions to our North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance, and for its vocal defense of our shared values.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday President Trump visited the Capitol to discuss the ongoing efforts to fight the new coronavirus and its growing footprint here in the United States.

As Vice President PENCE, Dr. Anthony Fauci, and the other administration experts related in their briefing yesterday, we should expect a number of cases to continue to climb throughout our country. Fortunately, our Nation was rated the best prepared in the world for this kind of outbreak, and we are continuing to scale up our response every day.

My home State of Kentucky currently has eight confirmed cases. I applaud the efforts of State and local leaders who are working together with Federal officials to proceed carefully and intelligently.

Our public health experts are compiling the best guidance for individuals, families, businesses, schools, and healthcare professionals in one place, and www.coronavirus.gov is the place to go. I encourage every American to read through the information, particularly anyone whose personal circumstances make additional precautions a wise idea.

President Trump and Senators also discussed potential policies to soften the economic impact of the virus. Over the last 3 years, we have built a historically strong economy of American workers and middle-class families. We should take sensible steps to help that momentum continue, notwithstanding this new challenge.

I am glad the Secretary of the Treasury and the Speaker of the House are engaging in direct bipartisan talks on this subject. Congress has already provided billions in new funding to Federal, State, and local health leaders. I hope we can bring the same bipartisan energy to any steps that prove necessary to support our strong U.S. economy.

Now, it has been sad but not surprising to see some of President Trump's Democratic critics here in Washington fall back on the same old predictable partisan attacks, even at a time like this, but across the country, where leaders are working together on the frontlines, we have seen something different. I want to commend the Democratic Governor of California, who stated on Monday that he had been in close touch with the President and Vice President and appreciated their attention and support.

Here is what he said:

> He said everything I could have hoped for. . . . We had a very long conversation, and

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

Printed on recycled paper.

every single thing he said, they followed through on.

That is the Governor of California talking about the Republican President of the United States. He praised the administration's work on this and said: ''It starts at the top.''

So, clearly, this does not have to be a time for partisan bickering. The American people know that. The leaders around the country know that. I hope our Democratic colleagues here in Washington understand the American people expect us to be working together on this problem.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, now on another matter, yesterday, both the House and Senate were briefed by top intelligence community officials on the state of ongoing efforts to protect the security of American elections.

I was glad that so many Members took the chance to hear directly from the experts. This issue is very important, and it is bad for our democracy that some have sought to politicize it.

All of us should acknowledge the threat, and all of us should applaud the unprecedented step this administration has taken to protect against it. These significant efforts undertaken by the administration and funded by the Congress are actually working.

Since 2017, the hundreds of millions of dollars we have directed to help State and local election officials reinforce their systems have been finding their mark.

In all 50 States and across thousands of jurisdictions, new tools, more resources, and greater coordination have our Nation's defenses in a stronger place. This includes far greater coordination with the social media companies to combat foreign disinformation, as well as close collaboration between the Federal Government and State and local jurisdictions on protecting electoral infrastructure.

And to date, the intelligence community reports they have not seen any foreign interference that aims to change vote tallies or prevent Americans from voting. So the American people are absolutely right to have confidence in the integrity of our voting systems, and they actually do.

As I mentioned yesterday, one new survey has found that more than 70 percent—70 percent—of Americans are confident their State and local authorities will oversee a fair and accurate election this November. That is 70 percent of the American people who have confidence in the fairness of the elections this November.

As an aside, this is worth remembering as our Democratic colleagues try to claim that election security demands things like an unprecedented Washington power grab over the nuanced details of how States and localities conduct elections or addressing things like campaign finance. These are longtime leftwing goals that have basically nothing whatsoever to do with the actual threats now before us.

But the American people's confidence in the key institutions of our democracy does not mean they are complacent; they aren't. The same survey shows the American people understand full well that foreign adversaries like Russia want to divide our country and distort our discourse through disinformation.

The intelligence community confirms that as well. Our intelligence experts have publicly assessed that Russia and other adversaries will continue looking for ways to warp our public debate from overseas.

We all need to be aware that our adversaries seek to exploit the openness of our society to turn Americans against ourselves. Adversaries like Russia want to exacerbate social and political tensions in our country. They want to undermine our confidence in our own election and our democratic institutions. This is why I have stressed that politicians need to be careful not to take the bait. It is why the President signed an Executive order to enable sanctions against any person or any country that attempts to meddle in our elections. It is why this administration has created new procedures for promptly notifying campaigns that are targeted by foreign entities, unlike—unlike—how the Obama administration hid the ball back in 2016, and it is why the new, tough foreign policies of the last 3 years will continue to be essential.

Narrow, tailored solutions are important, but the best way for the United States to defend ourselves and our interests against any malign behavior is to possess unquestionable strength and make it perfectly clear we are not interested in being pushed around.

I have been a Russia hawk for more than 30 years. I am on record from the late years of the Clinton administration warning Democrats not to be naive about a new President-elect by the name of Vladimir Putin, so I applaud this administration's tough stance with Russia. And I am pleased that Democrats have stopped—stopped—mocking Republicans for being too tough on Russia and have come around to our point of view.

We have come a long way since the passivity and the failures of the Obama administration back in 2016, but the work is not finished, and Senators are fooling themselves if they think this is just about Russia.

We must stay vigilant—all of us; Federal leaders, State and local election officials, and every American citizen. Every one of us has a part to play in protecting our democracy.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO ''BORROWER DEFENSE INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY''—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S.J. Res. 56, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 56) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to ''Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability''.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, yesterday afternoon, South Dakota Governor Kristi Noem notified me that multiple residents of South Dakota have tested positive for the coronavirus. While this is obviously something we had hoped to avoid, we knew this was a possibility, and South Dakota has spent weeks preparing to deal with an outbreak.

Over the next few days, public health officials will be checking into where these individuals have been so that anyone with whom they came in contact can be notified. My staff and I are working closely with the Governor and her team, and I will continue to carefully monitor the situation.

At the Federal level, I am focused on making sure that State and local governments have the resources they need to deal with the virus. Last week, I was proud to support bipartisan legislation committing significant Federal resources to the coronavirus fight.

I am praying for all of the South Dakotans who are affected by the virus, and I want to thank the healthcare workers who are on the frontlines of this fight. We are lucky to have you.

S. 2657

Madam President, I am disappointed that the Senate failed to move forward on the American Energy Innovation Act this week. This is a bipartisan

piece of legislation that should have been able to advance in the Senate. It contains measures from more than 60 Senators, and 90 Senators voted last week to begin debate on the bill. I am disappointed that we couldn't maintain that bipartisan momentum and get this bill over the finish line.

The United States is in a pretty good position when it comes to energy right now. Our energy supply is abundant, and energy prices are generally affordable. But we are in this position for a reason—because we took steps to increase our domestic energy supply and lessen our dependence upon foreign oil.

We can't afford to become complacent. If we want to keep American energy affordable and abundant, we need to make sure that we stay on the cutting edge of energy innovation and continue to invest in our domestic energy supply, from oil and natural gas to renewable energy sources like hydropower and wind. We also need to make sure we stay on top of threats to our energy grid and our energy security.

The American Energy Innovation Act is designed to help maintain American strength in the energy sector. It invests in a wide range of clean energy technologies, from wind and solar to hydropower and geothermal. It focuses on improving research into carbon capture, and it directs the establishment of a research and development program to identify ways to use captured carbon.

The bill also invests in advanced nuclear energy research so that we can regain our edge in the use of this clean energy technology, and it focuses on improving energy storage. Many modern clean energy technologies are intermittent or lack the reliability of traditional electric sources. The amount of energy produced from wind, for example, is dependent on the amount of wind on any given day, so it must be backed up by a traditional plant, often powered by natural gas. Creating new ways to store clean energy will allow us to increase our reliance on renewable energy sources.

Another area that needs to be addressed when it comes to renewable energy is recycling. Solar panels, wind turbine blades, and electric car batteries are key components of clean energy production, but all of these components eventually reach the end of their life. Both solar panels and wind turbine blades eventually have to be replaced, and car batteries eventually lose their ability to hold a full charge.

The question becomes what to do with these components. Wind turbine blades can be well over 150 feet long and weigh somewhere around 15 tons. That takes a lot of room in a landfill. In the case of electric vehicle batteries, we are not just talking about filling up landfills. We are talking about potentially hazardous waste if lithium or other materials leak from the battery.

While recycling and reuse methods exist for clean energy components, much more work needs to be done to ensure that clean energy doesn't eventually result in massive buildups in landfills. Since roughly a quarter of the net electricity generated in my home State of South Dakota comes from wind, I am particularly interested in what it would take to recycle or reuse the blades from wind turbines on a large scale.

I am very pleased that my wind energy recycling amendment was included in the chairman's substitute amendment to the American Energy Innovation Act. My amendment would establish a competition to identify innovative uses for wind blades that have reached the end of their life, with a focus on uses that present the greatest potential for large-scale commercial deployment.

With an estimated 32,000 wind blades likely to be removed from U.S. wind turbines in the next 4 years, it is past time to get American innovators focused on this problem. I appreciate Chairman MURKOWSKI's interest in addressing this side of green energy and hope that we can continue this work.

In addition to clean energy and innovation, the American Energy Innovation Act focuses on boosting the security of our electric grid. It invests in cyber security and grid modernization and focuses on improving our domestic supply of some of the key elements and minerals that we rely on for manufacturing—everything from computer chips, to batteries, to defense applications.

Right now, we have to import too much of these critical minerals from countries like China. For the sake of our national security, it is important that we find ways to identify supplies of these minerals here at home.

Finally, the American Energy Innovation Act invests in workforce development. All of the innovative technologies in the world will not help us if we don't have the skilled workers to operate and maintain these technologies. We need to ensure that, while we are investing in innovation, we are also investing in the energy workforce of the future.

As I said, it is disappointing that the Senate wasn't able to move forward on this bipartisan legislation. I hope we will be able to continue discussing this bill and the Senate will take it up again in the near future.

The American Energy Innovation Act would promote clean energy development, help maintain a strong domestic energy supply, increase the security of our energy grid, and invest in American workers. We need to get this legislation across the finish line.

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.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the United States has more than 1,000 confirmed cases of COVID–19, the coronavirus. The actual number, however, could be much higher. We don't truly know how many cases of coronavirus there are in the United States because our testing regime has been entirely inadequate.

The CDC took weeks to develop testing kits that worked properly, and the Federal Government was far too slow in allowing hospitals, medical labs, and public health clinics to conduct tests on their own. The New York Times this morning has a story about how doctors and clinicians in Washington State were forced to wait a period of weeks for samples of the coronavirus and approval to test patients for the virus, even after they had suspected cases. The virus was spreading in the United States for weeks, without our knowledge, because we could not reliably test for it.

Even now, the administration has been laggard about making sure that testing kits are available to all who need them, and the United States is trailing countries around the world in our testing capacity. We, who were supposed to have the greatest public health system in the world, are lagging behind many countries, and it is a matter of life and death.

Last night, I spoke with the mayor of New Rochelle, NY, where multiple infections have been confirmed and where residents are now living under a 3-square-mile containment area. The mayor told me that despite the best efforts of the State of New York—and they are doing a good job—there are not enough coronavirus testing kits for the community. I asked him what his major problem was. He said: Lack of testing kits, lack of testing. I fear that what is happening in New Rochelle will happen in cities and towns across the country. It is virtually certain that a limited quarantine or containment area will be imposed on other cities, like they were in New Rochelle, and we need to make sure the mistakes that have plagued the whole testing regime is not repeated when other cities have to be under some limited quarantine. Those cities have to able to get the tests and resources they need, and New Rochelle still isn't getting them because of the Federal Government.

I honestly don't know why it has taken so long for the Trump administration to get a handle on testing, which is the most powerful tool in helping us respond to the spread of the virus. I honestly don't know why, after this issue with testing has been glaring and very public, the administration has still not announced anything resembling a coherent plan to fix the problem.

This morning, I am demanding that the Trump administration do five

things to improve the Nation's ability to test for the coronavirus in the United States:

One, expedite the approval of labs that are ready and willing to provide testing. Every lab that is able to provide testing should be up and running as soon as possible.

Two, provide daily updates on the volume of tests, both available and expected, and set up a special office or bureau within HHS dedicated to managing the acquisition and distribution tests. The conflicting reports and lack of information have left States unable to plan.

Three, support the use of automated testing to increase the speed and volume with which testing is conducted.

Four, ensure that patients who need tests face no out-of-pocket costs. The coverage requirements for testing are currently a patchwork of State executive orders and private company actions. We need Federal leadership. Hundreds of millions of Americans do not know if they can access affordable testing.

And, five, ensure that COVID–19, coronavirus, hotlines are fully staffed and responsive to patients and providers who have questions and concerns.

Our top priority at the moment is to confront the spread of this disease head-on. The first is making sure communities across the country have the testing capability and capacity that they need.

The public also needs clear guidance from the Federal Government regarding how to best avoid contracting this virus. It has been reported that Federal health officials recommended that older Americans refrain from air travel for this reason, but the White House overruled them. What exactly happened here? Were health officials overruled for political reasons? What is the truth? And what is the recommendation of our Federal health experts going forward, most importantly?

The coronavirus has also created turbulence in our economy and disrupted daily life for many Americans. As I have said before, by far, the best way to respond to any adverse effects on our economy is to deal with the coronavirus itself. You treat the disease, not the symptoms. But even as we focus primarily on combating the spread of COVID–19, we should consider relief to American families and workers who are impacted.

Later this morning, I will join Senators MURRAY, BROWN, DURBIN, WYDEN, CARDIN, and others to announce a series of measures that Senate Democrats believe we should take up to provide economic relief to working Americans during the coronavirus outbreak.

I will have more details at that time, at 11:30. But for now, I want to make one thing clear. When it comes to providing short-term economic relief, our priority should be the American people, not corporations.

That means targeted measures that give working families the flexibility and support they need during a medical emergency. That means money goes directly to the people and workers affected and who need help, not money tossed out of an airplane and hope that some lands on the people who need the help.

It does not mean bailing out the oil and gas industry, as the press reported was under consideration at the White House. It does not mean deregulating the banking industry, as another report said was a part of the discussion at the White House. It does not mean another corporate tax cut.

In the face of test shortages, growing cases, and lack of medical supplies, President Trump seems more interested in bailing out oil and gas companies and other big interests than in helping the families struggling to afford coronavirus treatment.

As the spread of coronavirus continues within our borders, Democrats remain committed—absolutely committed—to finding ways we can protect Americans most at risk by this disease. President Trump should work with us in Congress to make sure we continue managing this pandemic in a measured, responsible, and transparent manner.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3415

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, Senator ALEXANDER is here. Senator MURRAY will be joining us in a moment. They are the chair and ranking member of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, which has jurisdiction over this very important issue of sick leave with sick pay. Many companies do that in this country. We are the only wealthy country in the world that doesn't have a real policy. As Senator ALEXANDER says, we do this for Federal employees. It should be for more than those of us who are Federal employees.

Today, we need to get help to the people who need it now: parents whose children's schools are closed; people who aren't getting paid; people who have trouble making rent or making their mortgage payments or their student loan payments. Paid sick days are one of the most important ways we do that. That is why we need to pass this bill today.

Think about restaurant workers preparing our food. Think about what you do if your child's school closes down for a week. For so many people, taking a sick day means going without pay and potentially losing their jobs. Put yourself in their position. It is hard for us to do—we are lucky enough and privileged enough to have these jobs—and for most of our staff also. But think about a worker making $12 an hour. That worker has symptoms. She is the only working person in her family. She might think her illness is the coronavirus; nonetheless, her illness is debilitating enough that it is hard for her to go to work. She is making $12 an hour. She stays home and loses $100 that day. She has a $700-a-month rent payment or possibly lower than that if she is making $12 an hour. She has to make a decision: Do I go to work and potentially infect others but get my pay and maybe make myself sicker, or do I stay home to get well and give up that $100?

Then you think about some of those other workers. Someone might be a restaurant worker preparing our food. What do you do if your child's school closes down for a week, as schools—already Ohio State, Kent State, Case Western, and Baldwin Wallace have shut their doors. They have not really shut their doors; they are doing learning by distance, tele-learning. It means a number of people at those schools are in a very different situation with their employment.

Taking a sick day means going without pay. Taking a sick day may mean losing your job. It hurts everyone. If you are lucky enough to have paid time off—everybody is at risk when more people are out and about when they are sick.

Our office gets calls from workers all the time. Senator ALEXANDER has Tennesseans calling him. Senator MURRAY has Washingtonians calling her, asking: What do I do if I come down with something? I have to choose between going to work while I am sick or losing a paycheck or losing my job.

Because of our policy, we have put people in that situation or they are in that situation, and we have an obligation now to do something about it. It is unacceptable that millions of Americans are faced with that impossible choice.

That choice gets worse. I don't know how many people are faced with that choice today. We know it is millions. Tomorrow, it will be 1.2 times that, and the next day, it may be half again. We know this is getting worse before it gets better.

I am not an alarmist. I think we have some of the best health officials in the world. We have public health professionals who I think—the Governor of Ohio, a Republican, Mike DeWine, and I have talked a couple of times extensively. People in Ohio are doing this right.

We don't always get the leadership out of the White House we would like when we see the President saying something that is almost the opposite of our public health professionals. I tend to listen to the public health professionals. I know Senator ALEXANDER does too. I would be hopeful that the President does.

We know this impossible choice is getting more and more serious. Some corporations do the right thing, but

many are not doing the right thing. Some are promising they are going to do the right thing, but promises are not enough. We need to pass this bill now.

Our legislation would require all employers to allow workers to accrue 7 days of paid sick leave, and the bill would also provide an additional 14 days that would be available immediately in the event of any public health emergency like we have right now. This is a public health emergency. We need to do emergency kind of legislation. This is an unusual, extraordinary problem. We have to do something extraordinary here. Passing this bill allowing workers to accrue 7 days of paid sick leave and providing an additional 14 days available immediately in the event of any public health emergency is what we need to do.

Congress can't wait. People are choosing between going to work sick and missing a paycheck. They are making that choice every day. People in Memphis and Cleveland and people in Omaha and Dayton are making that choice every day—do I go to work sick, or do I stay home and miss that $120 I was going to earn this week?

We need to do this today. We need this bill to prevent the spread of coronavirus and stop this crisis from getting worse. It is about the dignity of work. It is about public safety.

I will wait for Senator MURRAY to make the UC request.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I also want to thank all of my colleagues who are coming down to speak about this today.

Families in my home State of Washington are scared. They are frustrated. They are angry. And so am I. New reporting now makes it clear that even after researchers in Seattle raised serious concerns about the possibility of community spread in Washington State and tried to work with Federal agencies to conduct testing, the administration didn't work with them to let the public know how serious the coronavirus was. You can be sure I am going to get to the bottom of this and make sure it will never happen again. I am furious that instead of acting with urgency, they did nothing; instead of acting with transparency, they kept quiet; instead of working to keep families safe, they wasted valuable time. And now in my State, 24 people have died. Over 1,000 across the country are confirmed to be infected, and experts are telling us that many more are likely to be ill.

I am hearing from people in my home State of Washington who are worried about their older relatives who are dying alone; worried about having to miss work and being unable to pay their rent; worried about how to keep their children safe at school and how to care for them and make sure they get a nutritious meal if their schools cancel. I am hearing from small business owners who are worried because no one is now coming through their door and they are unsure how to support the workers going forward. I am hearing from communities that are worried about how they protect people who are experiencing homelessness. I have seen a lot in my years as a Senator, but I am not exaggerating when I say this is one of the most trying times I have ever seen in my State experience.

I am absolutely going to be holding this administration accountable for missing so many opportunities to get ahead of this, but I am also going to be doing everything in my power to make sure we do not miss significant opportunities. We still have time to slow this down and manage it as best we can.

Our primary goal right now for people in my home State and across the country needs to be slowing the spread of the virus in areas where there are outbreaks so that areas where it has not hit so hard yet have the time to prepare. One of the best ways we can do this is by allowing workers who feel sick or who need to stay home with a child whose school is closed to do so without losing a paycheck or their job.

Workers and their families want to do the right things for themselves and for their communities, but for many of our workers—restaurant workers, truckdrivers, service industry workers—they may not have an option to take a day off without losing their pay or losing their job. That leaves them with the impossible choice between putting food on their table and paying the bills or the rent and protecting themselves and others. That is not a choice we should be asking anyone to make in the United States of America in the 21st century. Yet 32 million people in our country today—or about one out of every four private sector workers—are faced with this impossible choice every time they get sick. Right now, this choice has unique and potentially dire consequences.

I have been advocating for legislation to allow workers to earn paid sick days since 2004, along with my colleague Congressman ROSA DELAURO in the House. Time and again, we have been told no even though that simple step is critical, as we now see, for public health and gives workers the flexibility they need. In fact, we last introduced our bill in March of 2019, and here we are almost a year later to the day without the very policies in place that would have now helped millions of our workers and bolstered our resilience in the face of this exact kind of public healthcare crisis that paid sick days are intended to prevent and to mitigate.

We now have another opportunity to get this right. I am here to ask my colleagues to support our new emergency paid sick days legislation, which would ensure workers would have 14 days of paid sick leave immediately in response to public health emergencies like the one we face today in addition to allowing workers to gradually earn their 7 days of paid sick leave.

It would mean you would not lose a paycheck if, like so many parents in my home State of Washington and across the country are facing, your child's school has to close in the coming weeks because of this health outbreak. It would mean you would not lose a paycheck if your family member were quarantined and you needed to stay home to take care of him so that you would not spread the virus. Also, if you could not go to work because you were sick or your workplace were shut down, as we are seeing in so many places, you wouldn't lose pay. These are the real challenges people are now facing and will continue to face.

Our bill would help these workers immediately, the minute it becomes law. We have enough delay when it comes to paid sick days, so let's get this done. Let's keep working, as we need to do, on a comprehensive, coordinated response that focuses squarely on what our families and our workers and our small businesses need in the weeks and months ahead.

The Democrats on this side have a lot of ideas that we are laying out in response to this, including how to make sure these tests are affordable, that we support our most vulnerable communities, and that we reckon with the economic impact this crisis is having on our communities and Nation. There is a lot we need to do in the weeks and months ahead, but I urge us to start today with this simple, really important issue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 3415, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I will continue to work with the Senator from Washington State, as we always do, and on a comprehensive response to the this issue, the coronavirus. She and I have had four briefings, and we will have another one tomorrow. We have a history of being able to come to agreement on these matters.

The idea of there being paid sick leave is a good idea, but if Washington, DC, thinks it is a good idea, Washington, DC, should pay for it. When I

was the Governor of Tennessee, nothing used to make me more unhappy than when some well-meaning individual in the U.S. Senate or U.S. House would come up with a big idea, pass it, take credit for it, and send me the bill.

Employees are struggling, and so are employers struggling, but it is not a cure for the coronavirus to, in the middle of this matter, put a big, new, expensive Federal mandate on employers who are struggling. Paid sick leave is a good idea, and we do it in my office. The Federal Government now does it, and many businesses do it. Yet, if the Federal Government wants to require it, the Federal Government should pay for it.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do appreciate the fact that the Senator from Tennessee has been a great partner with me on many issues. I will keep talking to him about this.

Let me just say, without doing this, the cost to businesses is going to grow exponentially. We have already seen it on Wall Street, and we are seeing it in our communities. Because people are not getting paid, they are going to work and are spreading this virus. We are seeing the impact and will continue to see it in our communities as fewer people go to their stores or as fewer people go to their businesses.

We either do this now or we are going to continue to pay for it in the future. I am sorry it has been objected to today, because I think it is such a critical step with regard to this public health crisis we are having. We need to get this done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, as I watch up close and from afar Senator ALEXANDER's and Senator MURRAY's so often working together on issues like this, I absolutely believe Senator ALEXANDER when he says it is a good idea. Yet, as Senator MURRAY just said, there are all kinds of costs being imposed on businesses as a result of people who go to work sick. It is also more expensive for public hospitals and more expensive as more people get sick and what that means to Medicaid. These costs are impossible to quantify today with our not having a sick leave policy. A year from now, we will be able to look back on what the costs really were, and they will have been overwhelming. A solid, coherent sick leave policy—something modest like Senator MURRAY is calling for—could really make a difference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

REMEMBERING FELIX SPARKS

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I come to the floor to remember the life and service of a Colorado hero and to reflect on an upcoming anniversary of an event during World War II.

The hero's name is Felix Sparks—a name that may very well be familiar to the people of Colorado. Felix Sparks was born in Texas, though. We have a lot of Texans in Colorado, but this one made the right choice and stayed in Colorado. He was born in San Antonio, TX, in 1917, and he spent his childhood around Miami, AZ, where his family and father worked in a mining company. He was in high school during the Great Depression and was the eldest of five siblings.

Soon after graduating from high school, Felix decided to enlist in the U.S. Army. Upon completing his enlistment, Felix enrolled at the University of Arizona and completed the Citizens' Military Training program, which earned him a commission as a second lieutenant. Mr. Sparks then went on to pursue a pre-law degree. He had just finished his first semester of that effort when he was ordered to report for duty to the 157th Infantry Regiment in Colorado. He was ordered to report at the very beginning of World War II. That year was 1940—right before the United States officially entered World War II.

Neither Felix Sparks nor the American people knew it at the time, but World War II was about to change the history of the United States and the world forever. Felix would be on the frontlines of one of the most pivotal moments of World War II.

As a little bit of background on his work, along with the National Guard units from Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico, Colorado's 157th Infantry Regiment mobilized in support of the U.S. Army's 45th Infantry Division in Oklahoma, also known as the Thunderbird Division.

The division set sail for North Africa in June 1943 for its first mission—the invasion of Sicily. Over the next 511 days, Felix Sparks and his fellow soldiers in the Thunderbird Division would participate in so many well-known combat operations in Sicily, Naples-Foggia, Rome-Arno, Southern France, the Ardennes-Alsace, Rhineland, and Central Europe. It was an incredibly well-documented, decorated campaign. Yet, of these 511 days, Felix Sparks most often recounted one day in particular more than any other. That day was April 29, 1945.

On April 29, 1945, LTC Felix Sparks was the commander of the 3rd Battalion, 157th Infantry Regiment, and on that day, that April day, after so many days of fighting and after what they had already seen, the 157th Infantry Regiment, along with units of the 42nd Infantry Division and the 20th Armored Infantry Division, led the liberation of approximately 32,000 prisoners at the Dachau concentration camp. Although his unit had suffered thousands of casualties over the course of the war, what Lieutenant Colonel Sparks and his soldiers discovered at Dachau was beyond compare.

Felix Sparks described that day as one of the darkest days of his lifetime and, I can only imagine, one of the darkest days of lifetimes put together. Along with many of his fellow soldiers, he would spend the rest of his life reliving the horrors of what he witnessed at Dachau. As they neared the camp, the American forces discovered nearly 40 railroad cars that were filled with decomposing bodies. Felix Sparks said the ''stench of death was overpowering'' and that what he saw at the camp made Dante's Inferno seem ''pale compared to the real hell of Dachau.'' Inside the camp were even more bodies and more than 30,000 survivors—survivors of one of the darkest places in one of the darkest moments in world history.

We say we must never forget the horrors of the Holocaust, but Felix Sparks and the Americans who liberated Dachau didn't have a choice. They could never forget and will never forget.

Felix Sparks said:

> The men of the 45th Infantry Division were hardened combat veterans. [We had seen so many fights.] We had been in combat almost two years at that point. While we were accustomed to death, we were not able to comprehend the type of death that we encountered at Dachau.

There is no going back. There is no forgetting. There is no trying to erase from memory the horrors of Nazism and seeing it up close. The liberation of Dachau would be one of the Thunderbird Division's final missions during World War II. The division was officially deactivated on December 7, 1945—4 years after Pearl Harbor.

Following the end of the war, Felix Sparks attended the University of Colorado Law School in Boulder, CO—my alma mater. He graduated in 1947 and started a law practice in Delta, CO, while he also served as a district attorney. In 1956, Felix Sparks was appointed as the youngest ever—in Colorado's history—associate justice of the Colorado Supreme Court.

Then, in 1958, Felix accepted the role of director of the Colorado Water Conservation Board, where he was instrumental in the development of sustainable water policies for the State. For those not familiar with Colorado, this is an incredibly important position. We are a State whose history is written in water. Yet that wasn't enough for Felix Sparks. It was not all.

Felix Sparks wasn't just serving in his civilian life; he continued his military service as well. After returning home from World War II, Felix had joined the Colorado Army National Guard. He would go on to serve in and take command of the Colorado National Guard for nearly 30 years between the two—both service and commanding. He retired at the rank of brigadier general.

As both a civilian and a soldier, Felix Sparks truly exemplified servant leadership. His sense of duty to our Nation and to my home State lives on today, and I am proud to honor his legacy and life of service. Felix Sparks died on September 24, 2007, at the age of 90. He is buried in Wheat Ridge, CO.

Along with a number of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, I

will soon be introducing a resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the liberation of the Dachau concentration camp during World War II and to honor the service of Felix Sparks, as well as of the courageous personnel he fought alongside and of the brave men and women they saved along the way, and in memory of the tens of thousands who were brutally and savagely murdered by the Nazi regime.

We must never forget what happened. Unfortunately, far too many Americans and far too many people around the world may put aside these moments of our darkest time in history and forget or can't name a ghetto or a concentration camp today. That is something that we have to fix, that we have to correct, that we have to continue to speak of—the horrors that can never be repeated in the darkest times of our history.

I invite all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution. We already have the Senators from the States that participated in the Thunderbird Division so that we may remember the lives lost to the atrocities of the Holocaust and to World War II and remember the tens of thousands who were spared by the brave acts of our Nation's military. We must never forget. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution in one more showing to never forget.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to address the issue which will be before us at noon on the vote, but, preceding that, I would like to say a word on a different topic that certainly is on everybody's mind, and that is the coronavirus.

I was recently notified by my Governor, Governor Pritzker, that we have run into a shortage in our State of the test kits that are necessary. Some 330 Illinoisans have been tested to date, and these are people who, on physician's orders, should be tested because of exposure to coronavirus or because of the vulnerability of the patient and the suspicion that they may have been exposed to the virus.

The difficulty that we have run into is that the testing process apparently is coming to a stop. We are running out of the test kits, and there has been contact made with the Centers for Disease Control to determine why we are not getting responses on this need for additional kits in our State to test people who are truly vulnerable.

I don't believe our situation could be unique. I imagine other States are facing this same challenge.

I reached out to the Centers for Disease Control within the hour and had a lengthy conversation about the situation that we are facing.

Originally, the coronavirus test kits faced a shortage of reagents that were necessary to take the initial test. It turns out they are now facing a new challenge: It is an issue of the global supply of enzymes that are used by laboratories to analyze the test results. This is a commercially available enzyme that is now in short supply, and CDC is desperately looking for other commercial sources that are reliable that can come to the rescue.

The testing process, of course, is going to stop if the laboratories can't take the initial test results and test them to see whether they are positive or negative. They are looking for alternative ways at the CDC to meet this need. It is a critically important issue, and the lack of these enzymes limits the actual tests that can be taken across the United States.

The source at the CDC told me this situation is not unique to our country. It is a commercially produced product, and they are looking for other sources, either within the United States or without, as quickly as possible. This is a market-driven problem, and the CDC is looking across the market for sources to solve the problem.

For the time being, there is no relief in sight in Illinois or other places that have run into this same issue, where people desperately need to be tested to determine whether they are positive for this virus, and the testing, even if it takes place, cannot go through the laboratory approval.

The commercial supplies of this enzyme, apparently, are depleted at this moment. It is an urgent issue, as I mentioned repeatedly. They are looking for optional alternative platforms for this laboratory testing.

Now, I would say at this point I don't want to speculate on what that means. It is far beyond my personal expertise. But it is an indication of a desperate situation in many places. It is one that we need to respond to and quickly.

To argue that there are enough test kits that have been distributed is questionable to start with. But even if distributed and they cannot be analyzed, it really doesn't give us the information necessary to protect the Americans who may be vulnerable.

The bottom line is this. This administration is facing a challenge over test kits that still have many unanswered questions. How did other countries in the world—Korea and others—come up with test kits early on in volumes that were necessary to address this problem, and the United States did not? Why didn't we accept these test kits in other countries that apparently do come up with results that are needed and necessary?

I don't know those answers. Only time will provide them to us. But, in the meantime, we have appropriated all the funds and more asked for by the Trump administration to deal with this issue, on a bipartisan basis, and that is exactly what we should continue to do. But we need start-to-finish straight answers from everyone in the administration and outside about this public health threat.

Credibility is the first step toward dealing with a public health challenge such as the one we face today, and this test kit issue is clearly central to our bringing this situation under control—the sooner we get straight answers and good information and can respond to it quickly, the better for our Nation.

H.J. RES. 76

Mr. President, in just a few minutes, we will see a vote on the floor of the U.S. Senate that is fairly unique. There aren't many votes in this Chamber. This one, actually, is meaningful, because this issue before us on a vote at noon today relates to student borrowers who went to colleges—primarily, for-profit colleges and universities—and ended up attending those schools, going deeply into debt by borrowing money from the government to go to school, only to learn at a later stage that they were misled.

The schools didn't tell them the truth. The schools many times told them that if they took certain courses, there was a job waiting for them. In some cases they even told how much the jobs paid. They went on to say that the schools themselves had certain people on the faculty with certain qualifications, and it turned out that wasn't true. In addition, many students were told that the hours that they took at these for-profit schools could be transferred to other schools if they wanted to complete someplace else. It turns out that wasn't true either. These students were basically defrauded.

If you can understand the predicament, here is a student customer sitting at a desk in an office at a for-profit college or university being asked questions and being given information for the most important contract they will sign in their early lives. Many of these students incurred substantial student debt based on the representations and misrepresentations of these colleges and universities.

They find out now that the schools have gone bankrupt in some cases, and some schools that didn't go bankrupt ended up providing them with training and education completely inadequate for them to find a job. Here is the student deep in debt, having wasted years of their lives in these for-profit colleges and universities with nowhere to turn. Their lives are affected by it.

Who wouldn't be? Whether it is $20,000 or $50,000 or $100,000 in debt, it quickly adds up, and students find themselves literally in chains because of student debt and because of misrepresentations made by the schools.

You might say: What is the government going to do about it? We decided years ago exactly what we should do about it. We put in the Higher Education Act something called the borrower defense, and here is what it said.

If you went to a school and they lied to you, if they misrepresented what you were going to receive in your education, if they deceived you and defrauded you, and then you incurred a student debt because of it, you can go to the U.S. Department of Education under what is known as the borrower defense program and seek relief from some or all of your student debt.

This borrower defense program is not new. It has been around many years. But in the year 2014, it became a popular situation, sadly, because these for-profit schools were defrauding so many thousands of students. Over 200,000 students currently have a claim at the U.S. Department of Education that they were deceived by these for-profit schools, which are notorious for the representations and misrepresentations they make to these students.

These 200,000 students went to the Department of Education and said: Because there is statutory relief here, we are asking you, Secretary Betsy DeVos, to give us relief from this debt. We were students at these schools.

And she has refused. She has refused to take up their cases, refused to consider the merits of them, despite the fact that President Obama, before her and through the Department of Education, was actually using this program and this law to help the students.

To add insult to injury, Secretary DeVos said: Incidentally, we are going to change the standards at the Department of Education for students who feel that they have been defrauded and that the schools have misrepresented things to them.

How did she change the standards? She made it extremely difficult for these students to get any relief from the student debt from the schools that misrepresented them. Instead of the students' being able to rely, for example, on the fact that many States have investigated these schools and found fraudulent misconduct, she has established a new standard that each of the students has to prove that there was, in fact, an intentional defrauding of that student.

What does that mean? Each of these students has to lawyer up and each of these students has to have some investigative capacity to meet the new standard that has been established by Betsy DeVos at the Department of Education.

It turns out that these students are up in arms over it, and I am joining them. This measure on the floor would put an end to this new rule by Secretary DeVos and say that you have to treat students fairly when it comes to those who have been defrauded.

Yesterday, the Senate voted 55 to 41 on a bipartisan rollcall—fairly unusual, but a bipartisan rollcall—where 10 Republicans joined the Democrats to move the measure disapproving of this new rule by Secretary DeVos. I want to thank my Republican colleagues who stood up for these students and veterans.

We have veteran organizations coming to us saying: You can't do this. What happens is that we have military men and women who, when they are discharged from service, qualify for the GI bill. The GI bill pays for their college education, as it should, and I am proud that we do that. These very same schools not only take the GI benefits but then tell the students they have to turn around and borrow more money to finish what turns out to be an absolutely worthless education and training. The American Legion and many other veterans organizations are leading the charge with us to change this new Secretary Betsy DeVos standard. I thank them for that.

In 1992—that is how far back it goes—we put into law in the Higher Education Act this borrower defense so that students who were defrauded had somewhere to turn when it came to student debt they incurred. The schools misrepresented how many job placements would take place if they finished the courses. They misrepresented the earning potential of these jobs after graduation. They lied about the cost of attending these schools. They told the students their credits would transfer when, in fact, they did not. This kind of misrepresentation left these students to sign up for more student loans and go more deeply in debt because they were lied to. Those are just a few of the examples.

Congress rightly didn't want to leave the students to be left holding the bag for the misconduct of the schools. So it created in 1992 this statutory borrower defense. No one had ever heard of it until 2014, when Corinthian Colleges collapsed and the lid was blown off of other for-profit colleges and universities' fraud. We are talking about the University of Phoenix and DeVry and others. If you look, you will find them, and it is a long list. There are two numbers you need to know about the for-profit colleges and universities, and this will be on the final. One number is 8: 8 percent of all postsecondary students go to for-profit colleges and universities—8 percent. The other is 33: 33 percent of all federal student loan defaults are students from for-profit colleges and universities. For the very reasons that we come to the floor today, these schools are notorious for misrepresenting to students, overcharging them in tuition, and providing them with little or no education for the future. These schools take the money and run, and the students are left holding the bag with massive debts.

Corinthian is a good example. It collapsed in 2014. Thousands of students were the victims of Corinthian's misrepresentations. They inflated job placement rates, took out loans for students without their knowledge, and lied to the students about employers recognizing their degrees. Corinthian was not unique. Nearly every other major for-profit college has been the subject of multiple State and Federal investigations and lawsuits for similar predatory practices.

Since the year 2015, nearly 300,000 student borrowers—mostly from for-profit colleges—have applied to the Department of Education for this discharge, and it is not going to stop. These for-profit colleges are the coronavirus of higher education. The Department of Education estimates that nearly 200,000 borrowers will be subject to further illegal practices by their schools in 2021 alone. This new DeVos rule is going to make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for students to find relief. The best estimate is that 3 percent of the students who are defrauded by their school will get relief, and the other 97 percent will not under this new rule that we will have a chance to vote against this afternoon.

The rule by Secretary DeVos makes it almost impossible for future defrauded borrowers to receive the borrower defense discharge that Congress intended. It eliminates all group relief. Each of the students is supposed to lawyer up. To prove their claims under the rule, the borrowers must provide evidence that the school intended to deceive them, had knowledge of the deception, or acted with reckless disregard.

How many students fresh out of school are able to make that legal proof? In addition, borrowers under the DeVos rule are required to show financial harm above and beyond the fact that they took out the loans that now burden them later in life.

This is a situation where we can respond as a Congress and should on a bipartisan basis. The House has already passed this measure saying that we reject this new Secretary Betsy DeVos rule when it comes to this mistreatment of students who were defrauded and have a debt as a result of it.

One of my Senate colleagues whom I respect very much yesterday used a car analogy to defend Secretary DeVos' rule. He said:

> If your car is a lemon, you don't sue the bank; you sue the dealer. A college can be a lemon, just like a car can be.

That is what the Senator said. His point is that the students who were defrauded by the school, sold a lemon of an education, should go after the school and not the Department of Education—except that the DeVos rule allows the schools to prevent students from suing them. It eliminates a prohibition in current rules on the use of mandatory arbitration clauses and class actions.

Under the existing rule, students of Corinthian could have come together in a class action and ask for relief in a court of law directly from the school. Secretary DeVos eliminates that: Go on your own. Each one of you students stand up for yourself.

Is that fair? I don't think it is. It certainly isn't the kind of thing that we want to see in terms of justice for these students. The DeVos rule causes

the person who bought the lemon to be forced to sue the bank instead of the car dealer. You can't have it both ways.

It is not just me who believes that the DeVos rule is bad for student borrowers. A number of student, consumer, veteran, and other organizations are supporting this resolution to overturn the rule: the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, the NAACP, Third Way, Bipartisan Policy Center Action, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and 20 different State attorneys general. But the groups I want to highlight as I close in these final 2 or 3 minutes are the veterans organizations.

Many of the students who have been defrauded are veterans. These men and women have served our country in uniform, and after serving they seek an education to provide a better life for themselves and their families, and they deserve it. We have story after story after story of veterans who signed up at these for-profit colleges. They were told the GI education benefits were all they needed, only to waste the entire benefits on a worthless degree and be forced to take tens of thousands of dollars of student debt on top of it.

That is why our effort in this vote in just 2 minutes on the floor of the Senate—our effort to overturn this rule—is supported by the American Legion, the Student Veterans of America, the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, the National Military Families Association, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors, VetsFirst, Veterans for Common Sense, and Veterans Education Success.

James ''Bill'' Oxford is the national commander of the American Legion, and he wrote to me and said: ''Thousands of student veterans have been defrauded over the years—promised their credits would transfer when they wouldn't, given false or misleading job placement rates in marketing, promised one educational experience . . . but given something completely different.

He, the American Legion commander, calls the DeVos rule ''fundamentally rigged against defrauded borrowers'' and says that it ''flagrantly denies defrauded veterans [fair and timely] decisions [on their claims].''

How many speeches do each of us give as Senators about how much we value our military and veterans? We have a chance to prove it in just 1 minute, because there will be a roll call. Are you going to stand up for these veterans and these students and are you going to say to Secretary DeVos you are headed the wrong way?

These students and these veterans have been defrauded. Give them a fighting chance to rebuild their lives. Don't make it next to impossible.

I yield the floor.

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

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

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO BORROWER DEFENSE INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, the clerk will report H.J. Res. 76.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to ''Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution a third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to 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 pass?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

(Mr. LANKFORD assumed the Chair.)

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 70 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Portman
Bennet	Harris	Reed
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rosen
Booker	Hawley	Schatz
Brown	Heinrich	Schumer
Cantwell	Hirono	Shaheen
Capito	Jones	Sinema
Cardin	Kaine	Smith
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Sullivan
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	McSally	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	Young
Gardner	Peters	

NAYS—42

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hoeven	Romney
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Braun	Inhofe	Rubio
Burr	Johnson	Sasse
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lee	Shelby
Cramer	Loeffler	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	Moran	Toomey
Enzi	Paul	Wicker

NOT VOTING—5

Cruz	Murphy	Warren
Klobuchar	Sanders	

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) passed.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. Res. 56

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 439, S.J. Res. 56, be indefinitely postponed.

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the last several weeks, the world has watched closely as the coronavirus has spread from China to more than 100 countries around the world.

Since this rapid spread began—before cases were discovered in at least 35 States, including the District of Columbia—folks in my hometown of San Antonio were already providing top-notch care for Americans evacuated from Wuhan Province overseas with suspected exposure.

From the first evacuees from China to more than 120 passengers from the Diamond Princess cruise ship, to those who will soon arrive from the Grand Princess cruise ship, the dedicated healthcare professionals in San Antonio have been operating—have been hitting on all cylinders.

So far, Lackland Air Force Base has been used to quarantine 235 evacuees, with hundreds more to arrive in the coming days. I must say, they have done a good job of managing this rapidly evolving situation, but that is not to say there haven't been challenges.

A few weeks ago, I organized a meeting with officials from the city of San Antonio, including the mayor and two city council persons, as well as the Department of Health and Human Services and the Defense Department, to discuss the ongoing mission and any concerns the city might have. Anytime officials at every level of government

are working together—whether it is in response to a natural disaster or a public health emergency—coordination is key. You have to make sure everybody is operating on the same page and regularly sharing information—something that was a challenge in the beginning and remains a challenge today.

At one point, we were able to get everybody in the same room to discuss not only the response to the virus but the steps to be taken to protect the general public in the surrounding area. Of course, that work doesn't start and end at Lackland in San Antonio. Hospitals around the State are facing a great deal of pressure and uncertainty surrounding the virus and working to ensure that they are prepared to treat potential coronavirus patients without impacting their normal operations is an urgent concern.

Last week, I helped organize a conference call with the Texas Hospital Association and officials from Health and Human Services and the Texas Department of State Health Services to discuss some of the issues of concern to hospitals serving on the frontline all across our State. There have been a lot of news stories about the shortage of masks and personal protective equipment for healthcare workers and subsequent price gouging, and that is a big concern for these hospitals—many of which serve rural populations. As I told folks on that call, communication in these situations is critical. It seems so obvious, but it is not done unless you insist upon it. I was particularly glad to hear personally their concerns so we can make sure we are doing what is needed on our end in Washington, DC, to support them.

I appreciate Texas's incredible healthcare professionals who have been working to treat patients in their care and prevent the coronavirus from spreading to the general public. The city of San Antonio—I have to single out in particular—has been carrying the weight of the struggle for a number of weeks now, and it has come at quite a significant cost to city taxpayers. Fortunately, last week, the President signed an $8.3 billion funding bill to support our Nation's response to the coronavirus. It will send vital funding for treating and preventing the spread of the virus, including the purchase of masks and personal protective equipment, as well as supporting the development of a vaccine.

The funding bill will also include money for State and local communities, including San Antonio, which have been at the forefront of the battle at home. That makes $950 million available for reimbursement for the costs Texas and other States have incurred while monitoring and treating these individuals. It is a start in the process to repay San Antonio for the work they have done to help our Nation mitigate the impact of the coronavirus.

I appreciate Chairman SHELBY and Ranking Member LEAHY for including this reimbursement funding in the legislation and working so closely with all of us to get the relief on the way as soon as possible.

Over the last couple of days, we have witnessed the ripple effect the coronavirus threat has had on the markets, and the next big question on everyone's mind is how this virus will impact the economy. Yesterday we had the opportunity to discuss potential options with President Trump, Vice President PENCE, and Secretary Mnuchin, and we are continuing to work to identify the best path forward.

Unfortunately, there doesn't yet seem to be a bipartisan effort to try to reach a consensus—something we need. One of our Democratic colleagues suggested that the best way to prevent economic damage is to stop the spread of the virus. I can't argue with that logic, but unless that Senator knows something the rest of us don't know, that is not exactly a productive use of our time. We know we need to stop the virus, but we also need to deal with the economic fallout as well.

When we were in a position in 2014 with the Ebola crisis, we didn't hear a lot of griping about what President Obama was doing. We found ways to work with him for the betterment of our communities in the country. So I hope that at a time when we are confronting this threat, we can work together. That includes the Speaker and the minority leader here, all of us together to try to solve this problem. It is not a time to play politics. It is a time for us to work together in the Nation's interest.

Keeping the American people safe and healthy and keeping our economy strong should be a shared bipartisan goal. I hope our colleagues—all of our colleagues—will keep that in mind, just as we did when we worked with President Obama in 2014.

While the American people are rightly taking precautions to protect themselves and their loved ones, it is important to remember there is no reason to panic. Preparation, yes; panic, no.

The leaders at the Centers for Disease Control and the Department of Health and Human Services continue to remind all of us that the risk for the average American remains low, and the best defense against the virus is to use the same personal hygiene practices that our mother taught us when we were young. To help communicate what those practices are, as well as other information, my office has created a unique web page on my official website, cornyn.senate.gov. This will serve as a platform to provide information to all Texans who have questions about the virus and may be of interest to anybody who is concerned about what the government is doing to deal with the virus. If you are looking for information on how to prevent the spread of the virus, what Congress is doing to help, where you can find the latest number of cases in Texas, we have compiled all of the relevant links in one place.

I know I speak on behalf of all Texans when I thank the dedicated healthcare professionals around the State and around the Nation for providing the highest quality care for people who come down with the virus. I am grateful for everyone who is unified in this fight and who are working to stop the spread of the virus and, ultimately, develop a vaccine.

On one final note, let me say a word about my friend and colleague Senator CRUZ. Over the weekend, he announced he would self-quarantine after coming into contact with someone who was later determined to have the coronavirus. I want to thank him for having the courage to step forward and to do what any one of us should do if we are exposed to somebody with the coronavirus, if we know it: to monitor our health and make sure we don't spread it to others and to seek care from a healthcare professional should we begin to come down with worrisome symptoms.

His is a great reminder for all Americans to take this potential risk seriously and that we should all be joined together to do everything we can to keep our communities safe and healthy.

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

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

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my friend from Texas. I only heard part of them, but I appreciate his interest and what we need to do to deal with this coronavirus. I hear so often in this body that it is about the economic issues, which to be sure it is, as you know in Utah and Senator CORNYN knows. But when I hear the President's response on what to do—first, I know that people are angry in Ohio and I think elsewhere that the President has waited so long to act.

I know people are angry when they find out that the President made major cuts to the Centers for Disease Control, which the Presiding Officer knows is the best public health agency probably in the history of the world, combined with our public health departments at NIH and the FDA and National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health in Cincinnati—all of this incredible public health infrastructure safety net we have built in this country bipartisanly through decades and decades and decades.

I know people are unhappy when they learn about the President eliminating the position at the White House of the admiral physician who ran our effort to always be trying to anticipate a public health outbreak, a pandemic of sorts. I

don't know whether or not we are in one. I don't think we know that.

I am not an alarmist or panicky in any way, but I know people realize we had such a late start on this because of the President's actions over the last 3 years.

The issue is not to bail out more corporations. The issue is not to give money to the cruise ship companies, for gosh sakes, which is one part of the President's rhetoric tweet proposals. The cruise ship industry is almost exclusively foreign-owned. Why take tax dollars and shovel them into the cruise industry?

Instead of focusing on large corporations, which is something the President always does—I understand that is what he comes from, who he is, and who his supporters are—instead of focusing there, we should be focusing on individuals, and that means starting with a sick leave policy and sick days.

Think about how hard it is for all of us in this body—think about somebody making $12 an hour and living alone or living with a child or living with a spouse, whoever, making $12 an hour with no benefits and they get sick. They think, let's see, do I go to work—if I go to work sick, I may get worse, and I may infect my colleagues and other employees—or do I stay home and give up that $100 of a $12-an-hour job? I am paying $700 a month in rent. Can I give up that $100 or $200 or $300 over 2 or 3 days?

There are so many Americans who are sick who wrestle with that decision every single day. This is an opportunity. Senator MURRAY worked on a bill. I worked on this bill with her for a good while. I just spoke with Congresswoman DELAURO from Connecticut about working on legislation to provide emergency relief right now. We can do this today. I know the Presiding Officer has been open-minded about things like this. We can make this bipartisan. We can have immediate 14-day help as part of our package that we already voted on and then have a long-term, 7-day sick day policy where you earn those benefits. As you work, you earn that—up to 7-day sick day policy. Every other industrialized, wealthy country in the world has it. It makes safer, healthier workplaces and safer, healthier workers. It will mean good help and stronger families—all the kinds of things a sick day policy would mean to our country.

I am hopeful that rather than shovel money to corporations, we will spend that money on individuals, on people, on workers and their workplace. It could make all the difference in the world, not just in addressing this coronavirus public health crisis today but in preventing these kinds of crises in the future.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for me, Senator COLLINS, and Senator CASSIDY to have a colloquy.

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as most of my colleagues know, I hold a meeting in each of Iowa's 99 counties every year for Q&A with my constituents. Over the last couple of years, without fail, Iowans have brought up the skyrocketing prices of prescription drugs. People all over my State, including farmers, factory workers, and especially senior citizens, have raised the concern that pharmacy bills have been ballooning.

I will say, Iowans are always interested in hearing about solutions, and they are looking for solutions on this issue from Congress, but not a single one of these people who bring this issue up cares about the partisan politics of the issue. Iowans just want Congress to act. This is my 40th year of taking questions in our 99 counties—although, as of now, only 14. Rarely have I heard so much unanimity when it comes to this issue, but on prescription drug prices, it is unanimous. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike all want us to take action, and the data, both polling and otherwise, bears out our constituents' concerns.

As I highlighted last week, right here in this position on the Senate floor, a new study shows that pharmaceutical prices have increased 3½ times the rate of inflation in recent years. People are paying more than double what they paid in the year 2007 for drugs treating conditions from MS to diabetes and everything in between. The lack of transparency and the enormous subsidy incentives are driving these price hikes—perverse incentives that we have in law. If they were not intended to be perverse, they are incentives people have found out how to benefit from.

This is because the government's spigot is all the way open for the big pharmaceutical companies or—how we say it around here—Big Pharma. Of course, when this happens, taxpayers get ripped off. It happens because we pay a lot of money—I think about $138 billion—for Medicare and Medicaid. We pay at least that much. So, when you have 5- to 10-percent increases on January 1, you can see willy-nilly, on the judgment of Big Pharma, that taxpayers are paying a heck of a lot more.

I know all of my colleagues want to do something about this, and I know the administration wants to do something about it. In fact, let me say to the administration that I have been involved in this as the chairman of this committee since just a year ago January. The administration has given a major speech, and the Secretary of HHS has taken major action going way back to June of 2018. So we all know that our colleagues and our administration know that something needs to be done.

We are fortunate that, just yesterday, the White House published five principles that the administration can get behind for reducing prescription drug costs. Our legislation in the Senate fits the bill, or the principles, that were laid out in that op-ed piece. The Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act is the name of our legislation, and it addresses those principles. More importantly, it is the only option that can get 60 votes in the U.S. Senate.

Many Americans are reading about the coronavirus issue. It scares our constituents. We don't know what kind of drugs might come into the market to help treat the disease. Senator CASSIDY, who will soon speak, is an expert on that. He can address those issues for anybody who wants them addressed. Yet, if our bill becomes law, we know that folks who are on Medicare will not face sticker shock at the drugstore counter. Not only is that important in its being a comforting thought in the short term, as we face the coronavirus, but it is important in the long term, when we inevitably encounter another novel outbreak.

It took a long time to hammer out the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act. I thank Senator WYDEN for sticking it out with me and working in good faith for the benefit of all of our constituents so we could produce a bipartisan bill. His determination as well as the leadership of many of my colleagues, like Senators CASSIDY, COLLINS, and DAINES, have further improved the legislation. We have a bill. We have bipartisan support, and we have White House support. We also have the opportunity. The bottom line is, let's act.

I thank my colleagues for joining me in this effort.

I yield to my colleague Senator COLLINS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, first, I express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Finance, Senator GRASSLEY, not only for his leadership but also for his persistence on an issue that affects so many Americans, and that is the soaring price of prescription drugs.

Three committees—the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and the Committee on the Judiciary—have all advanced bipartisan legislation to reform our broken drug pricing system.

The Aging Committee, which I chair, has held eight drug pricing hearings which have highlighted the burden of soaring prices and the manipulation of the market by individuals like the infamous Martin Shkreli. It is now past time for us to move forward to the Senate floor to debate these bills that have

bipartisan support and that have garnered the approval of three major committees.

The Finance bill, which Senator GRASSLEY has crafted with Senator WYDEN and others and of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, makes crucial improvements to Medicare Part D, such as protecting seniors with an out-of-pocket spending cap as well as including cost control measures, such as an inflationary cap to limit pharmaceutical price hikes.

In one of the hearings that the Aging Committee held, it heard testimony that was heartbreaking from a former teacher with multiple myeloma who had to refinance her home in order to cover the cost of her $250,000 cancer medication. We heard example after example.

I will never forget my standing in the pharmacy line in Bangor, ME, where I live, and ahead of me was a couple who had just been told that the couple's copay was $111.

The husband turned to his wife and said: Honey, we just can't afford that.

They walked away—away from the medication that one of them needed.

I asked the pharmacist: How often does this happen?

He told me that it happens every day.

We have to take action. That experience led me to author legislation that became law that prohibited gag clauses that were preventing pharmacists from advising their patients, their customers, on whether or not there was a less expensive way to purchase their prescription drugs. I am proud to say that this legislation is now law, but there is much more that we need to do.

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, on which I serve, has incorporated more than 14 measures to increase price competition in its legislation on lowering healthcare costs. I know the Presiding Officer is a member of that committee as well. I am pleased to say that the bill includes major portions of the Biologic Patent Transparency Act, which is a bill that I authored with Senator TIM KAINE. It is intended to prevent drug manufacturers from gaming the patent system.

Now, patents are very important. They help to spur innovation, and that period of exclusivity encourages drug manufacturers to invest more into lifesaving drugs. Yet the fact is, when the patent has expired, generics should be allowed to come to the market and drive down the costs. According to former FDA Commissioner Scott Gottlieb, if all of the biosimilars—those are generics for biologic drugs—that had been approved by the FDA had been successfully marketed in our country in a timely fashion, Americans would have saved more than $4.5 billion in 2017.

A biosimilar version of HUMIRA, the world's best-selling drug, has been on the market in Europe for more than a year, while American patients must wait until 2023. We simply cannot allow this kind of abuse of the patent system to continue.

The Judiciary Committee has also advanced proposals to empower the Federal Trade Commission to take more aggressive action against anticompetitive behaviors. Last month, the FTC charged the infamous Martin Shkreli with an anticompetitive scheme of setting an increase of more than 4,000 percent overnight for the lifesaving drug DARAPRIM. That was the focus of an investigation on the Aging Committee that I led with former Senator Claire McCaskill. I applaud the FTC for taking action, and we simply must give them more authority and the resources to pursue these kinds of anticompetitive cases that drive up the cost of prescription drugs.

Finally, I hope that we have the opportunity to debate other worthy proposals, including one that Senator SHAHEEN and I have introduced to lower the skyrocketing price of insulin.

I want to commend the administration for today releasing a new plan to drive down the cost of insulin for Medicare beneficiaries. The fact is, between 2012 and 2016, the average price of insulin nearly doubled. According to the Health Care Cost Institute, the price of an average 40-day supply of insulin rose from $344 in 2012 to $666 in 2016. There is no justification for that. Insulin was isolated nearly 100 years ago, and while there are different varieties of insulin, it is still insulin.

As cochairs of the Senate Diabetes Caucus, Senator SHAHEEN and I have introduced legislation which creates a new pricing model for insulin, and our bill would hold pharmacy benefit managers, pharmaceutical companies, and insurers accountable for surging insulin prices by incentivizing reductions in list prices.

For the most popular insulins, this would result in as much as a 75-percent decrease in prices on average. Whether you are insured or you are paying out of pocket, you would benefit from that significant decline in the price if you need insulin to control your diabetes.

Congress has a tremendous opportunity to deliver a decisive victory in both lowering healthcare costs and in improving healthcare for the people in my State of Maine and throughout our country.

Let's not delay any longer. We must act on prescription drug legislation without further delay. We have three committees that have produced bills, and I believe this should be a priority for this Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I am going to speak about the drug affordability act, what people in Washington call the Grassley-Wyden bill.

I am renaming that bill. I am going to rename that bill to what I call the ''Making Coronavirus Medicines Affordable Act,'' and I want to address drug affordability from the perspective of coronavirus and address it from the perspective of a physician.

First, people ask: How is this different than regular flu? Ten thousand people die a year from flu. Why is this so different from that?

Well, again, as a physician, let me speak to that. Each of us, however old we are, have been exposed to flu, either by the flu vaccine or a flu infection, as many years as we have been alive. So when someone is exposed to the flu, they have a whole kind of armamentarium of antibodies. When the flu virus comes into your body, those antibodies mobilize, and it is not an exact fit to block the effects of the flu virus, but it is a pretty good fit. So for an infection which otherwise might cause problems, the effect is blunted and the symptoms are either absent or minimized.

As it turns out, the flu virus kills the very young, who have never before been exposed to the flu virus before, or the very old, whose immune systems are no longer working as well. Even though they have been previously exposed, their body is more vulnerable.

Now, as for coronavirus, nobody's body has ever seen that before. For everyone, this is a brand-new infection, and there is not a library book of immunologic responses that enable us to fight back against this virus. For all of us, if you will, it is a sucker punch to our health. We turn around, and, boom, it hits us.

Now, in terms of who it can kill, again, it seems to cause problems in newborns—the very young—but it also causes problems not just in the very old but in the older but not so very old.

In China we have learned that if someone is over 50 and they have an underlying medical condition, they are at increased risk. If you are over 60, you are at even more risk. So unlike influenza, where typically the person who dies would be 75 or 85 and in a nursing home, in terms of coronavirus, it might be somebody with high blood pressure or diabetes, heart disease, cancer, or a lung disease, who is otherwise living life, walking around the streets. They get hit with this virus, and, all of a sudden, they have a problem.

Now, we are going to find a cure. Sooner or later, we will come up with medicines that help somebody who is infected get well. The question is, Will those medicines be available to you? That is what we need to be concerned about.

So what does it mean? Well, first there have been reports that both because of the infection raging through China and a decision by India, it is possible that some of these drugs will not be available.

In China, they make the raw ingredients that are shipped to India, and they make the medicines. Well, China is not producing as many of the raw ingredients, and India has put an embargo on the export of some of those drugs to the United States.

At least of the drugs they have embargoed that I saw a list of recently, none of those medicines are medicines that we think might ultimately help fight coronavirus. So even though we have a problem with supply chain, so far there is no evidence it will impact the ability of a medication, whenever it is discovered, to be available here in the United States.

But there is another issue. Can the senior citizen who is most vulnerable afford the medicine?

Let me put this up.

Under the current structure of Medicare Part D, the senior citizen—the personal Medicare Part D—pays a certain amount of money until they go into the so-called catastrophic coverage phase. Now, pharmaceutical manufacturers and pharmacy benefit managers manipulate that list price to more quickly move the senior citizen into her catastrophic phase, and when she is in her catastrophic phase of our Medicare Part D benefit, she must pay 5 percent of whatever is the price of that drug. Even—imagine this—if that drug costs $1 million a year, she would have to pay 5 percent of it under the current structure of the Medicare Part D benefit.

I just posted a video on my Facebook page, and an oncology nurse, Kathy at East Jefferson General Hospital in New Orleans, was speaking about how this benefit design, where the senior has to pay 5 percent, no matter the cost, is so harmful in terms of her ability to get certain cancer drugs to cancer patients.

Now, imagine it is a coronavirus drug—a cure for coronavirus that we know is going to eventually be here, and it can be priced. You name the price; we are going to pay it. Or can we? Can someone afford 5 percent of $100,000 or 5 percent of $50,000? Is it imaginable that such a medication would be priced as such?

It is totally imaginable.

We need to enact what the chairman of the committee calls the Grassley-Wyden bill but which I call the ''Making Coronavirus Drugs Affordable Act.''

What we would do with this bill is change the Part D benefit so that when a senior pays up to a certain amount, period, it is stopped. She or he pays no more. And no matter how much that coronavirus drug is priced, she or he will not pay above a certain amount.

If they price it at $100,000, under current law you are paying 5 percent of that. Under this law, you would not. The out-of-pocket exposure, if you will, is capped. By the way, it also caps it for the taxpayer, which saves you and me as taxpayers—all of us as taxpayers—a heck of a lot of money as we attempt to balance the Federal budget and as we attempt to preserve the life of the Medicare Program.

So I will point out that we are going to have a cure for coronavirus sooner or later, but if a senior citizen or anyone cannot afford that cure, it is as if the cure had never been invented. We need both for the cure to be invented and we also need for it to be affordable. Otherwise, it would not be available.

By the way, somebody may tell you they are supporting another bill either in the House of Representatives or here in the Senate. This is the only bill out there which is bipartisan. This is the only bill out there which has a chance to pass. This is the only bill that can protect senior citizens, not only by being good policy but by being signed into law by the President of the United States. The President of the United States has signaled that he, indeed, would sign this law.

Now, the ''Making Coronavirus Drug Affordable Act'' does other things as well. It caps out-of-pocket expenses. It lets patients pay over time. If they know they are going to have a big amount in January, they don't have to pay it all in January. They can pay it a little bit in January, February, March, and all the way through the end of the year. It protects patients from price gouging, but it still preserves incentives for these cures to be invented.

As we look for a holistic response to the coronavirus infection, we must keep in mind that drugs have to be affordable. So I am asking all my fellow Senators to support the ''Making Coronavirus Drugs Affordable Act,'' also known as the Grassley-Wyden bill, and for Senator MCCONNELL to bring it to the floor.

With that, I introduce my colleague from Montana, STEVE DAINES, to continue this discussion.

Mr. DAINES. Senator CASSIDY, thank you—Dr. CASSIDY. It is a really good thing to have a physician serving on the floor of the U.S. Senate and your additional insight you have as a physician. Thank you.

Madam President, I am grateful for not only Senator CASSIDY's leadership but also Senator GRASSLEY's on this very important issue impacting millions of Montanans and Americans across our country.

I also want to thank my colleagues who spoke on this issue earlier today.

When I am back home in Montana, I hear the same concerns in virtually every corner of our State. Whether I am down in southeast Montana, in places like Ekalaka or Baker; or up in northeast Montana, in places like Westby and in places like Sidney and Plentywood; and if we go out to the northwest part of our State, to places like Eureka, Libby; or in southwest Montana, where I am from, in Bozeman, Belgrade, or anywhere you go, I am hearing that Montanans are concerned with the high cost of prescription drugs. That is why I have made it one of my top priorities in Congress and on the Senate Finance Committee to lower prescription drug costs for Montanans and for folks across the country.

Year after year, prescription drug out-of-pocket costs are reaching sky-high levels. They are impacting our seniors, our veterans, our families, and our working men and women. It is truly heart-wrenching to hear the stories of folks who are rationing or even skipping doses of daily medications because they can't afford the out-of-pocket costs. The American people are struggling under the burden of these out-of-control, high costs of prescription drugs, and they need relief.

That is why I am grateful to be working with Chairman GRASSLEY on the Finance Committee and my colleagues here today in a bipartisan fashion to lower costs, improve competition, and get our patients more bang for the buck. The complex drug pricing system has allowed Big Pharma and these pharmacy benefit managers—you may have seen the chart that Senator CASSIDY just laid out showing some of these complexities. These pharmacy benefit managers are the middle men responsible for negotiating drug prices, but in doing so, they take advantage of the secrecy of the pricing supply chain.

The bipartisan reforms we are fighting for and advocating for today would help fix the secrecy and save taxpayers more than $80 billion. These reforms will cap out-of-pocket costs in Medicare, providing our seniors with enhanced financial security. One of the great sources of anxiety for our seniors is financial security. When you think about it, their financial situation could be devastated with the out-of-pocket costs for a single prescription drug.

Our efforts would reform the payment incentives and ensure that Big Pharma and the pharmacy benefit managers have more skin in this game. These reforms are the product of over 1 year of bipartisan negotiations. Although this may not be what you hear on the news, bipartisan compromise is not dead. I am pleased to see my colleagues putting politics aside and doing what is right for this country. Lowering costs is more than just figures and numbers and spreadsheets. This is about keeping our families healthy without having to worry about how much it is going to cost or if they can even afford it. This is about getting relief for the retiree who has worked and saved their entire life only to see the dollars they earned go down the drain because of the high cost of prescription drugs.

President Trump is ready to sign prescription drug reform. He is committed to getting this done on behalf of the American people. He hears it when he travels around the country. With strong support from this administration, I am confident we can achieve some major reforms for the American people. Montanans and Americans across the country want to see reform, and that is why I am standing here today, fighting for it.

Let's move past the congressional gridlock and get this done. We had a good, strong, bipartisan vote out of the Senate Finance Committee, which will allow us to take a vote here on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Truly, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents

can deliver a historic victory for the American people, and I will continue working to get this bill on President Trump's desk.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Iowa.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, with spring approaching, the days are getting longer and temperatures are warming up. Many are hitting the gym, trying to get that summer bod before heading to the beach, including some turtles. That is right, your tax dollars actually paid for a study that put turtles on treadmills.

So here we have our turtles on a treadmill. To no one's surprise, it turns out that turtles are really, really slow. OK. That is what our tax dollars went to. In fact, this wasteful study found that turtles moved at nearly the same pace as dead turtles on a treadmill. Aren't you glad that Washington bureaucrats used your hard-earned dollars to conduct this study? Good grief, folks.

How many of your tax dollars went to this study, exactly? Well, folks, your guess is actually as good as mine because there is no legal obligation for most Federal agencies to publicly disclose the price of government projects, even though the American taxpayers are paying for them. Folks, this is your money—your money. Shouldn't you have a right to know how it is being spent?

It has been said before, and I surely believe it: Government functions best when it operates in the open. This is the basis of Sunshine Week, which begins this Sunday. Sunshine Week is celebrated every year in March to remind us of just how important it is to have government transparency, especially when it comes to how our tax dollars are being spent.

Transparency really is fundamental to the principles upon which our Nation was founded. The people have power to affect the decisions made by those of us who are elected leaders, and, in turn, Congress has the authority to hold accountable the millions of unelected Washington bureaucrats who ultimately write the rules and regulations that impact nearly every aspect of our lives and decide how our taxpayer dollars are spent.

This year, I have a couple of bright ideas to shine some light on how Washington is spending your money. Let's talk about those darn government boondoggles—those Federal projects that are billions of dollars over budget and years behind schedule. Frankly, we know nothing about them because the government agencies aren't required to report this information to you.

Well, I have a bill to help shed some light on these costly monstrosities. My Billion Dollar Boondoggle Act would require an annual report listing every single taxpayer-funded project that is $1 billion or more over budget or 5 years or more behind schedule. This will make it impossible for Washington bureaucrats to continue throwing our tax dollars into bottomless money pits without being noticed.

Unfortunately, it is not just the billions wasted on boondoggles being kept secret. It is the cost of the Federal projects. So I have proposed a bill that requires every project supported with Federal funds to include a pricetag with the amount that is paid by taxpayers. That way, when your money is being spent to put turtles on a treadmill—the ones I mentioned to you earlier—you, the taxpayer, can decide if the price is right.

Of course, the waste doesn't stop there. Did you know that Federal agencies spend over $1.4 billion every year on advertising and public relations? This includes—you will love this—more than a quarter of a million dollars for costumed mascots like Sammy Soil and Milkshake the cow—a quarter of a million dollars. There was nearly $10,000 to produce a zombie apocalypse survival guide. Yes, folks, I am not joking. And there was $30,000 for a martian New Year's Eve party and hundreds of thousands of dollars on tote bags, stress balls, fidget spinners, and other trinkets.

Well, folks, thankfully, the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee is voting today on my bill, which forces agencies to disclose exactly how much they are spending on all of these government gimmicks. Folks, it is time we bag the swag and end this unnecessary taxpayer-funded propaganda.

With our national debt now exceeding $23 trillion, there is literally no better time than Sunshine Week to start shedding more light on how Washington is managing or maybe, in this case, mismanaging your money. The only reason to keep taxpayers in the dark is that these spending decisions can't withstand the scrutiny. And, folks, that is exactly why sunlight is the best disinfectant.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, there are a lot of things going on right now in DC and a lot of moving targets. A lot of Americans are looking closely at what is happening with the COVID–19 virus. We are tracking what is happening overseas in Afghanistan and multiple other issues on the stock market, as well as what is happening with oil and gas right now.

We are spending a little bit of time, in the middle of all those things, to also say that we can't lose track of structural issues in government, to see if we can work on those issues that are, right now, in front of us, but we also have to look at long-term issues, to look at basic government transparency and basic accountability for government.

So I want to highlight—several of my colleagues are here, as well, highlighting some of the things that are actually on the floor or have moved recently or we think we can move on those. One of those things is the GREAT Act. This is a bipartisan bill that deals with basic transparency for grants.

If you go back 20 years ago, the Federal Government gave away very few grants. Now, $600 billion a year is just for grants. My colleague, JONI ERNST from Iowa, just highlighted some of those wasteful grants that are out there that, as we go through them, we say we can try to get those one at a time or we can try to get a system in place where all grants have to go through a centralized data system where we can actually all look at the data and compare it across the government to basically look for areas of inefficiency. That is what the GREAT Act does. It creates standard data elements so that we can look at how the money is being spent—America's money—so we can actually evaluate it. That has overwhelmingly already passed. We are grateful to get that done this year.

Another one we were able to get done this year that has passed the Senate but has not yet passed the House is providing accountability through transparency. Now, this may seem super simple, but let me just begin with the most basic principle. No small business owner in America gets up every day and reads the Federal Register. It just doesn't happen anywhere.

If you are running a small business, you are running your small business. You are not getting up every day and reading the Federal Register to see the latest regulation. Even if you did, with the pages and pages and pages of regulations there, you can't make sense of it. This basic providing of accountability through transparency asks a simple question: Can we force the agencies, when they actually do a new regulation, to condense it down to 100 words or less in plain English so that you can actually figure out what this regulation is trying to do, so when you see a regulation come out, you can actually understand it without having to hire an attorney to go interpret it for you?

That has overwhelmingly already passed the Senate, and we are waiting for that to pass the House, as well—basic simplification of some of the government entities, in trying to be able to help out.

We passed by a majority—and it has already been signed into law—the one dealing with representative payee fraud. Now, again, this was a simple piece that was just needed in government. We discovered that if someone is a trustee for a Federal retiree for their retirement account and, as a trustee, they stole the money out of that person's account, we couldn't actually enforce the law on them. We could in several other areas, if it was Social Security or if it was disability, but we couldn't on Federal retirees.

So we were able to get a bipartisan agreement to pass this to take care of

that. It was a very simple bill, but it is the way we need to react when we see a problem—to actually go to solve that problem rather than take forever to do it.

Speaking of ''forever'' to be able to solve it, what I think is the most basic government transparency piece we can put out there to force real dialogue on budget issues is a simple bill we have on shutdown prevention. If we can end government shutdowns, we can actually have more debate on budget issues here in this room, where it should occur, and take the pressure off of Federal workers and Federal families facing a shutdown and furloughs.

MAGGIE HASSAN and I have a very simple bill. The bill simply says: If we get to the end of the fiscal year and if we don't have all the issues resolved on our budget, we continue debating those things here. We remain in session 7 days a week until it is actually resolved. But in the meantime, Federal workers and their families are unaffected because the budget automatically continues at last year's budget level until we get things resolved here. But in the meantime, we can't go home until we actually solve that problem.

It is a straightforward solution to say: We are not going to have government shutdowns. We are not going to have chaos across the whole country. We have had 21 government shutdowns in 40 years. We have to stop that chaos.

So it stops that chaos, and it puts the pressure where the pressure needs to be—on us. When we finish our work, then we can move to the next thing. But if the budget work is not done, the most basic elements of those appropriations bills, if they are not finished, we remain in session 7 days a week until they are finished.

We need to find ways to be more efficient as a government. Government shutdowns waste money by the billions. ROB PORTMAN and his team did a remarkable study to look and see how much money was wasted in the last shutdown, and it was in the billions of dollars, and not even every agency turned in all their information to ROB PORTMAN and his team.

We can't keep losing money that way. We can't keep that chaos going for all the Federal workers and their families. We should have arguments about the budget. We have big ones that need to be resolved, but we should keep it here.

So, this week, as we pause for just a moment on all the other big issues that are pressing on us right now, I am grateful that we are also pausing for a moment to say: What are the big issues that we should look long term on, and how do we solve some of those issues for the future, as well, to make government more efficient and try to make government more transparent?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here to join my colleagues in speaking on the floor in advance of government Sunshine Week, but before I do that, let me commend my colleague from Oklahoma for his comments about the need for more transparency in government and particularly our grantmaking process.

We have made some progress on that—most recently, the DATA Act. His predecessor in Congress, Tom Coburn, worked on this issue, and we came up with legislation when I was on the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue at the Office of Management and Budget to put all grants and contracts online, which was a start. But the DATA Act takes that to the next level to make sure there is uniformity in government.

We still have difficulty with some agencies getting information out there, but he is absolutely right. It would make a difference because if people know how the money is being spent, it is much more likely to be spent wisely, all the way down to the ZIP Code in terms of where grants are going and what kind of Federal taxpayer dollars are being spent in our communities and whether it is being spent well.

Government shutdowns, of course—I couldn't agree more with my colleague—have not worked to help make our government more efficient. In fact, we always spend more after the fact.

Think about it. People were furloughed, and, then, when they went back to work, they got backpay. Well, it would have been much better had they been there to provide the services to the taxpayers.

You also just have a lot of dislocation that is unfair and people who have to go to work who are essential employees. Think of our TSA employees—for those of you who travel in airports—not getting paid. A lot of them had car payments or house payments they couldn't make during the last government shutdown. It is just unfair. So we have to get at that.

We have legislation that actually two-thirds of the Members of this side of the aisle have supported. Yet we have not been able to make that bipartisan. So I appreciate the fact that my colleague from Oklahoma has a bipartisan approach to that. We have tried for four or five Congresses now to pass legislation that simply says that at the end of the fiscal year, if you haven't completed all the bills, then the government continues to operate, but 1 percent of spending is cut every 120 days, and every 90 days thereafter to give the Appropriations Committees here the incentive to get to work and to get the budget bills done. That, I think, would work.

It used to be a bipartisan approach. It is not now. So I am interested in looking at other options, including what the Senator from Oklahoma was talking about in terms of providing more pressure on us here to get our work done because these shutdowns clearly haven't worked to help make the government more efficient. They have just had the opposite impact.

GOVERNMENT TRANSPARENCY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today there is a discussion about transparency. I am going to talk about one that is maybe going to surprise some people, but it is about the lack of transparency and about $150 billion a year that is taxpayer money that is put into research and development. It is money that we, as taxpayers, pay to places like the National Institutes of Health. The National Institutes of Health does great research. So the Federal dollars go in there to try to develop cures—as an example, for diseases, but also for other healthcare research. There is the National Science Foundation, which does a lot of research on technology and research, and the Department of Energy, which does a lot of the basic research on science in our country. So I am going to focus on that funding today and a specific problem we have right now. It is about ensuring the government remains accountable to taxpayers. It is about ensuring that hard-working American taxpayers know where their money is going, and it is about a specific issue of that money going to research that is then taken by other countries, particularly by China, and the need for us to address that issue, in part, through transparency and, in part, through actually some new criminal statutes to be able to ensure that there is accountability.

Last fall, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations did a study. It was about a yearlong study. We looked at this issue of China's talent recruitment programs and, more broadly, other countries, but, specifically, what China has been doing to find researchers over here in the United States whom they think are doing interesting work and recruiting those people to be able to provide that research and sometimes to have the person actually go to China to provide that research.

The issue we focused on in our report was this theft of intellectual property at research institutions and at our colleges and universities. It was a shocking report. We issued it late last year. It showed, as you probably know now from some of the press accounts that have arisen since then, that, in fact, China was recruiting individuals who were giving up their research that was taxpayer funded.

China has made no secret of its goal to surpass the United States to be the world leader in scientific research, but that doesn't mean they should use our research institutions here in America, paid for by us, to accomplish that goal. These talent recruitment programs—most notably, the Thousand Talents Program—recruits researchers at American universities and American research institutions to do the same research, usually at shadow labs in China, in order to just transfer taxpayer-funded research back to China.

This is an issue that has been going on for two decades, we found out, and

really kind of right under the nose of the FBI and others. The FBI testified at our hearing and said they readily acknowledge that they were asleep at the switch, essentially, that they had not been on top of it, and they have only recently begun to focus on it.

We have seen the results of that, by the way. Little was done to stop it, but, recently, there has been a lot of publicity. You probably know about the recent arrest of Dr. Charles Lieber at Harvard University. Dr. Lieber actually lied to Federal investigators about his participation in the plan, and that is what they have charged him with.

Most recently, today, we heard about another one, Dr. James Lewis at West Virginia University, who pleaded guilty to fraudulently requesting time off to raise a newborn, when he was actually in China conducting research as part of his agreement with this same group, the Thousand Talents Plan. Now, this is a definite conflict of interest.

As an example, Professor Lieber is accused of accepting $50,000 a month from the Chinese talent recruitment program and, also, $150,000 in funding just for his expenses—now, remember, he is already being paid by Harvard—but also accepting $1.5 million to set up a shadow lab in China. He did not tell his employer, Harvard, about this. Again, he was not honest when talking to the Federal prosecutors, which is how he came to be charged. So the fraud that he was committing was not the charge because that is not a criminal offense. It needs to be one.

With regard to the guy from West Virginia who just pleaded guilty yesterday, we don't know all the details yet there, but we know that this, again, is research that was being done, we assume partly funded by taxpayers, and this talent recruitment program was able to get that research.

So this can lead, obviously, to a real problem because it is helping to fuel not just the Chinese economy but also the Chinese military. Some of Professor Lieber's research, apparently, was done for our military, and, therefore, they got military research and, we assume, military secrets as well.

So they provide a reputational risk to the universities we are talking about, of course, and so many others around the country. But it is also just unfair to taxpayers, because this is government funded for the benefit of America, not to one of our stiffest global competitors.

So we are working with the Trump administration to ensure that we know where that taxpayer money is going and making sure it is going to benefit the United States of America.

Along with my counterpart on the subcommittee on the Democratic side of the aisle, TOM CARPER from Delaware, we plan to introduce bipartisan legislation that uses the key findings in our subcommittee report to ensure that our research enterprise is protected here in this country and also to ensure that it continues to be open and transparent and accountable but also secure. Our legislation does this in a few ways, and a lot of it has to do with more transparency.

First, it creates a new cross-government council at the Office of Management and Budget to coordinate and streamline the grant-making process between Federal agencies so we know where the money is going and how it is being used.

Right now, these agencies don't talk to each other, and we don't know much about the grant-making process. We need to make that transparent. Sunshine, I think, will be a very effective disinfectant here.

Second, the bill makes it illegal to not tell the truth on a grant application. Apparently, that happens all the time now. We requested some of these grant applications from the Thousand Talents Program. We weren't able to get all the information we wanted, but we got enough to know that most of these contracts, apparently, have the individuals saying: OK, I will accept this money from the Chinese Government through this program, but I will not tell my employer about it. On the grant application, they have to say that they will not reveal it. Obviously, that is defrauding the U.S. Government.

The third part of our legislation closes the loopholes exploited by China and other countries and empowers the U.S. State Department to deny visas to foreign researchers who seek to exploit the openness of our U.S. research enterprise to steal intellectual property and research from our universities and research institutions.

Now, this is something that the State Department has worked with us on and has asked for. They are looking for additional authority from us. When they know somebody is not here on a good-faith effort to do research but, rather, to take our research, they want to be able to act.

Fourth, it requires research institutions and universities to have basic safeguards against unauthorized access to sensitive technology. You would think that is already in place, but, apparently, it is not. Also, it requires them to tell the State Department what technologies a foreign researcher will have access to on campus, so, again, we can start talking to each other, including folks at the State Department, law enforcement folks, and people in our research institutions.

Fifth, it directs the U.S. Government to work with our critical research partners—think of Japan or Australia or the UK—to protect their research enterprises from Chinese theft as well. We are not interested in having U.S. taxpayer dollars go to do research here on which we then collaborate with a foreign government, an ally, and then that research is taken back to China or other countries. So we want more information about working with partners, as well, to protect that important research.

And, finally, it requires colleges and universities to report any gifts of $50,000 or more and empowers the Department of Education to fine universities that repeatedly fail to disclose these gifts. Current law requires reporting at the level of $250,000. So if you get $250,000 from a foreign entity, you are supposed to report it. In our study we found, shockingly, that 70 percent of U.S. universities consistently failed to do that. So the universities don't want to report the fact that they are getting money from foreign governments, but we need to know that. The taxpayers need to know that.

Lowering the threshold from $250,000 to $50,000 and increasing this transparency, including adding the penalty, ensures that those schools will report. In my view, that will lead to accountability and what we are looking for, which is more information.

Beyond these provisions, we are all going to have to do more to protect the U.S. research enterprise. My bill makes it clear that research institutions receiving taxpayer dollars have to do a better job giving the government just basic information about foreign researchers they partner with.

By the way, academics tend to agree. On Monday, the President of the American Council on Education in an op-ed agreed with our report's recommendation that research institutions should establish a ''know your collaborator'' culture—know whom you are collaborating with, know what their background is.

Providing basic information about researchers and what they will have access to on campus allows the State Department to properly vet foreign researchers before issuing them a visa. Frankly, it is hard to believe that universities aren't already required to tell the U.S. State Department this information, but they aren't.

A few universities and academic groups have raised concerns about the administrative burdens. We don't want to unnecessarily burden any research institution, university, or college, but we do want the transparency.

It is my hope that our research institutions will step up and do their part as patriots to help us ensure that our taxpayer-funded research does not fall into the wrong hands. Research universities need to take a hard look at what is happening on their own campuses. This threat is very real. If universities expect to continue to receive billions in taxpayer research dollars, Congress has to ensure the academic community is taking basic, commonsense steps to secure the research. I believe our legislation is a balanced way to ensure that will happen.

We talked earlier about the actions by college professors who have now been in the media. They have been charged by the FBI and others. One thing we do in this legislation, as well, is that we establish a new criminal law with regard to defrauding a university or defrauding the U.S. taxpayer.

Again, the reason these charges that we talked about earlier were able to be brought is not because of the fraud that was committed but because, in one case, someone lied about the reason they were looking for leave, and, in the other case, someone lied to the FBI about whether they were involved in the program or not. So these were perjury issues, really, not in terms of the fraud. Our legislation also tightens that up.

I think we all agree that the relationship we have with China is complicated. There is some good, and there is some bad. In my view, it is in both of our countries' interests to have a healthy relationship and have an exchange of new ideas and have the ability to collaborate where appropriate, but we cannot allow this continued theft of taxpayer-funded research.

My hope is that this legislation will send a firm but fair signal to China to change their behavior, respect our laws when it comes to research, and see the wisdom of our research values here in the United States of openness, transparency, reciprocity, integrity, and, most importantly, merit-based competition.

I encourage my colleagues to take a look at that legislation. We hope to introduce it the week after next, when we are back from recess. We believe that this legislation will be incredibly important to ensure that we can protect this research that taxpayer dollars are funding.

With that, 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. CRAMER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in offering support for improving the way our government runs. What we are doing is we are fighting for a government that is led in an open, transparent way by elected leaders—elected leaders—who are accountable to the people who elect us.

Reining in a bureaucracy that has run rampant has been a top priority of mine ever since coming to Congress. In fact, last year when I outlined my vision for serving in the Senate in my maiden speech, I vowed to take on the bureaucracy. Since coming to Washington, it has become abundantly clear to me that the bureaucracy has evolved into an unelected, unaccountable creature.

When constituents back home reach out to my office for help, there is a good chance it has to do with an intransigent, unresponsive, or even an aggressive—an aggressive—confrontational bureaucrat who has forgotten that a public servant is actually supposed to serve the public; that is, the public made up of people—people who elect officials.

In many cases, the Federal Government has codified the corruption, transforming from a group of civil servants carrying out our laws into a rogue body consumed with defending and in many cases expanding their power. This bureaucracy has turned internal guidance documents into infallible law, placing the creation and implementation of their policies and processes above the American people's needs—in fact, in many cases, changing the actual laws they are supposed to be enforcing. This is something I look to address at every given opportunity because it is a problem I discover in almost every issue we seek to solve.

I am going to start by talking a little bit about the Army Corps of Engineers. My efforts to take on this bureaucracy began almost immediately when I came to the Senate. President Trump, in fulfilling his promise to secure our border and keep America safe, declared a national emergency in order to expedite the construction of physical barriers along our southern border. Unfortunately, the agency charged with executing the building of this wall—that is, the Army Corps of Engineers—is not known for expediency or responsiveness.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Environment and Public Works Committee, both of which have direct jurisdiction over the Corps of Engineers, I exercised my congressional oversight responsibilities and role by conducting a study of the Army Corps' procurement process: how it awards contracts, how those companies have performed since being selected, what they are paid for in their bidding or RFP process. My findings, simply, were horrifying.

In a letter to President Trump, I detailed how the Corps' procurement process fails to foster competition—particularly when it comes to price and schedule—and disfavors new entrants and innovators into their process.

As I was conducting the investigation that led to these findings, I was met with bureaucratic obstruction at almost every step, from bad-faith promises, to empty vows of cooperation, to bureaucrats actually leaking my personal—my personal—emails to the media. Army Corps bureaucrats failed to meet even the most basic standards of good faith and cooperation in dealing with a Senator who sits on the committees that oversee them, as though their agency runs us instead of our having oversight over them. The correspondence they leaked was not even salacious or informative, really. It said nothing that I wasn't already saying out loud. But I think that was what bothered them the most, is that I was saying it out loud. This was a coordinated attempt to discourage me from continuing to dig into the bureaucracy. As I told them then, if you are counting on 99 out of 100 people to walk away exasperated because of your delays, consider me the other 1.

Such intimidation and such a breakdown in proper government action should be infuriating and horrifying to any civically minded person who believes in checks and balances and the ability to hold the bureaucracy accountable.

It is not my first encounter with bureaucratic overreach, with an executive agency dipping its foot into the water of activism. During my time in the House of Representatives under the previous administration, the conservation advocacy group Ducks Unlimited was providing staff to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Natural Resources Conservation Service, embedded right in their offices. This meant that taxpayer funds were supporting the work of advocacy staffers campaigning for a State ballot measure to establish a slush fund that would benefit their organization. The Federal Government was funding political activists while those activists worked to pass a measure that would give them further funding. If that is not corruption, then nothing is, whether or not it is intended. If not for our efforts to shine light on such obvious corruption, their abuse would have gone unchecked, and their power would have only grown.

Somehow, the issue with the Natural Resources Conservation Services is not the most obvious example of bureaucratic abuse that North Dakotans have experienced. Over the years, the Fish and Wildlife Service has increasingly encroached on the rights of landowners who have perpetual wetland easements on their property.

One particularly egregious case is the story of Mike Johansen, a farmer from Hope, ND. After a heavy rainfall year, the land flooded, leaving him unable to harvest and seed for the next planting season. He asked the Service for help, but due to poor guidance and enforcement, the Service offered him nothing. In fact, after he dug a drain, the Service cited him and dragged him to court. The legal fees and fines caused by these vague regulations written without clarity, oversight, or an appeals process forced Mike to quit farming, sell his equipment, and borrow money just to get the funds he needed to defend himself in court against his government. Thankfully, he won in court. He proved his case against the government. But the cost was bankruptcy—bankruptcy.

I had the privilege of hosting Interior Secretary Bernhardt so he could meet with Mike and North Dakota landowners who have experienced similar abuse. Since then, the Interior Department has begun issuing updated guidance to give our landowners clarity and a right to appeal overzealous bureaucratic action.

I appreciate the Secretary's timely action and his emphasis on being a better neighbor, but this will only be successful if Fish and Wildlife Service employees follow the spirit of the Secretary's actions to actually work with

landowners versus ruling over them. We are working closely with the Department to make sure these regulations work for our constituents, and I am hopeful this example concludes with a positive ending. But after every election, there is a new set of leaders.

Frankly, I have been appalled at the reaction the bureaucracy has had to the Trump administration's moving of the Bureau of Land Management from Washington, DC, to Grand Junction, CO, or a couple of USDA agencies moving from Washington, DC, to Kansas City, only so they can be closer to the resources they manage and the people they are supposed to be serving. The backlash has been incredible; the outcry, unbelievable. It is as though the bureaucracy is entitled to whatever they think is important as opposed to the people they work for being entitled to good service.

Sadly, there is one glaring example to me that is far from reaching a conclusion or a positive ending anytime soon, although I will never give up. I will never give up.

Over 50 years ago, during the Vietnam war, the USS *Frank E. Evans* battleship collided with an allied aircraft carrier and sank, killing 74 deployed sailors. The USS *Frank E. Evans* had served multiple tours off the Vietnam coast and was scheduled to return after completing this exercise about 100 miles outside of the official combat zone. They were exercising with other American ships, as well as other allied ships, during the Vietnam war. Because of a geographic technicality, the names of those ''Lost 74'' sailors are not memorialized on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial wall, as if they didn't die in the service of our Nation's effort in Vietnam. The honor and gratitude owed to them is long overdue, but the only objections I have ever heard—remember, this was just about 51 years ago now—the only objections I have ever heard are from the people whose job it would be to add their names to the wall. In other words, I can't find anybody who opposes adding the 74 names to the wall except the people whose job it would be to carry out this task. We are working on sending a man to Mars, but somehow it is too much to add 74 heroes' names to the Vietnam Memorial wall.

It is inexplicable to me that bureaucrats in Washington could determine that these sailors' ultimate sacrifice is unworthy of being memorialized simply because they were on the wrong side of an arbitrary line. The exclusion of these veterans is a disservice to those who gave their lives for our country. A technicality is not an excuse for inaction, a previously issued memo is not a reason to express disapproval, and an objection from Washington's bureaucracy should not stop us from honoring these heroes, these veterans.

Last year, a bipartisan group of Senators introduced a bill to force the bureaucracy to make this a reality. Yet it remains stuck here in the Senate. Let me repeat that. The bureaucracy's excuses have found welcoming ears here, and the bill remains stuck, with no explanation or reasoning. It has equal bipartisan support. Yet it remains stuck in the bureaucracy of this body.

If we do not see movement soon, I am going to return to the Senate floor to attempt to pass the bill by unanimous consent. I have spoken to the chairmen of the two committees of jurisdiction. They see no objection. Yet, somewhere in this big place, objection clearly exists.

I hope that between now and then, we are able to see real progress on this important issue. The people fighting to have these fallen soldiers memorialized are also heroes. They are their shipmates. They are the survivors, the spouses, and the children of these heroes. I am not going to join the bureaucracy by standing in the way, and I hope none of my colleagues do either.

These are just a few of the many examples of what I call bureaucratic abuse, obstruction, and overreach that I have witnessed since coming to Congress just 7 years ago, and I think we should call them out. The opinion of Federal career staff is not sacrosanct; it is advice. It is counsel, but it is not a decision.

Without further action, complacency will only empower the bureaucracy. People elected us to have their power, the people's power. So now is the time to remind this city who holds that constitutional responsibility and authority. The people hold it. Our constituents elected us, the President, and every elected official, but they have no say in the bureaucracy except through us. That is our job as elected officials—to give the people we work for their voice in the bureaucracy. We must dedicate ourselves to doing so, so that we can define this era as a time that we, the elected representatives, stood up to the bureaucracy and reclaimed the true power of the Federal Government for the people, not the bureaucracy.

With that, I yield my time.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise today for ''Time to Wake Up'' speech No. 258 and my increasingly battered chart here to urge colleagues in the Senate to wake up and see the looming danger we face from climate change.

Just look at the recent climate effects in our Southern Hemisphere. The most devastating wildfires anyone can remember have ripped across Australia, burned more than a fifth of Australia's forests, destroying thousands of homes, killing an estimated 1 billion animals, and making a day of breathing air in Sydney like smoking 37 cigarettes. In the ocean off Australia, there are new warnings that the Great Barrier Reef—a Wonder of the World visible from space—is doomed.

The warmest temperatures ever were recorded in Antarctica—a 70-degree day when the average February temperature would be 33 degrees.

Here is the Thwaites Glacier. Here on Antarctica's Thwaites Glacier, scientists drilled through 2,000 feet of ice, down to the ocean water below, and discovered water 2 degrees above freezing. With 70 degrees above and 2 degrees above, it is a melting sandwich. Losing that glacier would trigger almost 3 feet of sea level rise, and that glacier is going.

Sea level rise brings me to the crash warnings that are the subject of this speech, crash warnings that are flashing throughout the economy. Sea level rise connects to these crash warnings because some of these crash warnings revolve around sea level rise in its crashing coastal property values. Other warnings are of a crash in what economists call the carbon bubble.

I have a binder of these warnings that I put together, and I sent this binder to every Member of the Senate in February of 2019. Every Senator has all of the warnings that are compiled in that binder. I have a letter, too, that follows up on the warnings in that binder—just about the warnings that have emerged since February of 2019—in fact, mostly just from this year. I sent this letter to all of the members of the Senate Banking Committee because the economic crashes that are warned of are within the Senate Banking Committee's jurisdiction, and that committee has the responsibility to be the distant early warning system for the rest of us in the Senate about these warnings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, dated February 6, 2020.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, February 6, 2020.

Hon. MIKE CRAPO,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. SHERROD BROWN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CRAPO AND RANKING MEMBER BROWN: With the impeachment procedure behind us, we return to regular work, and I write to bring your attention to further financial warnings related to the climate crisis.

You will recall that I wrote to you on December 2, 2019 about climate-related warnings emanating from the financial and regulatory community. The two lead warnings were of a coastal property value crash (which Freddie Mac has warned could be worse than the 2008 mortgage meltdown), and a carbon asset bubble crash (described by U.K. financial regulator the Bank of England as a ''systemic risk''—meaning the crash could cascade beyond fossil fuel companies out into the global economy). A copy of that letter is attached for you as a reference.

The warnings continue.

The Bank for International Settlements, described sometimes as the bank of the central banks, has published a report, ''The Green Swan: Central banking and financial stability in the age of climate change.'' This report recognizes and reinforces the many previous warnings that ''[c]limate change could . . . be the cause of the next systemic financial crisis'' (p. 1), and that ''[c]entral banks, regulators and supervisors have increasingly recognised that climate change is a source of *major systemic financial risks*'' (p. 65, emphasis added), indeed that ''climate catastrophes are even more serious than most systemic financial crises.'' (p. 3)

The ''Green Swan'' report goes on to describe the stunning scale of these risks: that ''[e]xceeding climate tipping points could lead to *catastrophic and irreversible* impacts that would make quantifying financial damages impossible.'' (p. 1, emphasis added; in an odd coincidence, that language mirrors President Trump's 2009 warning in a *New York Times* ad that climate change consequences would be ''catastrophic and irreversible.'')

The ''Green Swan'' report warns that this risk is so extreme because the risk is dual, and so dangerous because it is so unpredictable: ''The complex chain reactions and cascade effects associated with both *physical and transition* risks could generate *fundamentally unpredictable* environmental, geopolitical, social and economic dynamics.'' (p. 3, emphasis added). Like the ''black swans'' from which this report derives its title, ''both physical and transition risks are characterised by deep uncertainty and nonlinearity, their chances of occurrence are not reflected in past data, and the *possibility of extreme values cannot be ruled out*.'' (p. 3, emphasis added).

The ''Green Swan'' report warns that this dangerously unpredictable risk can put our financial stability in danger, citing ''growing awareness'' that these ''physical and transition risks . . . would affect the stability of the financial sector.'' (p. 65); and could be irremediable by ordinary methods. The impact could be so great as to ''make quantifying financial damages impossible,'' (p. 1), the effects would be ''catastrophic and irreversible'' (p. 1), and these ''climate-related risks will remain largely unhedgeable as long as system-wide action is not undertaken.'' (p. 1)

In this looming, ominous cloud of danger and uncertainty, one thing is certain. ''[T]here is certainty about the need for ambitious actions despite prevailing uncertainty regarding the timing and nature of impacts of climate change.'' (p. 3) The report identifies ''an array of actions'': ''The most obvious ones are *the need for carbon pricing* and for systematic disclosure of climate-related risks by the private sector.'' (p. 2, emphasis added). To achieve this safe and certain path, the report calls urgently for an end to ''[t]he procrastination that has been the dominant modus operandi of many governments for quite a while.'' (p. 66) (As you know, I take the position that our procrastination in Congress has been acquired by the fossil fuel industry through its armada of front groups and dark money channels, which will make the procrastination all the more blameworthy when the full story emerges.)

The stem warning of the ''Green Swan'' report, and the certain path to safety from the hazard, are echoed in a recent open letter from BlackRock CEO Larry Fink.

In his letter to CEOs, Fink notes that ''[c]limate change has become a defining factor in companies' long-term prospects,'' and that as a result ''*we are on the edge of a fundamental reshaping of finance*'' (emphasis in original), one that is ''compelling investors to reassess core assumptions about modem finance.''

This extraordinary language is based, as in the ''Green Swan'' report, on the dual nature of the hazard, ''of how climate risk will impact both our physical world and the global system that finances economic growth.'' The conclusion is harsh: ''*In the near future—and sooner than most anticipate—there will be a significant reallocation of capital.*'' (emphasis in original) The phrase ''significant reallocation of capital'' couches in bland economic terms a dramatic and painful human prospect.

BlackRock also agrees on the safe path: that ''government must lead the way in this transition,'' and that ''the scale and scope of government action'' is ''one of the most important questions.'' In this regard, ''carbon pricing [is] *essential* to combating climate change.'' (emphasis added)

In addition to the BIS ''Green Swan'' report and the BlackRock letter, in the time since my last letter the following organizations have also brought similar warnings forward.

On December 18, 2019, the Bank of England published a discussion paper outlining its proposal for climate stress tests for corporations under its regulatory supervision.

In January 2020, the management consultancy McKinsey released a comprehensive report on the physical risks of climate change. McKinsey warns that climate change could ''make long-duration borrowing unavailable, impact insurance cost and availability, and reduce terminal values.'' It could ''trigger capital reallocation and asset repricing.'' On January 15, 2020, the World Economic Forum's Global Risks Report identified the top five most likely risks facing the world over the next 10 years, and all were climate-related risks.

A January 2020 report from the Stanford Graduate School of Business notes that ''the financial risks from climate change are systemic'' and ''singular in nature,'' and ''[g]lobal economic losses from climate change could reach $23 trillion—three or four times the scale of the 2008 financial crisis.''

Given the scope and scale of these warnings, and given that Senators depend on the Banking Committee as our official eyes and ears into such hazards, I hope that the Committee will rapidly hold searching and fair hearings about these danger warnings.

Sincerely,

SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the warnings are serious. They come from some of our foremost financial experts. So let's walk through what we have in store if we keep sleepwalking through the climate crisis.

As I said, warning No. 1: coastal property value crash.

Freddie Mac, not an environmental organization but a giant mortgage company, warned that rising sea levels will prompt a crash in coastal property values that will be worse than the housing crash that triggered the 2008 financial crisis.

First Street Foundation found that rising seas have already caused $16 billion in lost property values in coastal homes from Maine to Texas.

Moody's, the bond rating agency, warned that climate risk will trigger downgrades in coastal communities' bond ratings.

BlackRock—the biggest asset manager in the world—estimated that, by the end of the century, climate change will cause coastal communities annual losses that will average up to 15 percent of local GDP with the hardest hit communities, obviously, hit far worse. Hello, Florida.

Warning No. 2: a carbon asset bubble crash.

The Bank of England, the Bank of France, the Bank of Canada, and the European Central Bank—all backed by top-tier, peer-reviewed economic papers—all warn that fossil fuel assets are dramatically overvalued on fossil fuel companies' books, that these assets are actually uneconomic and will become stranded, and that the resulting ''carbon asset bubble'' crash will swamp the world economy.

How bad is it? It is called systemic financial risk. Systemic financial risk is finance speak for risk to the entire economic system. Do you remember the 2008 financial crisis? Bad home mortgages blew up more than mortgage companies; they caused a brutal economic recession, and millions of people lost their jobs, their homes, and their retirement savings. We are still recovering from that collapse. That is a systemic financial crisis, and the warnings are that this one will be worse.

In my recent letter, I looked at the more recent warnings. Here is the Bank for International Settlements' recent Green Swan report. The title is a reference to the metaphor of a black swan—an unpredictable event with calamitous consequences for the economy.

Below is what my letter to the Banking Committee quoted from this Green Swan report.

Page No. 1 warns: ''[c]limate change could . . . be the cause of the next systemic financial crisis.''

From page No. 65: ''Central banks, regulators and supervisors have increasingly recognized that climate change is a source of major systemic financial risks,'' and ''climate catastrophes are even more serious than most systemic financial crises.''

Again, from page No. 1: ''Exceeding climate tipping points could lead to catastrophic and irreversible impacts that would make quantifying financial damages impossible.''

Let's slow down and do that one again: ''Exceeding climate tipping points could lead to catastrophic and irreversible impacts that would make quantifying financial damages impossible.''

As a little aside here, it is an odd coincidence that the report's language of ''catastrophic and irreversible'' mirrors President Trump's warning in a New

York Times ad in 2009 that the consequences of climate change would be catastrophic and irreversible—the same words, ''catastrophic and irreversible.'' This was said by Trump in 2009 and was written in the Bank for International Settlements' Green Swan report just 2 months ago.

Back to the Green Swan report, on page No. 3: ''The complex chain reactions and cascad[ing] effects associated with both physical and transition risks could generate fundamentally unpredictable environmental, geopolitical, social and economic dynamics.''

Fundamentally unpredictable economic dynamics? Fundamentally unpredictable social dynamics?

Again, on page No. 1: ''climate-related risks will remain largely unhedgeable as long as system-wide action is not undertaken.''

Back to page No. 3 again: Like the black swans from which the report derives its title, the ''physical and transition risks are characterised by deep uncertainty and nonlinearity, their chances of occurrence are not reflected in past data, and the possibility of extreme values cannot be ruled out''—the possibility of extreme values.

Another big warning that I quoted in my letter to the Banking Committee came from BlackRock CEO Larry Fink. In his open letter to CEOs, Fink echoes the Green Swan warning, writing: ''[c]limate change has become a defining factor in companies' long-term prospects.'' As a result, ''we are on the edge of a fundamental reshaping of finance,'' one that is ''compelling investors to reassess core assumptions about modern finance.''

Folks, BlackRock is the biggest asset manager in the world. When its CEO speaks of a fundamental reshaping of modern finance and a shaking of its core assumptions, that is serious stuff.

In my letter, I cite other recent warnings of this systemic financial risk, all since I distributed the binder, many just this year. Here are a few instances.

In December, the Bank of England proposed climate stress tests for corporations under its regulatory supervision. We started bank financial stress tests after the 2008 mortgage crisis, and central banks are starting to do the same for the climate crisis.

In January, massive management consultant McKinsey—again, not a green group but, presumably, a pretty smart group—warned that climate change could ''make long-duration borrowing unavailable, impact insurance cost and availability, and reduce terminal values.'' Climate change could ''trigger capital reallocation and asset repricing,'' which is finance speak for the fundamental upheaval of our economy.

January: The World Economic Forum puts out its Global Risks Report that identifies the five most likely global risks facing the world over the next 10 years. Five for five, every single one of them was climate related—all five.

Finally, from the Stanford business school's Corporations and Society Initiative is a report that warns ''the financial risks from climate change are systemic''—there is that word again, ''systemic''—that these risks are ''singular in nature,'' like the green swan-black swan warning, and that ''[g]lobal economic losses from climate change could reach $23 trillion—three or four times the scale of the 2008 Financial Crisis.''

Pause for a moment, and recall the agony of the 2008 financial crisis. Losses in the stock market wiped out nearly $8 trillion. Housing values cratered; retirement savings vanished; and Americans lost jobs, lost homes, and lost nearly $10 trillion in wealth. Global economic growth went negative. We all went home to States where we witnessed extraordinary human suffering. Three or four times that? The Stanford report is telling us that we are courting financial peril—systemic risk—the likes of which we cannot imagine.

Climate change is a natural force. It has blown carbon dioxide levels way outside what humankind has ever experienced. It is depositing the equivalent of four Hiroshima-sized atomic bombs of excess heat per second into our oceans—per second—and it is an economic bomb positioned beneath our economy, its detonator ticking down steadily.

We have a chance to defuse the bomb. With all of these warnings that I have described in this binder and that I have described in my letter to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs comes a clear description of the solution: Government must act. Here are the solutions that I quote in my letter to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

On page No. 66 of Green Swan: End ''[t]he procrastination that has been the dominant modus operandi of many governments for quite a while.''

By the way, here, it really hasn't been procrastination; it has been obstruction. It has been obstruction by the fossil fuel industry, its money, and its minions. Clearly, we haven't done anything serious about it, so that has to end.

On page No. 2 of the Green Swan: ''The most obvious ones are the need for carbon pricing and for systematic disclosure of climate-related risks by the private sector.''

It is, indeed, obvious to people in the financial sector. It is only not obvious to us because fossil fuel money swirls all around this place, trying to convince us that the obvious isn't true. Yet BlackRock CEO Fink's letter echoes that call for carbon pricing.

He says, ''carbon pricing [is] essential to combating climate change.''

So we have the warnings, and we have the solutions. We have everything except the will to act. The reason we don't have the will to act is because we have dark money, political predators controlling our behavior in ways that are deeply, deeply inappropriate.

Assume that these warnings are correct. When this blows, Senators who didn't help us act will have to come up with a better excuse than: Well, we weren't warned—because we were warned. We have been warned over and over and over again. We have been warned by experts. We have been warned by major financial institutions. We have been warned by the custodians of our economy, the central banks.

Colleagues, you have the warnings in your inbox. When this blows up, when coastal property values crash, or when the carbon bubble bursts, or worse, when both happen—nothing says both can't happen—it is not going to look good to say: Yes, I was warned, but, you see, my political party is funded by the fossil fuel industry so naturally I did nothing. That is how you lose the privilege of representing people.

It was a bit of a tempest in a teapot. It happened in Rhode Island 28 years ago, but I have lived through this. We had a financial crisis in Rhode Island in 1991. I was working for the Governor, who came in to have to clean up that horrible mess, and I was there for the following election after the financial crisis hit.

The legislators who slept through the warnings lost their jobs in a tidal wave of popular outrage. In the subsequent election, the 1992 election, more than one-third of Rhode Island's General Assembly was either voted out or didn't even bother running again.

There was a movie, when I went to law school, about the Harvard Law School. I think it was called ''One L.'' They brought in the freshman class of the One L class, and the crotchety old dean looked at them all and said: A third of you are going to be gone before you graduate because this is so demanding. Look to your right. Look to your left. One of you will not be here at graduation.

When this thing blows, that is going to be a ''Look to your left. Look to your right. One of you won't be here afterwards'' moment here in the U.S. Senate.

You think people are mad now, wait until this hits. Wait until these warnings come true, and they know you were warned. Wait for that.

It is time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, before I begin my formal remarks, I just want to state that the Senate page class—I don't know if you have noticed—are better than adequate. They are doing a good job for the United States of America, and I appreciate them in their service to the U.S. Senate.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, as of today there are over 1,000 confirmed COVID–19 cases in 35 States and Washington, DC. The World Health Organization has now declared COVID–19 a pandemic. Thirty-one people have died in the United States already because of this virus. This includes one person in the State of New Jersey. Communities across the country, and most recently New Jersey, are confronting the possibility of seeing a spread of this virus. We also know that it is possible that, due to delays and lack of availability of testing, the actual number of those infected here in the U.S. is likely higher than what has been reported.

Every day that passes during the spread of this virus—every single day, every single hour, every single moment is critical. We must act urgently to slow its spread, to mitigate its impact. We all have a role to play in fighting the virus, each and every one of us, from our personal hygiene habits to those of us in positions of authority and the roles we can play to protect each other and to protect our communities. One of the most significant ways to do this is actually by encouraging people to stay home. Members of Congress have self-isolated. For people who have symptoms or who have severe coughs or who may have been exposed, there is an importance in social isolation, staying home when you are sick.

The challenge for us as a country is that for millions and millions of Americans this idea of staying home is not an option. Tens of millions of Americans know that if they stay home, they miss a paycheck. If they miss a paycheck, that can mean financial devastation or ruin for their family.

We are now the only industrialized nation in the world that doesn't have paid family sick leave for workers. This is an unwelcome and, unfortunately, this is a dangerous distinction now in the time of a global pandemic. This literally punishes people who are struggling, low-income workers.

Right now the choice for millions of Americans is really this: Choose between your next paycheck and caring for your sick child. Choose between going to work sick or having to skip a meal. Choose between your health and well-being or your family's financial security. That choice, unfortunately, even before this pandemic, was a choice that many Americans knew—that the people who are handling our food, the people who work in our restaurants, and the people who work with our elderly often go to work sick in this country helping the normal flu and other illnesses spread. In the case of a pandemic which has a mortality rate of potentially five or ten times that of the flu, this is, unfortunately, a tragic choice that families are trying to make.

According to the National Partnership for Women and Families, 70 percent of the lowest income workers do not have a single paid sick day. They also report that 81 percent of people working in the food service industry—let me say that again: 81 percent of people working in our food service industry—and 75 percent of childcare center workers do not have access to paid sick leave. This is disproportionately seen in communities of color.

Think about the choice you make. Your child is sick, you are showing signs but you know if you do not go to work, you will not be able to make rent, you will not be able to put food on the table, you will miss a car payment, which means your car will be repossessed. These are choices that don't just put the families in crisis but they put us all at risk.

The disparity in access to preventive care is also an issue. There are disparities in access to healthcare and affordable medicine for people all across our country—millions and millions of people. This is already before the global pandemic is a health crisis. The continued and unmitigated spread of COVID–19 could have disastrous impacts on people in communities that already have this vulnerability. In my community, where I live, where I hopefully will go home this weekend, in Newark, NJ, the median income for the census track I live in is about $14,000, according to the last census. That is $14,000 per household. I know that public health emergencies can quickly become economic disasters for those who are already struggling in the economic margins of our country.

As we work together to combat the spread of this virus, we need to remember that any of us is only as healthy as our most vulnerable neighbors. In other words, as Martin Luther King said years ago, when he said ''injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere,'' well, the virus anywhere is a threat to the health and safety of us everywhere.

That is why we need to pass the bill introduced by Senator PATTY MURRAY to guarantee 7 days of sick leave for all workers and critically guarantee 14 days of paid sick leave during public health emergencies. That is an act of self-interest.

Again, I know with over 80 percent of those who handle our food in restaurants, if those folks do not have paid family leave, they are now economically incentivized to go to work sick. It can cause a greater spread of the virus.

Paid sick and family leave is a public health and safety issue, plain and simple. It is about economic justice and economic strength and security, but it is a public health issue for us all. As we prepare to fight this virus, we need to do the things that keep our people, our communities, and our country safe, healthy, and strong. That means joining with the rest of our industrial nations and having paid family sick leave. That means opening up and modernizing the Unemployment Insurance Act, because workers who lose a paycheck because their factory closes or their restaurant closes or they lost childcare should be able to access the critical benefits they need to help their family get by. That means we also expand SNAP benefits for those kids who are forced to stay at home and from school and may miss meals.

To take on this virus, to protect all of our communities, to ensure the strength of our economy, and to ensure our health, we need to take a comprehensive and inclusive approach. That means leaving no one behind, because we are all in this crisis together.

I have seen challenges from 9/11 to when I was mayor and we had Hurricane Sandy hit. It was the strength of our community in that region around 9/11. It was the strength of that community during that terrible storm. I remember seeing that the strength was that we stood up for each other and stood by each other—neighbors opening up their homes, people lending a hand, people showing sacrifice for each other. That is the American way. Those values and virtues should be reflected in our policy. We are weakened and more vulnerable right now because we do not have commonsense policies that other countries take for granted, like paid family leave. We in the U.S. Senate should act for the love of each other and love of country, for the strength and security and health of our well-being for each other.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I just want to first say that I agree with everything the Senator from New Jersey just said, and I think it is important to heed his message, because as of this afternoon, we are officially facing a global pandemic.

The coronavirus pandemic has spread to more than 100 countries around the world. The World Health Organization has declared it a pandemic. The economic repercussions have taken on a global dimension. This is also a virus that is impacting Americans on a very personal dimension.

Massachusetts residents are worried about keeping their children, their families, and themselves safe. Day to day, even hour to hour, there is a lot of uncertainty during this public health emergency. Will I be able to work? Will I be able to get medical care? Will I be able to pay the mortgage or the rent?

There is one thing I want my constituents to know for certain. I share your concern for your loved ones, and your safety is my top priority. We need our response to this emergency to match the seriousness of the crisis.

I commend the Governors and mayors across this country who have stepped up and provided leadership to their constituents, including Massachusetts Governor Charlie Baker, who has wisely and swiftly declared a state of emergency in Massachusetts, and our great mayor of Boston, Martin Walsh, who has led early on this issue to make sure that we deal with this crisis.

We need that leadership more than ever because we are seeing a dangerous complete abdication of leadership from Donald Trump. His mismanagement of this crisis is unconscionable. It is immoral, and the harm it is causing the American people is an injustice. The Trump administration has let this crisis spin out of control.

President Trump has repeatedly said the risk is low and minimized the implications of the disease, even saying that Americans are unlikely to die from an infection. But just today, Dr. Tony Fauci, Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases and the Nation's leading expert on infectious diseases, explained that coronavirus is 10 times more lethal than the flu. The administration overruled health officials who wanted to recommend that the elderly and physically fragile Americans be advised not to fly.

Trump has called efforts to draw attention to the real risk of coronavirus, the new Democrat-created ''hoax.'' Just today, it is being reported that the White House has ordered top officials to treat top-level coronavirus meetings as classified, further hampering information sharing in our response to this virus.

We saw what a lack of transparency, misinformation, and denial did in China with the spread of this virus. We cannot allow that to happen in the United States of America. The bottom line: Families need clear, nonbiased, accurate, and reassuring information. They need it from public health officials. They need it from their elected leaders. There should be no partisanship in pandemics.

The President and his administration have undermined science and our scientists. We have the best scientists in the world. We must put their expertise to work to solve this challenge. We have shown that we can do that. Congress came together and quickly passed $8.3 billion in emergency funding to respond to this crisis, but we can do much more.

First, the President should immediately declare the coronavirus pandemic an emergency under the Stafford Act. That direction would allow FEMA to access over $42 billion in disaster relief funds and support States and communities directly as they deal with the spread of this virus. I am officially calling on President Trump to do that today: Declare this an emergency under the Stafford Act. Free up the FEMA money of $42 billion in disaster relief so that we can work on this issue right now, dealing with it in a way that reflects the seriousness of the threat. The President should act today.

Second, we need widespread and free coronavirus testing and affordable treatment for all.

Third, we need to increase the Federal Medicaid assistance percentage. This would increase the amount of Federal dollars that go into Medicaid, immediately pumping more resources into States to deal with this health crisis. We did this during the great recession as a way to assist States in providing medical care. We should do it again, and I will be introducing legislation to accomplish that.

Fourth, we need to ensure paid sick leave for our workers. We need to pass Senator PATTY MURRAY's legislation to provide an additional 14 days' sick leave immediately in the event of any public health emergency, including the current coronavirus crisis.

Fifth, we need to enhance unemployment insurance and expand and support programs like SNAP and Women, Infants, and Children and school lunch and other initiatives to support food security. Banks should suspend payments on mortgages for those struggling with the economic impacts of this crisis, and we should provide rental assistance for those who need it.

Sixth, we need to protect consumers, and that includes shielding them from scams and price gouging, which I called on Amazon to do. Amazon took action by removing bad actors from the site who were charging upwards of $400 for hand sanitizer. No one should be allowed to reap a windfall from fear and human suffering.

We need to provide clear guidance on protections for frontline health workers and access to needed protective equipment. In a pandemic, our healthcare workers are heroes, but these heroes need help. We have to make sure they get the protective gear they need.

The coronavirus is not the first and it will not be the last biothreat the United States faces. That is why I have introduced legislation that provides $1 billion for research into a universal coronavirus vaccine that prevents the next biothreat that would come in the form of a coronavirus. They morph into different types of coronaviruses. We have to plan for the future. We need to find a universal coronavirus vaccine now, and we have to fund it, which is why I am asking for $1 billion for that solution to be found.

Sadly, the reality is that this pandemic is going to get worse before it gets better. But this is our call, and this is our time to come together. We all have a responsibility to act, to show leadership, and to support those who are most vulnerable and will be most impacted by this virus. The elderly in nursing homes, our young children, the uninsured, the undocumented—they need our help right now. These are the lives to be saved, livelihoods to be protected, and futures to ensure.

I will continue to work with my colleagues and fight for legislation that provides Massachusetts residents and businesses and those all across our country with the resources they need. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in this commitment to action.

With that, I yield back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I will have to tell you and all of my colleagues, as they probably know, this has been a fairly tough month for my fellow Tennesseans.

As you know, last week, a tornado tore through eight counties. This started in West Tennessee and exited through Middle Tennessee up on the plateau of our great State. This left multiple communities absolutely devastated. We have mourned the loss of life and livelihoods and property.

I want to, again, thank President Trump for coming to Tennessee to offer his support and for listening to those who were so adversely impacted by this storm and for being there to encourage the emergency management officials, the volunteers, and all of the elected community officials.

We have been encouraged that our Tennesseans have been joined from volunteers all across the country who have shown up to help. They have donated their time, their supplies, and their money to our restoration and rebuilding and recovery and cleanup efforts. To all of those who have volunteered and offered their support, you have made such a difference in the lives of so many Tennessee families. We know this is going to be a long and difficult recovery.

After all of this occurred, on Wednesday of last week, Tennessee health officials confirmed our first case of coronavirus. It was in a patient just south of Nashville in Williamson County.

With all that said, that is a lot to handle in any given week, but Tennesseans and all Americans should be encouraged that there is a lot of good work that is taking place. As I said, the rebuilding efforts span all of those counties in our State.

And then, of course, right there in Nashville are efforts to combat the spread of the 2019 novel coronavirus. The Vanderbilt University Medical Center's Denison Lab is one of the top 20 labs in the world that is studying this disease. For over 25 years, they received Federal grants for their research into how these viruses make us sick, and they are currently helping with the development of treatments, antivirals, and vaccines to deal with coronaviruses, and especially the COVID–19. I am just so pleased with the progress they are making.

Today I want to draw attention to a threat that has, again, been highlighted because of this coronavirus outbreak. Pharmaceuticals are no different from other products in that they

are usually manufactured in pieces—the active ingredients in one place and the inactive ingredients in another place and so on. Currently, only 28 percent of the facilities producing active pharmaceutical ingredients—and you will hear these referred to by the acronym APIs—only 28 percent of the facilities producing these APIs are in the United States. What this means is that American consumers rely heavily on foreign-sourced drugs in order to stay healthy.

Meanwhile, the number of Chinese facilities producing these APIs has more than doubled since 2010. Think about that. Only 28 percent of all the facilities globally are in the United States. China has doubled the number of facilities in China that are producing these APIs.

Why does this matter? Last year, experts at the FDA testified before Congress that while the United States is a world leader in drug development, we are falling behind in drug manufacturing. We do all the R&D here. We have the great scientific minds here. They are creating these products. They are manufactured primarily in China. Their testimony identified the cessation of American manufacturing of APIs as a key health and security concern because it created vulnerabilities in the U.S. supply chain.

The FDA is not alone in their concerns. In its 2019 report to Congress, the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission revealed ''serious deficiencies in health and safety standards in China's pharmaceutical sector.'' That is not something that somebody just read on the internet. It is not an assumption. That is the 2019 report to Congress from the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review.

The coronavirus outbreak is drawing much needed attention to the possibility of a global health crisis. Indeed, today the WHO classified it as a pandemic. I have to tell you, I think awareness is not enough. If the Congress does not act, our dependency on China for medications will continue to put American lives at risk.

Yesterday, alongside my friend, the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ, I introduced the Securing America's Medicine Cabinet, or the SAM-C Act, to encourage an increase in American manufacturing of APIs. The act would expand upon the Emerging Technology Program within the FDA to prioritize issues related to national security and critical drug shortages and bring pharmaceutical manufacturing jobs back to the United States. In addition, the SAM-C Act authorizes $100 million to develop centers of excellence for advanced pharmaceutical manufacturing in order to develop these innovations. These centers will be partnerships between institutes of learning and the private sector.

The number of API manufacturing facilities in China is still growing. It grows every single day. Although we cannot yet quantify our dependence on China's APIs, we do know the more Chinese products flow into the United States, the more potential there is for trouble.

In 2007 and 2008, 246 people died as a result of adulterated Heparin, a widely used blood thinner. An investigation by the Centers for Disease Control determined that batches of Heparin manufactured in China had been contaminated. The contaminant, which is very cheap, was similar in chemical structure to Heparin and went undetected in routine tests.

Since 2010, regulators have also found serious problems with batches of thyroid medication, muscle relaxers, and antibiotics. In 2018, the FDA recalled a number of blood pressure medications made in China that were contaminated with cancer-causing toxins.

To be perfectly clear though, adulteration isn't the only concern. In 2016, an explosion at a Chinese factory resulted in a global shortage of an important antibiotic because that factory was the drug's sole source of production. Think about that. The factory exploded, and there was a shortage of an important antibiotic because they were the only people who were making it. Without intervention, the FDA expects the pharmaceutical industry will continue to rely on Chinese companies to make these active pharmaceutical ingredients, the APIs.

On February 27, 2020, the FDA announced the shortage of one drug that was used to treat patients with the coronavirus. They attributed the shortage to difficulties obtaining—guess what—the active pharmaceutical ingredients from a site in China that has been affected by the disease.

The status quo has made us vulnerable, but the fix is sitting right in front of us. If we fail to act, we are placing our future in the hands of unregulated foreign countries we know to be bad actors. We have a lot of work to do before we will be able to call our supply chain and our healthcare delivery systems secure. But if we are learning anything, we are learning we need to bring this production back into the United States where there is proper oversight, where we know we are not going to have contamination in this supply chain for these active pharmaceutical ingredients. We must embrace telehealth, especially across State lines, and halt the breakdown of care in our rural areas.

I have introduced bills that will help support those things, and I welcome additional cosponsors. The door is always open. All of this activity is here to secure our supply chain and our ability to access the healthcare that Americans need. Today I specifically ask that our colleagues support S. 3432, the SAM-C Act, Securing America's Medicine Cabinet Act. That is a first step in securing this pharmaceutical supply chain and securing the health and wellness of American consumers.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT ACCURACY AND TECHNOLOGICAL AVAILABILITY ACT

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, schools, libraries, healthcare providers, and other community anchor institutions need high-capacity broadband for distance learning, access to information, and telemedicine, but too often, anchor institutions' need for broadband service are overlooked. That is why I want to make sure that anchor institutions are included in the mapping legislation under consideration today. I am pleased that S. 1822 will enable the Federal Communications Commission to develop more accurate and more granular broadband maps. However, in implementing this legislation, the FCC must make sure to include anchor institutions in its list of serviceable locations so that our broadband maps accurately cover anchor institutions as well as residences.

CITIZENSHIP FOR CHILDREN OF MILITARY MEMBERS AND CIVIL SERVANTS ACT

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I rise today to applaud my colleagues for passing H.R. 4803, Citizenship for Children of Military Members and Civil Servants Act, without amendment by unanimous consent.

Last year, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON joined me in introducing the bipartisan Senate companion to H.R. 4803 to make sure that when children of U.S. citizens serving in the U.S. Armed Forces or working for the U.S. Government are born abroad because their parents are serving our Nation overseas, they automatically acquire U.S. citizenship.

The unanimous passage of the Citizenship for Children of Military Members and Civil Servants Act by the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate sends a strong message that children born to American parents serving our country abroad are just as worthy of automatic citizenship as any other child in this country.

This principle should not be controversial. That is why for the past 15 years, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services considered children of members of the U.S. Armed Forces and Federal Government employees stationed outside the United States to be deemed as ''residing in the United States'' for the purpose of automatically acquiring citizenship.

This policy was pragmatic and cut burdensome redtape for American parents willing to serve our Nation abroad

as U.S. servicemembers or civil servants. It provided flexibility and allowed U.S. citizen parents to meet residency requirements for acquisition of citizenship while serving overseas. It kept American parents from cutting their overseas commitment short to establish residency so their children could earn citizenship. This policy allowed their children to enjoy the same privileges of acquiring citizenship, as if their parents were working and living within our country's borders.

However, in August 2019, the Trump administration enacted a policy change to reverse this practice. Under this new policy, certain Americans serving their Nation abroad, in uniform or in the civil service, must apply for citizenship on behalf of their children. These parents now have to navigate a complex bureaucratic process and spend hundreds of dollars on an application, with no guarantee that their children will receive citizenship of the very country they are serving abroad in uniform or as a Federal employee.

In fact, this policy change caused Republican and Democratic lawmakers to recognize that current citizenship laws disadvantage these patriotic families. Our citizenship laws and bureaucratic requirements inflict undue burden on these families and make American parents ''prove'' that their children are worthy of U.S. citizenship.

As a combat veteran, I understand the challenges and family stressors that face Active-Duty members deployed to defend our Nation overseas. Congress should be helping U.S. servicemembers focus on achieving their mission. Providing U.S. servicemembers and civil servants with the peace of mind that they will not have to navigate a lengthy and expensive process to apply for U.S. citizenship for their children advances this important goal.

Our commonsense legislation codifies the previous policy by clarifying the Immigration and Nationality Act to clearly require that children of U.S. citizen parents born in a foreign nation while their parents are stationed abroad automatically acquire U.S. citizenship.

I urge the President to honor the service and dedication of our U.S. servicemembers, military families, and Federal workforce by signing the Citizenship for Children of Military Members and Civil Servants Act into law.

AUSTRALIAN WILDFIRES

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. Res. 527, a resolution I was proud to cosponsor, recognizing the longstanding partnership between the United States and Australia to share critical firefighting resources during times of crisis.

I first want to thank my colleagues, Senator CARDIN and BARRASSO, for introducing this important legislation recognizing the brave men and women who have not only risked their lives in the United States as first responders, but went above and beyond to help combat the recent bushfires in Australia.

In November 2019, Australia began to experience devastating bushfires that burned over 30,000,000 acres of land. During this time, more than 300 American firefighters mobilized to assist Australian efforts to suppress and contain the bushfire raging throughout the continent. This bipartisan resolution recognizes the efforts and bravery of Australian and American men and women who worked together to help those in danger and also specifically honors the three American firefighters who lost their lives fighting Australia's bushfires on January 23, 2020.

In my home State of Nevada, several firefighters answered the call to assist with bushfire mitigation and suppression efforts. I want to take a moment to recognize them individually: Matthew James Petersen, Justin Cutler, Brian C. Holmes, Ian McQueary, Jacob Keogh, Juan Islas, Kevin Kelly, Joseph L. Miller, Dylan Rader, Timothy P. Roide, and Eric T. Tilden.

Thank you to all of these brave Nevadans for your service and sacrifice.

TRIBUTE TO HERCHEL WOODY WILLIAMS

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of one of my constituents, an American hero, Medal of Honor recipient Herchel Woody Williams and all of the magnificent men who fought and died in the Battle of Iwo Jima on this the 75th anniversary. Iwo Jima was one of the most bloodiest and costly battles of WWII which saved thousands of lives in the future. Mr. Williams is the last Medal of Honor recipient living from that battle of 27 who received this honor.

IWO

(By Albert Carey Caswell)

In . . .
In every heart of every Marine . . .
There are but some battles seen . . .
From which such magnificent reflections can be gleaned . . .
All in what it so means, but to be a United States Marine . . .
All in those most magnificent shades of green . . .
Semper Fidelis,
and oh what a brilliant shadow you so cast . . . this sheen . . .
As you marched off to war as a United States Marine . . .
Hoo . . . Raaah Jar Head . . .
As throughout the centuries,
all for God and Country you have died and bled . . .
And all in that battle that we call lwo Jima in what was said . . .
As a time when their fine blood ran red . . .
Now, all etched in their creed as said . . .
Of what it really all so means,
but to be a United States Marine . . .
For from out of all of their grave sacrifice and loss,
but comes such reverence all in this their grave cost . . .
All in what their great valor and courage to us has taught . . .
As why still to this very day,
such homage we now must pay . . .
All in this battle and victory,
all in what it means To Be A United States Marine . . .
All in those magnificent shades of green . . .
But, there are some things men do not talk about . . .
Of such things surely there is no doubt . . .
Of which they'd much rather live without . . .
All in those times of war that which bring about . . .
As now buried deep down inside all their fine souls throughout . . .
Of which we all devoutly talk about . . .
Such things that which make them awake . . .
All in the middle of night as such deep breath's they take . . .
As they so re-fight this fight that which they can not escape . . .
To be carried with them as they grow old . . .
As with each new step they make in these hearts of gold . . .
Of the evils that men do,
that which now leads their fine hearts to such heartache . . .
And yet too,
such great warmth from within them emanates . . .
All because of the brilliance their most gallant hearts would create . . .
And whenever they think of their Brothers In Arms their fine hearts so ache . . .
For the ones who so heroically for each other fine lives so gave . . .
That such splendor neither time nor distance can away so take . . .
Such horrific memories only death can this pain forsake . . .
As now all of those visions of horror they carry deep,
as all in the middle of the night they awake and weep . . .
Until, up in Heaven rejoined with their Brothers once more they meet . . .
When, no longer all these nightmares their fine souls will keep . . .
Oh yes, there are such things that men do not talk about . . .
That which come to mind within ones soul no doubt . . .
Who once upon a battlefield of honor so stood.
for what was right and what was good gallantly all throughout . . .
For their courage and valor to this day we still talk about . . .
As all of this we must now tout . . .
For War is Hell, and Hell is War . . .
And all of this young children must be told about . . .
As it was to be the of War of War's . . .
The Big One so all for sure . . .
To Save The World, as was their monumental mission for sure . . .
As a time when every battle but meant the most . . .
As upon an Island named Iwo Jima,
where to such new heights their most heroic hearts rose . . .
Where each new step was but life or death,
all in hand to hand combat as death stood close . . .
As somehow, someway . . .
all of them to the occasion rose in those days . . .
Rose to such new heights of heroism did they . . .
With 26,000 casualties,
as 6,800 United States Marines most precious lives they gave . . .
And upon a hill in Arlington this day,
tears come to your eyes whenever you look upon that memorial and that flag they raised . . .

Because, to the top of Mount Suribachi a pilgrimage,
every Marine dreams in their lifetime to take . . .
As it was 35 nights and days of Hell on earth as all so showed their fine worth . . .
As it was 70,000 United States Marines,
who dug in deep against an enemy which could not be seen . . .
As so quickly boys had to become men as their fine red blood ran green . . .
All in what it so means,
to be a United States Marine . . .
As all around them death lie replete,
with the smell of death upon their feet . . .
Such scenes of hell and carnage that would make the Angels weep . . .
At the evils that men do all in one's soul to keep . . .
And so too,
all in what new magnificence heights a heroic heart can reach . . .
With some of the fiercest fighting of the war as each new horrific day would repeat . . .
With the greatest number of Medal of Honors presented in any battle this feat . . .
As it all began as they reached the beach . . .
After a bombardment looking like it would never cease . . .
As an eerie quiet calmness upon their souls beseeched . . .
As step by step into the island they left from that beach,
until finally all hell broke loose as they were all in deep . . .
Walking into an ambush as out of tunnels and caves the enemy would creep . . .
With years to plan such strategy to succeed . . .
As these Marines climbed and fought for every inch of real estate so steep . . .
Through inhospitable terrain of volcanic ash as death for them would meet . . .
As all of these dark scenes from hell so came to pass . . .
While, in the cover of darkness from out of caves such a grave toll the enemy amassed . . .
As a new weapon came into play,
the Zippo Tank a flame thrower helped win the day . . .
Helping these heroes through such hell to so make their way . . .
Because, that airfield they could not concede . . .
As why 6,821 American Fine Heroes would die and bleed . . .
or War Is Hell and Hell Is War,
is that but not what heaven is for?
And in the coming years how many more would have died?
If it were but not for all of their most heroic battle cries!
For only the number our Lord knows up on high . . .
Fighting to the death hand to hand,
as perhaps each one a Medal of Honor could command . . .
Flamethrowers . . . tunnel by tunnel . . . cave by cave . . .
Tunnel rats crawling into death so very brave . . .
And how did they all get through each new dark day?
As the enemy made them to such hell to pay . . .
But, in the end there is nothing that has ever been made,
which can stop a United States Marine to this day . . .
As such a heavy toll these Marines made the enemy pay . . .
21,844 would die, the ones who now lie in that dark ground cold graves . . .
As it was on the 5th day,
when 5 Marines and a Navy Corpsman portrayed . . .
Out into the future such an iconic moment made . . .
Now, all etched in stone to be imprinted on every Marines heart they say . . .
As all part of their very DNA . . .
Whether at the top of Mount Suribachi,
or when we see that photo or memorial tears come to our eyes do they . . .
Making us all so proud to be American's the rest of our lives each day . . .
For this battle is and will always be,
one of our Nation's most decisive of all victories . . .
With only 216 of enemy so left,
to tell their children's children all about that battle against America's Best. . .
Yea, there are some things that men do not talk about . . .
Who for all of their courage and valor Heaven so awaits them no doubt . . .
And all throughout the history of The United States Marines,
Iwo Jima will now be always seen . . .
As the embodiment of what it all so means,
but to be a United States Marine . . .
And to what new heights a heroes heart can achieve . . .
Can so climb too all in those magnificent shades of green . . .
As Iwo Jima, is and will always be,
Semper Fidelis of what faith and courage is all about. . .
Iwo . . . Hoo . . . Rah . . . no doubt . . .

CENTENNIAL OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA GREATER WYOMING COUNCIL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today in celebration of 100 years of Scouting in Wyoming.

On Saturday, March 21, 2020, the Boy Scouts of America Greater Wyoming Council will host their annual Silver Beaver and Eagle Scout Recognition Luncheon in Casper. This year holds a special significance as they will celebrate their 100th anniversary at this event.

The Boy Scouts of America incorporated on February 8, 1910. Scouting came to Casper with the creation of the Casper Council in 1917. The council continued to expand, changing its name to the Casper Area Council in 1925, Central Wyoming Council in 1931, and finally the Greater Wyoming Council in 2016. The Boy Scouts of America's mission is ''to prepare young people to make ethical and moral choices over their lifetimes by instilling in them the values of the Scout Oath and Law.'' The council remains true to this mission and to their purpose to educate youth, age 5 to 21, to build character, develop personal fitness, and to train in the responsibilities of participating citizenship.

In Wyoming, the Greater Wyoming Council upholds the mission and purpose of the Boy Scouts through service to 11 counties and 3,000 youth across our State. The organization enjoys tremendous community support with 1,400 volunteers and 150 community partners. This consistent and broad involvement demonstrates what a valuable benefit the council provides to the youth and people of Wyoming.

The council provides a variety of events and opportunities for Scouts, families, and communities in Wyoming. These events include their annual Strength of America Banquet, the annual Camp Buffalo Bill Summer Camp in Cody, fishing tournaments, and family camping trips. They work hard to provide many opportunities for Scouts to participate in fellowships, trainings, basecamps, and much more, to help members be, as the Scouts say, ''Prepared for life.''

Brad Bodoh, the Scout executive for the council, has a strong background in serving the Scouts of America. We are fortunate to have his leadership. Before Brad made Wyoming home, he worked for the Boy Scouts of America in Iowa and Ohio. The knowledge and experience Brad brings to the Greater Wyoming Council allow the Scouts to flourish and expand their skills. Senior district executives Frank Solla and Andrew Allgeier, in addition to the council office staff, are instrumental in growing and supporting the organization's participation throughout the state.

In Wyoming, we live by the Code of the West. One of the principles of the Code is ''to take pride in your work.'' The council's volunteers and families embody this principle. They make it possible for Scouts to advance through the program all the way through the rank of Eagle Scout. They see their work rewarded every time a Cub Scout earns a new badge and an Eagle Scout completes their project. The support for this organization is truly exceptional, and Wyoming is better for it.

Mr. President, it is my pleasure to honor this historic milestone for the Greater Wyoming Council. Their centennial celebration is a recognition of all the hard work and preparation the council has done in the past 100 years and will continue to do for the next 100 years. Bobbi and I are proud of the Greater Wyoming Council and the community support behind it. We celebrate the century of Scouting in Wyoming and extend our congratulations.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING FALLON FOOD HUB

• Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, each week the U.S. Senate Committee on Small Business & Entrepreneurship recognizes one small business that exemplifies the hard work and perseverance of the American Dream and the American entrepreneur. The great State of Nevada is home to more than 250,000 small businesses of all types from mom-and-pop shop bakeries to world renowned cybersecurity firms. In fact, about 99 percent of all business in Nevada are small businesses. Nevada's small businesses are the driving force behind our State's rapidly growing economy and the engine that powers our communities. It is therefore my honor to recognize Nevada's Fallon Food Hub, a small business with a strong and deeprooted commitment to

improving lives and a desire to give back to the community, for recently having been named the U.S. Senate Small Business of the Week.

The Fallon Food Hub's mission is to educate the northern Nevada community about the benefits of eating seasonally in order to create a thriving and expanding local food scene, resulting in increased opportunities for producers and local businesses. Fallon Food Hub believes that through educational opportunities for the community about health and wellness, members of the community can gain a greater sense of cooperation and appreciation for the area producers, local farmers, and specialty food producers that serve the Silver State. Through increasing awareness of and appreciation of local farming and proper nutrition, people can learn a healthier lifestyle while also supporting local producers.

The Fallon Food Hub conducts frequent surveys to get a sense of what the community is interested in learning, hosts monthly classes on the benefits of eating seasonal produce, and keeps the community informed through a monthly newspaper. The Fallon Food Hub provides an outlet for local farmers, ranchers, and value-added producers to sell their goods.

I would also like to recognize the work that Fallon Food Hub does to advocate on behalf of local farmers. Through ongoing education for members and surrounding communities about farmers and the origins of local food, Fallon Food Hub is encouraging our community to connect with one another on a new level. They are an example of an outstanding business with deep love for our community and one of the many reasons why they were a clear choice for this recognition.

Small businesses truly are the driving force for development and growth not just in Nevada, but across our entire Nation. Small businesses like Fallon Food Hub not only help our economy succeed, they also give back by uplifting our communities, inspiring others to open businesses of their own, improving people's health and well-being, and changing lives for the better.

Again, I would like to recognize Fallon Food Hub and all the employees there for their contribution to Nevada and our Nation and congratulate them for being named the Senate Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee's Small Business of the Week. As a member of the committee, it was my honor to nominate this proud Nevada business for recognition and my continued privilege to represent them and all of Nevada's small businesses in the U.S. Senate.●

REMEMBERING DICK AMBROSIUS

● Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I would like to remember the life of Dick Ambrosius. Mr. Ambrosius passed away on January 24, 2020, at the age of 73.

Dick Ambrosius was born in Huron, SD, and graduated from Huron High School in 1964. He attended the University of South Dakota, USD, in Vermillion, SD, where he earned a master's degree. He was actively involved in the Alpha Tau Omega Fraternity and the Reserve Officer Training Corps during his time at USD and continued to advocate for the value of Greek life and the importance of military service throughout his career.

Following his college graduation in 1968, he was commissioned as an officer in the U.S. Army, where he ultimately attained the rank of captain prior to his separation from service. He served in Vietnam and was awarded the Bronze Star and Purple Heart medals.

In life, Mr. Ambrosius was a tireless advocate for senior citizens and disabled veterans. He served as executive director for Warriors Never Give Up, a nonprofit organization that provides outdoor adventures for disabled veterans.

I commend Mr. Ambrosius for his devotion to his community, disabled veterans, and seniors. I offer my sincerest condolences to his family and friends, including his wife Karen, daughter Jennifer, sons Matt and Jacob, sister Nancy, and numerous grandchildren.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3598. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to automatically discharge the loans of certain veteran borrowers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6020. An act to require an evaluation by the Government Accountability Office of the social, economic, and historic contributions that Minor League Baseball has made to American life and culture.

At 5:30 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, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6172. An act to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3598. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to automatically discharge the loans of certain veteran borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 6020. An act to require an evaluation by the Government Accountability Office of the social, economic, and historic contributions that Minor League Baseball has made to American life and culture; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 6172. An act to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communication was laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and was referred as indicated:

EC–4289. A communication from the Attorney and Federal Register Liaison, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Government Participation in the Automated Clearing House'' (RIN1510–AB32) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 6, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Coast Guard nomination of Capt. Miriam L. Lafferty, to be Rear Admiral (Lower Half).

*Coast Guard nomination of James M. Kelly, to be rear Admiral.

*Coast Guard nomination of Vice Adm. Scott A. Buschman, to be Vice Admiral.

*Coast Guard nomination of Rear Adm. Steven D. Poulin, to be Vice Admiral.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation 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.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Jason A. Acuna and ending with David J. Zwirblis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 6, 2020.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Jennifer J. Conklin and ending with Gennaro A. Ruocco, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2020.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Ryan G. Angelo and ending with Jeffrey S. Zamarin, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 13, 2020.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on Finance.

*Jason J. Fichtner, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2024.

*Kipp Kranbuhl, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

*Sarah C. Arbes, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

*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.

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 and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 3434. A bill to make Federal law enforcement officer peer support communications confidential, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 3435. A bill to authorize the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to reclassify the technical enforcement officers in the Homeland Security Investigations tactical patrol unit operating on the lands of the Tohono O'odham Nation (commonly known as the ''Shadow Wolves'') as special agents; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MCSALLY, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 3436. A bill to establish grant programs to improve the health of border area residents and for all hazards preparedness in the border area including bioterrorism, infectious disease, and noncommunicable emerging threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. LOEFFLER (for herself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 3437. A bill to reauthorize certain programs regarding rural health care; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. LOEFFLER (for herself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 3438. A bill to reauthorize the telehealth network and telehealth resource centers grant programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3439. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit high deductible health plans to divide the deductible between medical and drug costs for purposes of qualifying for health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3440. A bill to require States to adopt contingency plans to prevent the disruption of Federal elections from the COVID–19 virus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 3441. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide exceptions to the prohibition on participation by individuals convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 3442. A bill to require private health insurers to cover related to COVID–19 without cost-sharing and to provide for special enrollment periods for individuals diagnosed with COVID–19; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 3443. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide Medicaid coverage for all pregnant and postpartum women, to provide coverage under the Medicaid program for services provided by doulas, midwives, and lactation consultants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. COONS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KAINE, Mr. REED, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 3444. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the list of diseases associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents for which there is a presumption of service connection for veterans who served in the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 3445. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to award grants to develop, administer, and evaluate early childhood education apprenticeships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 3446. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to prescribe regulations providing that a presumption of service connection is warranted for a disease with a positive association with exposure to a herbicide agent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 3447. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a program to allow qualified group practices to furnish certain items and services at qualified skilled nursing facilities to individuals entitled to benefits under part A and enrolled under part B of the Medicare program to reduce unnecessary hospitalizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3448. A bill to provide for certain contracting requirements to promote fair and safe workplaces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 3449. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide for third-party submission of evidence relating to a trademark application, to establish expungement and ex parte proceedings relating to the validity of marks, to provide for a rebuttal presumption of irreparable harm in certain proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 3450. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to treat certain programs of education converted to distance learning by reason of emergencies and health-related situations in the same manner as programs of education pursued at educational institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. Res. 539. A resolution supporting the rights of the people of Iran to determine their future, condemning the Iranian regime for its crackdown on legitimate protests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. KING, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 540. A resolution recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. Res. 541. A resolution recognizing and celebrating the 200th anniversary of the entry of Maine into the Union as the 23d State; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 596

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for direct payment to physician assistants under the Medicare program for certain services furnished by such physician assistants.

S. 785

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 785, a bill to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1136

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize concurrent use of Department of Defense Tuition Assistance and Montgomery GI Bill-Selected Reserve benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 1942

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1942, a bill to amend chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to create a presumption that a disability

or death of a Federal employee in fire protection activities caused by any of certain diseases is the result of the performance of the duty of the employee, and for other purposes.

S. 2254

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2254, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes.

S. 2366

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2366, a bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the premium assistance tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy.

S. 2669

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2669, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by Federal campaigns to detect and report such acts, and for other purposes.

S. 2772

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2772, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program.

S. 2950

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 2950, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to concede exposure to airborne hazards and toxins from burn pits under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 2970

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2970, a bill to improve the fielding of newest generations of personal protective equipment to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2989

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2989, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements.

S. 3218

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3218, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to modify the definition of franchise fee, and for other purposes.

S. 3242

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) 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. 3244

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3244, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to improve the detection, prevention, and treatment of mental health issues among public safety officers, and for other purposes.

S. 3276

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3276, a bill to eliminate asset limits employed by certain federally funded means-tested public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3337

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3337, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require more accountability in the airline industry, and for other purposes.

S. 3350

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3350, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to deem certain State Veterans homes meeting certain health and safety standards as meeting conditions and requirements for skilled nursing facilities under the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 3353

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3353, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients, and for other purposes.

S. 3364

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3364, a bill to improve the health and academic achievement of students in highly polluted environments, and for other purposes.

S. 3372

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3372, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for treatment of certain respiratory protective devices as covered countermeasures for purposes of targeted liability protections for pandemic and epidemic products and security countermeasures, and for other purposes.

S. 3374

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3374, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder patient records.

S. 3398

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3398, a bill to establish a National Commission on Online Child Sexual Exploitation Prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 3415

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3415, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 3418

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 3418, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to allow the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide hazard mitigation assistance to reduce risks from disasters and natural hazards, and other related environmental harm.

S. 3422

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3422, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Indian Education, and to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 3431

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3431, a bill to require online marketplaces to disclose certain verified information regarding high-volume third party sellers of consumer products to inform consumers.

S. RES. 99

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 99, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should take all appropriate measures to ensure that the United States Postal Service remains an independent establishment of the Federal Government and is not subject to privatization.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 539—SUPPORTING THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE OF IRAN TO DETERMINE THEIR FUTURE, CONDEMNING THE IRANIAN REGIME FOR ITS CRACKDOWN ON LEGITIMATE PROTESTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. ROSEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 539

Whereas, on January 8, 2020, the Government of Iran shot down Ukraine International Airlines Flight 752, lied about its culpability, and then admitted to downing the plane on January 11 after evidence was made public by other sources;

Whereas all 167 passengers and 9 crewmembers aboard Ukraine International Airlines Flight 752 died in the resulting crash;

Whereas passengers were mostly citizens of Iran, but also included citizens of Canada, Ukraine, Great Britain, Afghanistan, and Sweden;

Whereas, during January 11 through 13, 2020, protesters gathered across Iran to denounce lying and incompetence by regime leadership with respect to the airline shootdown;

Whereas video clips of protests from January 11 through 13, 2020, showed protestors chanting against Iran's Supreme Leader Ali Khamene'i and the IRGC;

Whereas video clips suggest Iranian authorities deployed tear gas and live ammunition against protestors in January 2020;

Whereas earlier antigovernment protests in Iran began on November 15, 2019, and rapidly spread to dozens of Iranian cities in 29 of Iran's 31 provinces, in the most significant antigovernment protests in Iran since the Green Movement demonstrations in 2009 and 2010;

Whereas the protests began in response to an announced increase on the price of fuel, and protesters expressed numerous economic grievances, while also calling for the structural reform of the political system and condemning current and former Iranian leaders;

Whereas reports indicate that Iranian security forces responded to protests with lethal force, killing hundreds of demonstrators and arresting thousands more;

Whereas reports indicate that the Government of Iran authorities have, in many instances, refused to return victims' bodies to their families and that security forces have removed bodies from morgues and transferred them to unknown locations;

Whereas, on November 16, 2019, Iranian authorities began implementing a near-total shutdown of internet services, stopping nearly all means of online communications for people inside Iran to prevent the sharing of images and videos of deadly violence being used by security forces;

Whereas, on November 16, 2019, Iran's Interior Minister Abdolreza Rahmani Fazli suggested that the Iranian regime would no longer show ''tolerance'' toward the protesters;

Whereas, on November 17, 2019, Iranian Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamene'i called the demonstrators ''villains'', suggested that protests were incited by foreign enemies and domestic insurgents, and ordered Iranian security services to ''implement their duties'' to end the protests;

Whereas, on November 18, 2019, the IRGC deployed to the southwestern city of Mahshahr, which had been taken over by demonstrators, and engaged in mass repression over a period of 4 days, reportedly killing as many as 100 people;

Whereas multiple United States laws provide authorities to designate and sanction elements of the Iranian regime for its repressive conduct, including those involved in significant corruption or serious human rights abuses, including—

(1) the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8501 et seq.);

(2) the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8701 et seq.);

(3) the Countering Iran's Destabilizing Activities Act of 2017 (22 U.S.C. 9401 et seq.); and

(4) the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note);

Whereas the Iranian regime was implicated in a terrorist plot targeting gatherings of Iranian dissidents in Paris in June 2018 and in Albania in March 2018;

Whereas, in August 2018, the United States Government arrested 2 Iranian nationals who later pleaded guilty for acting on behalf of the Iranian regime to conduct covert surveillance in the United States against officials of the Iranian opposition for a target package which, according to the Department of Justice complaint, may have included ''apprehension, recruitment, cyber exploitation, or capture/kill operations'';

Whereas the Iranian regime has routinely violated the human rights of Iranian citizens, including by implementing ongoing, systematic, and serious restrictions of freedom of peaceful assembly and association and freedom of opinion and expression, including the continuing closures of media outlets, arrests of journalists, and the censorship of expression in online forums such as blogs and websites;

Whereas, on November 22, 2019, the United States imposed sanctions on Iran's Minister of Information and Communications Technology for his role in shutting down internet access in Iran;

Whereas the Department of State's most current Human Rights Report noted that the Government of Iran levied ''severe restrictions on free expression, the press, and the internet, including censorship, site blocking, and criminalization of libel; substantial interference with the rights of peaceful assembly and freedom of association, such as overly restrictive nongovernmental organization (NGO) laws; egregious restrictions of religious freedom; restrictions on political participation;'' and that there is ''widespread corruption at all levels of government'';

Whereas, on November 18, 2019, the Office of the German Chancellor stated, ''It is legitimate and deserving of our respect when people courageously air their economic and political grievances, as is currently happening in Iran. . .We urge the government in Tehran to respect freedom of assembly and expression.'';

Whereas, on November 20, 2019, the French Foreign Ministry stated, ''France is following the demonstrations taking place in Iran with concern. It expresses its deep concern at reports that a large respect its international human rights obligations.'';

Whereas, on December 2, 2019, a statement from Amnesty International confirmed that ''extensive video footage verified and analyzed by Amnesty International's Digital Verification Corps shows security forces shooting at unarmed protesters who did not pose any imminent risk'';

Whereas, on December 6, 2019, United Nation's High Commissioner for Human Rights Michelle Bachelet said, ''Verified video footage indicates severe violence was used against protesters, including armed members of security forces shooting from the roof of a justice department building in one city, and from helicopters in another,'' and added that the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights has also received footage showing security forces ''shooting to kill'';

Whereas, on December 8, 2019, a Declaration by the European Union High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy Josep Borrell Fontelles stated, ''A growing body of evidence indicates that despite repeated calls for restraint, the Iranian security forces' disproportionate response to recent demonstrations has led to high numbers of deaths and injuries. For the European Union and its Member States, the widespread and disproportionate use of force against nonviolent protestors is unacceptable.'';

Whereas, on December 16, 2019, Amnesty International further reported that ''[eyewitness testimony] suggests that, almost immediately after the Iranian authorities massacred hundreds. . .participating in nationwide protests, [the authorities] went on to orchestrate a wide-scale clampdown designed to instill fear and prevent anyone from speaking out about what happened'';

Whereas, on January 17, 2020, the United States designated IRGC General Hassan Shahvarpour, Khuzestan Province's Vali Asr Commander, for his involvement in gross violations of human rights against protestors during the November 15 through 18, 2019, protests in Mahshahr, Iran;

Whereas Iran is a member of the United Nations, voted for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and is a state party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966;

Whereas, during February 2020 parliamentary elections, against the backdrop of regime interference, disqualification of reformist and moderate candidates, and anger over crackdowns on protesters, the majority of the Iranian people chose not to vote, making turnout the lowest in Iran's post-1979 history; and

Whereas the Iranian regime has a long history of violent repression of dissent, including—

(1) in 1988, carrying out the barbaric mass executions of thousands of political prisoners—including teenagers and pregnant women—by hanging and firing squad for refusing to renounce their political affiliations and, in some cases, for possessing or distributing political reading material;

(2) in 1999, brutally suppressing a student revolt that was one of the largest mass uprisings up until that point in the country since 1979, in a crackdown since referred to as ''Iran's Tiananmen Square'';

(3) following voting irregularities that resulted in the 2009 re-election of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, cracking down on peaceful political dissent from wide segments of civil society in a cynical attempt to retain its undemocratic grip on power; and

(4) beginning in December 2017, and continuing for several months after protests erupted over economic conditions in more than 80 cities, confronting protestors with excessive force that resulted in at least 25 deaths and 4,000 arrests: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) stands with the people of Iran that are engaged in legitimate protests against an oppressive, corrupt regime;

(2) supports the right of Iranians to peacefully assemble, without fear of persecution and violence, whether in Iran or internationally;

(3) respects the proud history and rich culture of the Iranian nation and fully supports efforts by the people of Iran to promote the establishment of basic freedoms that build the foundation for the emergence of a freely elected and transparent republic;

(4) condemns the Iranian regime's downing of Ukrainian International Airlines Flight 752 and its repeated lying to the people of Iran and around the world about its responsibility for the disaster;

(5) condemns the Iranian regime for its record of brutal repression against peaceful protests;

(6) condemns the Iranian regime's serious human rights abuses against Iranians, significant corruption, and destabilizing activities abroad;

(7) commends the statements of support for protesters from the United States and key United States allies;

(8) calls on all democratic governments and institutions to support the ability of the people of Iran to live in a free society such that they can exercise their human rights and fundamental freedoms;

(9) demands that the Iranian regime abide by its international obligations with respect to human rights and civil liberties, including freedoms of peaceful assembly and speech, including for members of the press;

(10) urges the President to work to convene emergency sessions of the United Nations Security Council and the United Nations Human Rights Council to condemn the ongoing human rights violations perpetrated by the Iranian regime and establish a mechanism by which the Security Council can monitor such violations;

(11) encourages the United States Government to do everything in its power to ensure the Iranian people have free and uninterrupted access to the internet;

(12) calls on telecommunications companies to reject requests by the regime to cut off the Iranian people from social media and other communications platforms; and

(13) urges the President and the Secretary of State to work with the international community to signal through future multilateral and bilateral discussions that the Government of Iran's human rights violations are unacceptable.

SENATE RESOLUTION 540—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICORPS MEMBERS AND ALUMNI TO THE LIVES OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. KING, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 540

Whereas, since its inception in 1994, the AmeriCorps national service program has proven to be a highly effective way—

(1) to engage the people of the United States in meeting a wide range of local and national needs; and

(2) to promote the ethics of service and volunteerism;

Whereas, since 1994, more than 1,100,000 individuals have taken the AmeriCorps pledge to ''get things done for America'' by becoming AmeriCorps members;

Whereas, each year, AmeriCorps, in coordination with State service commissions, provides opportunities for approximately 75,000 individuals across the United States to give back in an intensive way to communities, States, Tribal nations, and the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps members have served more than 1,600,000,000 hours nationwide, helping—

(1) to improve the lives of the most vulnerable people of the United States;

(2) to protect the environment;

(3) to contribute to public safety;

(4) to respond to disasters;

(5) to strengthen the educational system of the United States; and

(6) to expand economic opportunity;

Whereas, since 1994, AmeriCorps funds have been invested in nonprofit, community, educational, and faith-based groups, and those funds leverage hundreds of millions of dollars in outside funding and in-kind donations each year;

Whereas AmeriCorps members recruit and supervise millions of community volunteers, demonstrating the value of AmeriCorps as a powerful force for encouraging people to become involved in volunteering and community service;

Whereas AmeriCorps members serve at more than 21,000 locations across the United States, including at nonprofit organizations, schools, and faith-based and community organizations;

Whereas AmeriCorps National Civilian Community Corps campuses in the States of Mississippi, Iowa, California, and Colorado strengthen communities and develop future leaders through team-based service;

Whereas AmeriCorps members nationwide, in return for the service of those members, have earned nearly $4,000,000,000 to use to further their own educational advancement at colleges and universities across the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps members, after their terms of service with AmeriCorps end, have been more likely to remain engaged in their communities as volunteers, teachers, and nonprofit professionals than the average individual;

Whereas AmeriCorps is a proven pathway to employment, providing members with valuable career skills, experience, and contacts to prepare them for the 21st century workforce and to help close the skills gap in the United States;

Whereas, in 2009, Congress passed the bipartisan Serve America Act (Public Law 111–13; 123 Stat. 1460), which authorized the expansion of national service, expanded opportunities to serve, increased efficiency and accountability, and strengthened the capacity of organizations and communities to solve problems;

Whereas national service programs have engaged millions of people in the United States in results-driven service in the most vulnerable communities of the United States, providing hope and help to individuals with economic and social needs;

Whereas national service and volunteerism demonstrate the best of the spirit of the United States, with people turning toward problems and working together to find community solutions; and

Whereas AmeriCorps Week, observed in 2020 from March 8 through March 14, is an appropriate time for the people of the United States—

(1) to salute current and former AmeriCorps members for their positive impact on the lives of people in the United States;

(2) to thank the community partners of AmeriCorps for making the program possible; and

(3) to encourage more people in the United States to become involved in service and volunteering: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) encourages the people of the United States to join in a national effort—

(A) to salute AmeriCorps members and alumni; and

(B) to raise awareness about the importance of national and community service;

(2) acknowledges the significant accomplishments of the members, alumni, and community partners of AmeriCorps;

(3) recognizes the important contributions made by AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States; and

(4) encourages individuals of all ages to consider opportunities to serve in AmeriCorps.

SENATE RESOLUTION 541—RECOGNIZING AND CELEBRATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENTRY OF MAINE INTO THE UNION AS THE 23D STATE

Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. KING) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 541

Whereas the place now known as Maine is Wabanaki Homeland and is home to vibrant indigenous cultures and communities;

Whereas Maine was a district of Massachusetts, 1 of the 13 original colonies of the United States;

Whereas, by 1820, people living in Maine had built a thriving economy that included farming, forestry, fishing, and shipbuilding industries;

Whereas, in March 1820, Congress and President James Monroe approved the Missouri Compromise, authorizing the establishment of the State of Maine and making Maine the 23d State of the United States;

Whereas Maine is characterized by hardworking, altruistic, and independent people and a strong community spirit;

Whereas the State motto of Maine, ''Dirigo'', Latin for ''I lead'', reflects the trailblazing nature of Maine and the 1,300,000 inhabitants of Maine;

Whereas Maine has 1 of the highest numbers of veterans per capita in the United States, and is the home of Togus, the first veterans hospital in the United States;

Whereas Maine contributes greatly to national defense through the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Bath Iron Works, Pratt & Whitney, and numerous other suppliers and installations whose skilled employees are a vital asset to the United States;

Whereas distinguished statesmen from Maine include William King, Joshua Chamberlain, Hannibal Hamlin, Margaret Chase Smith, and Edmund Muskie;

Whereas Maine is known as ''The Pine Tree State'' and ''Vacationland'' for the extensive forests and spectacular scenery that draw millions of visitors to Maine every year;

Whereas the majestic beauty of Mount Katahdin, 1 of the highest peaks in New England and the northern terminus of the Appalachian Trail, and other unspoiled natural treasures beckon outdoor enthusiasts;

Whereas the rugged coastline and vibrant fall foliage of Maine are showcased in particular splendor in Acadia National Park, 1 of the 10 most visited national parks in the United States;

Whereas the pristine Atlantic waters off the coast of Maine support fishermen and women and the iconic lobster industry, which is the most valuable fishery in the United States and is known worldwide as a standard of seafood excellence;

Whereas Maine is the most forested State in the United States, with a long history of pulp and paper production and an exciting recent turn toward innovation and diversification of forest products;

Whereas the fertile soils of Maine have helped farmers produce the best potatoes and wild blueberries for generations, and have supported the increase of organic agriculture operations;

Whereas March 15, 2020, marks the 200th anniversary of the attainment of statehood by Maine; and

Whereas that bicentennial is a monumental occasion to celebrate and commemorate the achievements of the great State of Maine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes and celebrates the 200th anniversary of the entry of Maine into the Union as the 23d State.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I have 10 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 COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 11, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on pending nominations.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 11, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Douglas Benevento, of Colorado, to be Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and David A. Wright, of South Carolina, and Christopher T. Hanson, of Michigan.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 11, 2020, at 10:10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Kipp Kranbuhl, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Sarah C. Arbes, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, and Jason J. Fichtner, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 11, 2020, at 10:10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 11, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nomination: James E. Trainor III, of Texas, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 11, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a closed roundtables.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 11, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a closed roundtables.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 11, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed roundtables.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 11, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 11, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 6172

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6172) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICORPS MEMBERS AND ALUMNI TO THE LIVES OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 540, submitted earlier today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 540) recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 540) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 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 preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RECOGNIZING AND CELEBRATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENTRY OF MAINE INTO THE UNION AS THE 23D STATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration S. Res. 541, submitted earlier today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 541) recognizing and celebrating the 200th anniversary of the entry of Maine into the Union as the 23d State.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 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. 541) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

SAVANNA'S ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 407, S. 227.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 227) to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, 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 ''Savanna's Act''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to clarify the responsibilities of Federal, State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies with respect to responding to cases of missing or murdered Indians;

(2) to increase coordination and communication among Federal, State, Tribal, and local law enforcement agencies, including medical examiner and coroner offices;

(3) to empower Tribal governments with the resources and information necessary to effectively respond to cases of missing or murdered Indians; and

(4) to increase the collection of data related to missing or murdered Indian men, women, and children, regardless of where they reside, and the sharing of information among Federal, State, and Tribal officials responsible for responding to and investigating cases of missing or murdered Indians.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONFER.—The term ''confer'' has the meaning given the term in section 514 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1660d).

(2) DATABASES.—The term ''databases'' means—

(A) the National Crime Information Center database;

(B) the Combined DNA Index System;

(C) the Next Generation Identification System; and

(D) any other database relevant to responding to cases of missing or murdered Indians, including that under the Violent Criminal Apprehension Program and the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System.

(3) INDIAN.—The term ''Indian'' means a member of an Indian Tribe.

(4) INDIAN COUNTRY.—The term ''Indian country'' has the meaning given the term in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code.

(5) INDIAN LAND.—The term ''Indian land'' means Indian lands, as defined in section 3 of the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4302).

(6) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian Tribe'' has the meaning given the term ''Indian tribe'' in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(7) LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—The term ''law enforcement agency'' means a Tribal, Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency.

SEC. 4. IMPROVING TRIBAL ACCESS TO DATABASES.

(a) TRIBAL ENROLLMENT INFORMATION.—The Attorney General shall provide training to law enforcement agencies regarding how to record the Tribal enrollment information or affiliation, as appropriate, of a victim in Federal databases.

(b) CONSULTATION.—

(1) CONSULTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall complete a formal consultation with Indian Tribes on how to further improve Tribal data relevance and access to databases.

(2) INITIAL CONFER.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of the Interior, shall confer with Tribal organizations and urban Indian organizations on how to further improve American Indian and Alaska Native data relevance and access to databases.

(3) ANNUAL CONSULTATION.—Section 903(b) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (34 U.S.C. 20126) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) enhancing the safety of Indian women from domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, homicide, stalking, and sex trafficking;'';

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) improving access to local, regional, State, and Federal crime information databases and criminal justice information systems.''.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall—

(1) develop and implement a dissemination strategy to educate the public of the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System; and

(2) conduct specific outreach to Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, and urban Indian organizations regarding the ability to publicly enter information, through the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System or other non-law enforcement sensitive portal, regarding missing persons, which may include family members and other known acquaintances.

SEC. 5. GUIDELINES FOR RESPONDING TO CASES OF MISSING OR MURDERED INDIANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the consultation described in section 4(b)(1) is completed, the Attorney General shall direct United States attorneys to develop regionally appropriate guidelines to respond to cases of missing or murdered Indians that shall include—

(1) guidelines on inter-jurisdictional cooperation among law enforcement agencies at the Tribal, Federal, State, and local levels, including inter-jurisdictional enforcement of protection orders and detailing specific responsibilities of each law enforcement agency;

(2) best practices in conducting searches for missing persons on and off Indian land;

(3) standards on the collection, reporting, and analysis of data and information on missing persons and unidentified human remains, and information on culturally appropriate identification and handling of human remains identified as Indian, including guidance stating that all appropriate information related to missing or murdered Indians be entered in a timely manner into applicable databases;

(4) guidance on which law enforcement agency is responsible for inputting information into appropriate databases under paragraph (3) if the Tribal law enforcement agency does not have access to those appropriate databases;

(5) guidelines on improving law enforcement agency response rates and follow-up responses to cases of missing or murdered Indians; and

(6) guidelines on ensuring access to culturally appropriate victim services for victims and their families.

(b) CONSULTATION.—United States attorneys shall develop the guidelines required under subsection (a) in consultation with Indian Tribes and other relevant partners, including—

(1) the Department of Justice;

(2) the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(3) the Department of the Interior;

(4) the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(5) Tribal, State, and local law enforcement agencies;

(6) medical examiners;

(7) coroners;

(8) Tribal, State, and local organizations that provide victim services; and

(9) national, regional, or urban Indian organizations with relevant expertise.

(c) COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States attorneys shall implement, by incorporating into office policies and procedures, the guidelines developed under subsection (a).

(2) MODIFICATION.—Each Federal law enforcement agency shall modify the guidelines, policies, and protocols of the agency to incorporate the guidelines developed under subsection (a).

(3) DETERMINATION.—Not later than the end of each fiscal year beginning after the date the guidelines are established under this section and incorporated under this subsection, upon the request of a Tribal, State, or local law enforcement agency, the Attorney General shall determine whether the Tribal, State, or local law enforcement agency seeking recognition of compliance has incorporated guidelines into their respective guidelines, policies, and protocols.

(d) ACCOUNTABILITY.—Not later than 30 days after compliance determinations are made each fiscal year in accordance with subsection (c)(3), the Attorney General shall—

(1) disclose and publish, including on the website of the Department of Justice, the name of each Tribal, State, or local law enforcement agency that the Attorney General has determined has incorporated guidelines in accordance with subsection (c)(3);

(2) disclose and publish, including on the website of the Department of Justice, the name of each Tribal, State, or local law enforcement agency that has requested a determination in accordance with subsection (c)(3) that is pending;

(3) collect the guidelines into a resource of examples and best practices that can be used by other law enforcement agencies seeking to create and implement such guidelines.

(e) TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Attorney General shall use the National Indian Country Training Initiative to provide training and technical assistance to Indian Tribes and law enforcement agencies on—

(1) implementing the guidelines developed under subsection (a) or developing and implementing locally specific guidelines or protocols for responding to cases of missing or murdered Indians; and

(2) using the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System and accessing program services that will assist Indian Tribes with responding to cases of missing or murdered Indians.

(f) GUIDELINES FROM INDIAN TRIBES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Indian Tribes may submit their own guidelines to respond to cases of missing or murdered Indians to the Attorney General.

(2) PUBLICATION.—Upon receipt of any guidelines from an Indian Tribe, the Attorney General shall publish the guidelines on the website of the Department of Justice in 1 centralized location to make the guidelines available as a resource to any Federal agency, State, or Tribal government.

SEC. 6. ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORTING.—Beginning in the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall include in its annual Indian Country Investigations and Prosecutions report to Congress information that—

(1) includes known statistics on missing Indians in the United States, available to the Department of Justice, including—

(A) age;

(B) gender;

(C) Tribal enrollment information or affiliation, if available;

(D) the current number of open cases per State;

(E) the total number of closed cases per State each calendar year, from the most recent 10 calendar years; and

(F) other relevant information the Attorney General determines is appropriate;

(2) includes known statistics on murdered Indians in the United States, available to the Department of Justice, including—

(A) age;

(B) gender;

(C) Tribal enrollment information or affiliation, if available;

(D) the current number of open cases per State;

(E) the total number of closed cases per State each calendar year, from the most recent 10 calendar years; and

(F) other relevant information the Attorney General determines is appropriate;

(3) maintains victim privacy to the greatest extent possible by excluding information that can be used on its own or with other information to identify, contact, or locate a single person, or to identify an individual in context; and

(4) includes—

(A) an explanation of why the statistics described in paragraph (1) may not be comprehensive; and

(B) recommendations on how data collection on missing or murdered Indians may be improved.

(b) COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, for the purpose of compiling accurate data for the annual report required under subsection (a), the Attorney General shall request all Tribal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to submit to the Department of Justice, to the fullest extent possible, all relevant information pertaining to missing or murdered Indians collected by the Tribal, State, and local law enforcement agency, and in a format provided by the Department of Justice that ensures the streamlining of data reporting.

(2) DISCLOSURE.—The Attorney General shall disclose and publish annually, including on the website of the Department of Justice, the name of each Tribal, State, or local law enforcement agency that the Attorney General has determined has submitted the information requested under paragraph (1) for the fiscal year in which the report was published.

(c) INCLUSION OF GENDER IN MISSING AND UNIDENTIFIED PERSONS STATISTICS.—Beginning in the first calendar year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall include gender in its annual statistics on missing and unidentified persons published on its public website.

SEC. 7. IMPLEMENTATION AND INCENTIVE.

(a) GRANT AUTHORITY.—Section 2101(b) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10461(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(23) To develop, strengthen, and implement policies, protocols, and training for law enforcement regarding cases of missing or murdered Indians, as described in section 5 of Savanna's Act.

''(24) To compile and annually report data to the Attorney General related to missing or murdered Indians, as described in section 6 of Savanna's Act.''.

(b) GRANTS TO INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.—Section 2015 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10452(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (10), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(11) develop, strengthen, and implement policies, protocols, and training for law enforcement regarding cases of missing or murdered Indians, as described in section 5 of Savanna's Act; and

''(12) compile and annually report data to the Attorney General related to missing or murdered Indians, as described in section 6 of Savanna's Act.''.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, 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 committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 227), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed.

NOT INVISIBLE ACT OF 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 417, S. 982.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 982) to increase intergovernmental coordination to identify and combat violent crime within Indian lands and of Indians.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, 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 ''Not Invisible Act of 2019''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term ''Commission'' means the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice Joint Commission on Reducing Violent Crime Against Indians under section 4;

(2) the term ''human trafficking'' means act or practice described in paragraph (9) or paragraph (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

(3) the term ''Indian'' means a member of an Indian tribe;

(4) the terms ''Indian lands'' and ''Indian tribe'' have the meanings given the terms in section 3 of the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4302); and

(5) the terms ''urban centers'' and ''urban Indian organization'' have the meanings given the terms in section 4 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1603).

SEC. 3. COORDINATOR OF FEDERAL EFFORTS TO COMBAT VIOLENCE AGAINST NATIVE PEOPLE.

(a) COORDINATOR DESIGNATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall designate an official within the Office of Justice Services in the Bureau of Indian Affairs who shall—

(1) coordinate prevention efforts, grants, and programs related to the murder of, trafficking of, and missing Indians across Federal agencies, including—

(A) the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

(B) the Department of Justice, including—

(i) the Office of Justice Programs;

(ii) the Office on Violence Against Women;

(iii) the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services;

(iv) the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

(v) the Office of Tribal Justice;

(2) ensure prevention efforts, grants, and programs of Federal agencies related to the murder of, trafficking of, and missing Indians consider the unique challenges of combating crime, violence, and human trafficking of Indians and on Indian lands faced by Tribal communities, urban centers, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Tribal law enforcement, Federal law enforcement, and State and local law enforcement;

(3) work in cooperation with outside organizations with expertise in working with Indian tribes and Indian Tribes to provide victim centered and culturally relevant training to tribal law enforcement, Indian Health Service health care providers, urban Indian organizations, Tribal community members and businesses, on how to effectively identify, respond to and report instances of missing persons, murder, and trafficking within Indian lands and of Indians; and

(4) report directly to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) REPORT.—The official designated in subsection (a) shall submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report to provide information on Federal coordination efforts accomplished over the previous year that includes—

(1) a summary of all coordination activities undertaken in compliance with this section;

(2) a summary of all trainings completed under subsection (a)(3); and

(3) recommendations for improving coordination across Federal agencies and of relevant Federal programs.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE JOINT COMMISSION ON REDUCING VIOLENT CRIME AGAINST INDIANS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, in coordination with the Attorney General, shall establish and appoint all members of a joint commission on violent crime on Indian lands and against Indians.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of members who represent diverse experiences and backgrounds that provide balanced points of view with regard to the duties of the Commission.

(B) DIVERSITY.—To the greatest extent practicable, the Secretary of the Interior shall ensure the Commission includes Tribal representatives from diverse geographic areas and of diverse sizes.

(2) APPOINTMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior, in coordination with the Attorney General, shall appoint the members to the Commission, including representatives from—

(A) tribal law enforcement;

(B) the Office of Justice Services of the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(C) State and local law enforcement in close proximity to Indian lands, with a letter of recommendation from a local Indian Tribe;

(D) the Victim Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(E) the Department of Justice's Human Trafficking Prosecution Unit;

(F) the Office of Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice;

(G) the Office of Victims of Crime of the Department of Justice;

(H) a United States attorney's office with experience in cases related to missing persons,

murder, or trafficking of Indians or on Indian land;

(I) the Administration for Native Americans of the Office of the Administration for Children & Families of the Department of Health and Human Services;

(J) the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services;

(K) a Tribal judge with experience in cases related to missing persons, murder, or trafficking;

(L) not fewer than 3 Indian Tribes from diverse geographic areas, including 1 Indian tribe located in Alaska, selected from nominations submitted by the Indian Tribe;

(M) not fewer than 2 health care and mental health practitioners and counselors and providers with experience in working with Indian survivors of trafficking and sexual assault, with a letter of recommendation from a local tribal chair or tribal law enforcement officer;

(N) not fewer than 3 national, regional, or urban Indian organizations focused on violence against women and children on Indian lands or against Indians;

(O) at least 2 Indian survivors of human trafficking;

(P) at least 2 family members of missing Indian people;

(Q) at least 2 family members of murdered Indian people;

(R) the National Institute of Justice; and

(S) the Indian Health Service.

(3) PERIODS OF APPOINTMENT.—Members shall be appointed for the duration of the Commission.

(4) VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made and shall not affect the powers or duties of the Commission.

(5) COMPENSATION.—Commission members shall serve without compensation.

(6) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—The Secretary of the Interior, in coordination with the Attorney General, shall consider the provision of travel expenses, including per diem, to Commission members when appropriate.

(c) DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may hold such hearings, meet and act at times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers to be advisable to carry out the duties of the Commission under this section.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall develop recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior and Attorney General on actions the Federal Government can take to help combat violent crime against Indians and within Indian lands, including the development and implementation of recommendations for—

(i) identifying, reporting, and responding to instances of missing persons, murder, and human trafficking on Indian lands and of Indians;

(ii) legislative and administrative changes necessary to use programs, properties, or other resources funded or operated by the Department of the Interior and Department of Justice to combat the crisis of missing or murdered Indians and human trafficking on Indian lands and of Indians;

(iii) tracking and reporting data on instances of missing persons, murder, and human trafficking on Indian lands and of Indians;

(iv) addressing staff shortages and open positions within relevant law enforcement agencies, including issues related to the hiring and retention of law enforcement officers;

(v) coordinating tribal, State, and Federal resources to increase prosecution of murder and human trafficking offenses on Indian lands and of Indians; and

(vi) increasing information sharing with tribal governments on violent crime investigations and prosecutions in Indian lands that were terminated or declined.

(B) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 18 months after the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall make publicly available and submit all recommendations developed under this paragraph to—

(i) the Secretary of the Interior;

(ii) the Attorney General;

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

(iv) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate;

(v) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

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

(C) SECRETARIAL RESPONSE.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Interior and the Attorney General receive the recommendations under paragraph (2), the Secretary and the Attorney General shall each make publicly available and submit a written response to the recommendations to—

(i) the Commission;

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

(iii) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate;

(iv) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

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

(d) FACA EXEMPTION.—The Commission shall be exempt from the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(e) SUNSET.—The Commission shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

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

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass, as amended?

The bill (S. 982), as amended, was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

TAIWAN ALLIES INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT INITIATIVE (TAIPEI) ACT OF 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 1678.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 1678) entitled ''An Act to express United States support for Taiwan's diplomatic alliances around the world.'', do pass with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the motion be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR A CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL COLLECTIVELY TO THE CHINESE-AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 91, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 91) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the Chinese-American veterans of World War II.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 91) was agreed to.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 2020

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 12; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 587; further, that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the Danly nomination occur at 11:45 a.m. and that all postcloture time expire at 1:45 p.m.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

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 6:06 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 12, 2020, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FAYLEEN DENNY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Fayleen Denny for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Fayleen Denny is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Fayleen Denny is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Fayleen Denny for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

SAVE YOUR TOOTH MONTH

HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the month of May 2020 as Save Your Tooth Month, and beginning on May 3, 2020, the 13th annual observance of Root Canal Awareness week, as we recognize our nation's highly skilled endodontists and their work to preserve their patients' natural teeth.

There was a time when state-of-the-art dental care meant having a painful tooth pulled by a barber, blacksmith or wig maker. Modern dentistry ushered in the use of anesthesia, radiography, sterile technique, and increasingly sophisticated methods to address pain caused by an infected or broken tooth. But despite incredible advances in restorative dentistry, peer-reviewed studies continue to demonstrate that the best solution to preserve a patient's quality of life still lies in saving the natural tooth whenever possible.

Modern endodontic treatment is devoted to preserving our natural teeth when decay, trauma, a failed crown or repeated procedures to treat dental caries lead to inflammation or an infection of a tooth's root pulp. Using the latest techniques and skills acquired after completing years of advanced training, skilled endodontists can often save a painful tooth and spare their patients the discomfort and expense of additional treatment required to fill the gap caused by an extraction.

Like their colleagues who specialize in general dentistry, through organizations including the American Association of Endodontists and the American Board of Endodontics, our nations' endodontists devote thousands of hours to professional development, funding research on advancing the standard of care, fundraising to support clinics that provide free dental care to the underserved, and educating the general population about the importance of practicing good oral hygiene and preserving one's natural teeth.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the thousands of patients who have had their teeth and their smiles preserved by our nation's skilled endodontic practitioners, I salute the skills, years of training, and dedication of our nation's endodontists, and the more than 350 endodontists practicing in my home state of Illinois.

TRIBUTE TO BRENDA BURROUGHS—28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Brenda Burroughs of Burbank, California.

Brenda Burroughs is a devoted wife, mother, and community leader in Burbank, California. Ms. Burroughs is an active community volunteer and her generous contributions have impacted the lives of many people in Burbank. With a dedication to public service, she has devoted her time to volunteer with numerous organizations that help benefit schools and charities within her community.

Ms. Burroughs began her volunteer work 26 years ago at the Burbank Parent Education Council where she served as their Safety Chair and co-editor of the monthly newspaper. Brenda has volunteered on the School Site Council and has been a member of the National Charity League. She has held numerous leadership positions in the Burbank Council Parent Teacher Association including recording secretary, financial secretary, auditor, and historian, as well as being the Honorary Service Award chairman. A supporter of the arts, Ms. Burroughs has been an engaged volunteer with the Burbank Arts for All Foundation and was the recipient of their prestigious Champion of the Arts Community Volunteer Award in 2017. Her extensive volunteer service list also includes the Burbank Educational Foundation, the Renal Support Network, the Girl Scouts of America and Relay for Life.

Ms. Burroughs champions the Family Service Agency of Burbank by volunteering for the non-profit's yearly Carewalk and Party with a Purpose to raise funds that underwrite community counseling and mental health care for the children, families, and veterans in Burbank. She has recently been recognized by Business Life Magazine as a Woman Achiever for the scope and depth of her service to her community. The City of Burbank is made a better place by the invaluable contributions of Ms. Burroughs.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring this exceptional, well-respected woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Brenda Burroughs.

RECOGNIZING RICHARD ''DICKIE'' LAMAR CREW

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Richard ''Dickie'' Lamar Crew, who passed away on Friday, March 6th, at the age of 81.

Dickie was born on May 5th, 1938, in Crews, Alabama. He was a beloved member of his community in Pontotoc, Mississippi, and was known for his kindness.

Left to cherish his memory is his wife of 64 years, Shelia Simmons Crew; his children, Tabby Vaughn, Kerry Crew, and Richie Crew; his grandchildren, Codi Crew, Bryer Vaughn, Max Crew, Kenny Houpt, and Kassidy Houpt, as well as many friends and extended family members.

Dickie's life was one of service, grace, and love for his family and community. He will be greatly missed by all whom he encountered.

HONORING THE 70TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF LEROY AND OVIA MARIE MCGINNIS

HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my dear friends, Leroy and Ovia Marie McGinnis, on their 70th wedding anniversary. Married on March 10, 1950, the couple has experienced a lifetime of ups and downs, successes and failures, and many wonderful memories. Together, they raised six children, Pat (spouse Bob) Bell, Jack (spouse Edna) McGinnis, the late Kim (spouse Diana) McGinnis, Don (spouse Tina) McGinnis, Renee (spouse Ed) Bowen, and Michele McGinnis. They have also been blessed with 18 grandchildren and 34 great-grandchildren. I can only imagine the excitement and exuberance at their family get-togethers.

The couple both grew up in Gainesville, Missouri, and were reunited after Leroy's discharge from the Navy. He was on his way to

San Diego when he decided to stop and visit his sister, who was Ovia Marie's best friend at the time. It only took three short months for the couple to realize they had ''together forever'' in mind, and eloped. They recall the memory fondly and laugh at their lack of grandeur; Ovia wore jeans down the aisle and didn't tell her parents about the wedding until she missed her curfew that night.

Over the years, Leroy and Ovia became well-respected community and business leaders in their town of Cuba, Missouri. Mr. McGinnis founded and still serves as CEO of McGinnis Wood Products, which he started in 1968. They make hand-crafted wine and bourbon barrels that are sold to some of the country's top-selling distilleries, as well as companies in Japan, Spain, and Scotland. After five generations of family involvement, I think it's safe to say this is a remarkable family-owned company that will serve as a legacy for the McGinnis family for generations to come.

I am so honored for the opportunity to wish the McGinnis's a happy anniversary and many joyous returns of the occasion.

GARRETT FINDLEY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Garrett Findley for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Garrett Findley is a student at Oberon Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Garrett Findley is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Garrett Findley for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING THE LIFE OF R. ALEXANDRA 'SANDY' LARSON OF NORTH BRUNSWICK

HON. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and contributions of R. Alexandra Larson, better known as Sandy, who spent her life advocating for social justice, fighting for those who might otherwise be voiceless and placed justice higher than any other objective.

Sandy dedicated her career to the taxing but incredible work of fighting for civil rights and supporting children and families. Unlike many, she walked the walk, living her values daily. As an attorney with the Middlesex County Office of the Public Defender, she developed projects to document and address disproportionate rates of arrest and incarceration for people of color—working to correct a disparity that plagues our society even now. As Director for the Governor's Committee on Children's Services Planning, Sandy was responsible for reports that to this day are the basis for broad advocacy efforts for children across my state, and she is credited with helping to develop the New Jersey Youth Services Commission—established to fix the way courts handle at-risk youth.

Sandy's efforts to affect positive change were not limited to her professional endeavors. In her free time, she shared her three degrees—a BA in Journalism from Douglass College, an M.S.W. from Rutgers School for Social Work and a J.D. from Rutgers School of Law—Newark—and her years of expertise with community organizations that included the Metuchen-Edison NAACP and the Latino Leadership Alliance of New Jersey. She served on the Board of Trustees of the New Jersey Training School for Boys, the Children's Trust Fund of New Jersey, the Coalition for Hispanic Rights in Criminal Justice, the Middlesex County Local Advisory Council for Alcohol and Drug Abuse, and the ASAP program.

What her friends and family, including her daughter Francesca Dulce Larson, her mother Francesca Nadalini, granddaughter Serafina Giovanna, and her siblings Michela, Marthe, Robb, Gus, Giovanna, George, Jayne Amelia, and Jonathan, will no doubt miss the most is her spirit. Sandy was fearless and fierce. She was about building a brighter future for everyone and connecting the dots that would improve the world just a little with every action she took. She was a light in every room, the link that connected so many friends, and a source of love in a world that could use more of it. I am so grateful for everything she accomplished and devoted herself to with her time here, and I send my heartfelt prayers to all those who join me in mourning her loss.

MOVING OUR DEMOCRACY AND CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS TOWARDS MODERNIZATION RESOLUTION

SPEECH OF

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 10, 2020

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following exchange of letters on H. Res. 756:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 3, 2020.

Hon. ZOE LOFGREN,
Chairperson, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRPERSON LOFGREN: I write concerning H. Res. 756, the Moving Our Democracy and Congressional Operations Towards Modernization Resolution. There are certain provisions in this legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite floor consideration of H. Res. 756, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure agrees to forgo action on the bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill would not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the committee report on H. Res. 756 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

PETER A. DEFAZIO,
Chair.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, March 4, 2020.

Hon. PETER A. DEFAZIO,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DEFAZIO: Thank you for your letter regarding H. Res. 756, the Moving Our Democracy and Congressional Operations Towards Modernization Resolution. This House resolution was referred primarily to the Committee on House Administration with additional referrals to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on the Judiciary.

I recognize that this resolution contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I appreciate your Committee's willingness to be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 756 and that this discharge is not a waiver of future jurisdictional claims by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure over this subject matter and will not prejudice your Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees if this were to be necessary.

I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H. Res. 756.

Sincerely,

ZOE LOFGREN,
Chairperson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, March 5, 2020.

Hon. ZOE LOFGREN,
Chair, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR LOFGREN: This is to advise you that the Committee on the Judiciary has now had an opportunity to review the provisions in H. Res. 756, the ''Moving Our Democracy and Congressional Operations Towards Modernization Resolution,'' that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. I appreciate your consulting with us on those provisions. The Judiciary Committee has no objection to your including them in the resolution for consideration on the House floor, and to expedite that consideration is willing to forgo action on H. Res. 756, with the understanding that we do not thereby waive any future jurisdictional claim over those provisions or their subject matters.

In the event a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation is convened, the Judiciary Committee reserves the right to request an appropriate number of conferees to address any concerns with these or similar provisions that may arise in conference.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the

measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our committees.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, March 5, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: Thank you for your letter regarding H. Res. 756, the Moving Our Democracy and Congressional Operations Towards Modernization Resolution. This House resolution was referred primarily to the Committee on House Administration with additional referrals to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on the Judiciary.

I recognize that this resolution contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. I appreciate your Committee's willingness to be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 756 and that this discharge is not a waiver of future jurisdictional claims by the Committee on the Judiciary over this subject matter and will not prejudice your Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees if this were to be necessary.

I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H. Res. 756.

Sincerely,

ZOE LOFGREN,
Chairperson.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ANI HALABI—28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Dr. Ani Halabi of Tujunga, California.

Ani Halabi is a devoted wife and mother and has been a successful optometrist for fifteen years. Born in Tehran, Iran, Ani was first introduced to optometry while working in her family's business marketing and designing an eyeglass frame line. She attended Glendale Community College and California State University, Northridge where she received a bachelor's degree in biology, all while working in a private optometry practice. Dr. Halabi continued her education at the Southern California College of Optometry, where she received her Doctorate of Optometry. She specializes in primary eye care, which includes diagnosis and treatment of ocular diseases, prescribing contact lenses and glasses, and working with local eye surgeons.

Dr. Halabi is an active volunteer and member of several local non-profit organizations. She is a 10-year member of the Armenian American Medical Society, where she has helped coordinate the vision clinic at the Glendale Health Festival, which serves more than 1,500 disadvantaged patients annually. She is also a 10-year member of the Glendale Northwest Lions Club, where she is a co-chair of the sight conservation committee, and under her leadership, the club has provided free eyeglasses to people in need and has offered eye screenings that have restored and improved vision to more than 3,000 individuals. In addition, as a Glendale Healthy Kids organization volunteer, Ani has provided free eye care services for underprivileged families and children. She has also volunteered at vision screenings at several schools, including St. Mary's Richard Tufenkian Preschool & Kindergarten, Glendale High School and Herbert Hoover High School, educating parents about routine eyecare and providing early detection of vision problems.

Dr. Halabi has made it her mission to help aspiring optometrists by mentoring students and offering internships at her practice. She regularly sits on the panel of Glendale Community College's Professional Alumni and has volunteered at college events to guide students who have an interest in the field of optometry. Ani's successes have been recognized by "Women in Optometry" magazine, who featured her on their cover.

Dr. Halabi and her husband, Steve Khroyan live in Tujunga and have two children, Nara and Sareen.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring this exceptional, well-respected woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Dr. Ani Halabi.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CARGO FLIGHT DECK SECURITY ACT

HON. JESÚS G. "CHUY" GARCÍA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the bipartisan Cargo Flight Deck Security Act along with my colleague, Brian Fitzpatrick.

The safety and security of our pilots, our skies, and the flying public are at stake.

Today, many cargo planes have no cockpit barrier and without the safety of hardened flight deck doors, the aircraft's interior is open, and the flight deck is completely exposed. This leaves pilots without a means to adequately separate the flight crew from personnel riding in the bulkhead or potential cargo-hold stowaways.

Ultimately this is about parity and safety. Cargo pilots have been fighting for hardened cockpit doors for 18 years, and this bill will solve that long overdue security concern.

After 9/11, regulatory changes put in motion requirements to require hardened cockpit doors for all aircraft to separate the flight deck from the cargo/passenger bay. Unfortunately, after 2003, the TSA made changes to its requirements and erected a wholesale carve-out for cargo airplanes, effectively creating disparate requirements for passenger and cargo airline safety.

The Cargo Flight Deck Security Act ensures all pilots are protected by hardened cockpit doors and takes steps to keep our skies and flying public safe.

I urge this body to pass advance this legislation.

ECKO GONZALEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ecko Gonzalez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Ecko Gonzalez is a student at North Arvada Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ecko Gonzalez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ecko Gonzalez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING MARTY LYNCH, PH.D.

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Marty Lynch, Ph.D, as he retires as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to CEO Emeritus of LifeLong Medical Care. Dr. Lynch's service in the healthcare industry spans over 60 years, including service as a non-profit administrator for more than 30 years. Dr. Lynch is involved in national, state, and local public policy and research activities related to health access for the uninsured, long-term care models, chronic care, and financing care for disabled populations. In addition, Dr. Lynch is a lecturer at the University of California Berkeley in the School of Social Welfare.

Dr. Lynch received his Ph.D. in Social and Behavioral Sciences from the University of California, San Francisco, and an MPA from the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard. Dr. Lynch began his journey with LifeLong Medical Care in 1982 when the organization was known as The Over Sixty Clinic. After becoming the CEO in 1984, Dr. Lynch expanded The Over Sixty Clinic into what is now LifeLong Medical Care.

Dr. Lynch co-founded the Elderly Sub-Committee of the National Association, recently served on California's State task force to examine policy changes necessary for the integration of primary care and mental health services and helped to develop a California plan for Alzheimer's disease. One thing Dr. Lynch's work does, is that it underscores the humanity in caregiving, as we all are connected to someone directly or indirectly who is aging.

Through Dr. Lynch's vision and leadership, LifeLong Medical has had a profound impact on the lives of seniors in our communities and now extends that care to people of all age demographics. LifeLong is a 25-site Federally Qualified Health Center that also provides

care on the street, in patients' homes, and in nursing homes and supportive housing.

Dr. Lynch operates on the belief that healthcare is a right not a privilege. This is reflected in the LifeLong's commitment to providing integrated services to the disabled elderly and homeless communities. He has ensured this by providing access to medical assistance, mental health support, and substance abuse therapy to our elderly and vulnerable populations.

On a personal note, I am thankful for Dr. Lynch's wise counsel and friendship. I have known Dr. Lynch since 1974.

Today, I join the LifeLong Medical Care Health Services in celebrating the retirement of Dr. Marty Lynch. On behalf of California's 13th Congressional District, I am honored to commend Dr. Marty Lynch for his lifelong work in healthcare. I thank him for his continued service to the community as CEO Emeritus of LifeLong Medical Care Services for All.

RECOGNIZING DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES AWARENESS MONTH

HON. VAN TAYLOR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the 33rd Anniversary of National Developmental Disabilities Awareness Month. This important commemoration serves to raise awareness and promote respect for those with intellectual and developmental disabilities while also recognizing the importance of inclusion.

It is estimated there are over 4.6 million individuals in the United States and over 250,000 individuals in North Texas alone with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Texas' Third Congressional District is the home to incredible organizations including Cornerstone Ranch, My Possibilities, and LifePath Systems. These dedicated organizations, staffs, and volunteers serve as steadfast advocates, fostering opportunities for these individuals to realize their full potential.

My Possibilities has become a national model in vocational education and job placement for adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities throughout North Texas, dramatically changing the landscape for these individuals.

LifePath Systems is a community-based organization designed to assist individuals and families dealing with intellectual disabilities and developmental delays through its collaborative efforts with other community partners to ensure the best possible care for all Texans.

And Cornerstone Ranch provides a family-centered environment where residents thrive, confidence is nurtured, and special needs adults are empowered to lead productive lives as members of the community.

While these are just a few entities in North Texas who work tirelessly to expand the conversation of inclusion, accessibility, and lifelong independent living skills, I am honored to recognize their efforts on behalf of all Collin County residents with intellectual and developmental disabilities. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in thanking these organizations and recognizing the importance of Developmental Disabilities Awareness Month.

INTRODUCTION OF THE SUPPORT OUR MILITARY WORKING DOGS ACT

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, today I introduce the ''Support Our Military Working Dogs Act'' in commemoration of National K9 Veterans Day later this week. The United States K9 Corps was established on March 13, 1942. As chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness, I want to thank my vice-chairman Congressman ANDY KIM (D–NJ) for his support as the bill's original cosponsor.

Military working dogs serve on the front lines with our troops to defend our nation and provide recuperating services for our veterans and their former handlers. Caring for these dogs in the field and once they return home is our responsibility.

The ''Support Our Military Working Dogs Act'' would ensure that our nation's military working dogs receive the best possible care and direct the U.S. Department of Defense to work with veterans' service organizations and other nonprofits to support their long-term care, once adopted by their former handler's into loving homes.

In 2019, the U.S. special forces raid that led to the death of ISIS terrorist leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi included an American special operations military working dog Belgian Malinois named Conan. During the raid, Conan chased al-Baghdadi into a tunnel underneath a compound in northern Syria, where he then detonated his suicide vest. During the chase, Conan was injured by live electrical wires in the tunnel. Under current federal law, the Department of Defense cannot cover the veterinary expenses of military working dogs like Conan, when they retire from duty or recuperate from injury while adopted.

The ''Support Our Military Working Dogs Act'' would remove these restrictions to authorize the Department of Defense to provide support for retired or injured military working dogs after their adoption. The bill would also ensure that the U.S. government covers all transportation costs associated with transferring retired military animals, including horses, to their new adopted homes, building upon the success of the Military Working Dog Retirement Act of 2015.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness, which has jurisdiction over military working dogs, I urge all our Members of the House to join me and Congressman KIM in cosponsoring this important legislation.

HAILEY HAYNES

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Hailey Haynes for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Hailey Haynes is a student at Arvada K–8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Hailey Haynes is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Hailey Haynes for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

COMMEMORATING 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY, TURNAROUND TUESDAY, AND THE FINAL MARCH FROM SELMA TO MONTGOMERY

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, fifty-five years ago, in Selma, Alabama, hundreds of heroic souls risked their lives for freedom and to secure the right to vote for all Americans by their participation in marches for voting rights on ''Bloody Sunday,'' ''Turnaround Tuesday,'' or the final, completed march from Selma to Montgomery.

Those ''foot soldiers'' of Selma, brave and determined men and women, boys and girls, persons of all races and creeds, loved their country so much that they were willing to risk their lives to make it better, to bring it even closer to its founding ideals.

More than a half century has passed since that day of horror and carnage on the bridge, a day so terrible that it was immediately named and will be forever known as ''Bloody Sunday.''

But we will always remember.

Madam Speaker, people come from all over the world to stand on the bridge, ground sanctified and consecrated by the blood and courage and sacrifice of nameless, innocent, ordinary persons whose commitment to justice changed America for the better.

People come to Selma and remember Bloody Sunday with reverence and awe for the same reasons they visit the beaches of Normandy and the cornfields of Gettysburg.

We remember them because we know in our hearts that President Lyndon Johnson was right when he addressed the Congress and the nation the evening of March 15, 1965, stating:

''At times history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom.

''So it was at Lexington and Concord.

''So it was a century ago at Appomattox.

''So it was last week in Selma, Alabama.''

On Bloody Sunday, John Lewis and Reverend Hosea Williams led 600 courageous, unarmed men, women, and children in a peaceful march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge from Selma to Montgomery to dramatize to the nation the aspiration of African Americans to become full citizens and to participate in the political process.

As they crossed the highest part of the bridge, the marchers were viciously attacked

by Alabama state troopers, who ridiculed, teargassed, clubbed, spat on, whipped and trampled them with their horses.

In the end, John Lewis's skull was fractured by a state trooper's nightstick, and 17 other marchers were hospitalized.

In direct response to Bloody Sunday, Congress passed, and President Lyndon Johnson signed into law the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the greatest victory of the Civil Rights Movement, and the most significant advance in the field of civil rights and democratic governance since the Civil War Amendments of the 1860s.

Selma marked a turning point in history because it was the place where moral courage met and overcame entrenched power.

The Edmund Pettus Bridge is more than a bridge; it was the portal through which America left the dark days of its past and marched into a better and brighter future.

And the trail of that journey is marked by the blood of the foot soldiers who led the way.

Despite, or perhaps because of its proven effectiveness in breaking down voting barriers, on June 25, 2013, the Supreme Court, issued the shameful decision in Shelby County, Alabama v. Holder, which struck down Section 4(b) of the VRA, which immobilized the heart of the Act, the preclearance provisions of Section 5.

The Supreme Court did this even though a bipartisan Congress in 2006 voted nearly unanimously to reauthorize Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

After hearing from more than 90 witnesses with a diverse range of views, holding 20 hearings, and evaluating a 15,000–page record, 98 Senators and 390 House members voted to re-authorize Sections 4(b) and 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

Within hours of the Supreme Court's Shelby County decision, the State of Texas, where in 2012 alone Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act blocked the state's discriminatory photo ID law and intentionally discriminatory redistricting plans, announced its intention to implement those measures immediately.

This is only one of many examples of formerly covered states taking advantage of the gap in Section 5 protection by reverting back to laws that the Voting Rights Act previously blocked.

The struggle to ensure that all Americans can participate equally in the political process continues.

And that is why I was proud to cosponsor and support H.R. 4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act, which corrects the damage done to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and commits the national government to protecting the right of all Americans to vote free from discrimination and without injustices that previously prevented them from exercising this most fundamental right of citizenship.

IN RECOGNITION OF PROFESSOR RONALD WOODS DISTINGUISHED CAREER AT EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Professor Ronald Woods on his retirement and recognize his forty-three years of distinguished service at Eastern Michigan University (EMU). His contributions to our community have been many and deserve significant recognition.

In his decades of service as a teacher and mentor, Professor Ronald Woods has become a pillar of the EMU community. A former poverty law attorney, Ronald Woods started at EMU in 1976 as a lecturer in the Afro-American Studies Program, and later went on to become a professor and the first head of the African American Studies Program. In these capacities, Professor Woods provided valuable expertise on the intersection of race, public policy, and law. He shed light on the impact of social policy on our nation's schools and communities and published on a variety of different topics like African policy in the horn of Africa. In addition to his work as a professor and scholar, Professor Woods was highly regarded in serving as Director of the Institute for the Study of Children, Families, and Communities.

Today, we celebrate Professor Woods for his leadership and unrelenting dedication to his students, community, and academia. Throughout his tenure, Professor Woods mentored hundreds of students and was recognized for his professionalism, kind demeanor, and passion for educating our nation's future leaders. Beyond academics, Professor Woods's contributions included serving as interim president of the Michigan Council of Black Studies, a member of the Board of Directors of the African American Cultural and Historical Museum of Washtenaw Court, and member of the Board of Directors of Wittenberg University, and even a member of the Board of the Ann Arbor Housing Commission, just to name a few of his many outstanding accomplishments. In addition, Professor Wood was paramount to the success of key community programs. As an early leader and the first coordinator of Washtenaw County My Brother's Keeper, Professor Woods empowered multiple generations to build community, change narratives, and improve outcomes for young men and boys of color in Washtenaw County. Professor Wood's years of service have impacted the lives of many, and his continued dedication provides a lasting example of what we should all endeavor to accomplish—to effect change, be compassionate leaders, and do all we can to make a difference in the world.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ronald Woods as he retires from Eastern Michigan University. We thank him for his decades of distinguished of service and leadership and wish him the best of luck in all future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO MEYMUNA HUSSEIN-CATTAN—28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Meymuna Hussein-Cattan of the Echo Park neighborhood of Los Angeles, California.

Meymuna Hussein-Cattan is an executive, social entrepreneur and world traveler dedicated to shifting the narrative around refugees in the United States. Born in an Ethiopian refugee camp in Somalia, Ms. Hussein-Cattan's childhood gave her a first-hand view of the struggles of refugee children. In 1983, Meymuna's father moved to San Diego when he was resettled by the International Rescue Committee. Young Meymuna and her mother, Owliya Dima followed the next year.

Growing up with a passion for human rights and advocacy, Meymuna went on to receive her bachelor's degree in Social Sciences from the University of California, Irvine and a master's degree in Organizational Management from Antioch University. Hussein-Cattan wrote her Master's thesis about Tiyya, which proposed creating a nonprofit organization that supports refugees starting a new life in Southern California. Tiyya means "my love" in Oromo, which is one of the languages spoken in Ethiopia. Over the years, Tiyya has improved the lives of refugees in the greater Los Angeles area through the arts, education and recreational activities.

With generosity and public service as core principles and the help of her mother, Meymuna made it her mission to assist refugees to find stability and navigate the similar complex challenges that her family went through. As co-founder and CEO, Ms. Hussein-Cattan has played a vital role in Tiyya's successes over the past decade, which include impacting the lives of hundreds of people each year with a variety of programs. As funding sources dwindled, Meymuna expanded the organization's mission by launching Flavors from Afar, a program that helps refugees develop culinary careers in their new country and build connections within the neighborhood.

Apart from her work at Tiyya, Meymuna is committed to broadening her scope and reaching other advocates with her expertise. A speaker at many organizations and universities, she enjoys sharing her insights and experience to motivate and inspire the future wave of human rights activists. The Los Angeles refugee community has greatly benefited from the generosity and dedication of Meymuna Hussein-Cattan.

Meymuna and her husband, Shukry live with their daughter, Suraya in Echo Park.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring this exceptional, well-respected woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Meymuna Hussein-Cattan.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALMA S. ADAMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I was absent on March 3, 2020 due to my primary election. Had I been present, I would have voted: Roll Call No. 81—YEA, and Roll Call No. 82—YEA.

FULTON JACKSON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Fulton Jackson for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Fulton Jackson is a student at Mandalay Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Fulton Jackson is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Fulton Jackson for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JAMES ''JIM'' MCGRATH

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in remembering the life of James ''Jim'' McGrath, a longtime District of Columbia resident and our city's leading activist for tenants' rights, on the occasion of his death on March 3, 2020.

Jim McGrath, born in Boston, Massachusetts on September 1, 1937, came to the District after serving in the U.S. Army. He studied literature at American University and received a master's degree in literature at Georgetown University. Jim worked full time as he pursued his education. He worked and volunteered for the American Cancer Society, he was a research assistant for a D.C. law firm and a paralegal for a telecommunications firm in D.C.

These experiences led him to the House of Representatives, where he worked for former Speaker of the House John W. McCormack of Massachusetts. Jim worked as a clerk for the House Committee on the Judiciary and later became a leading expert on federal pay issues as an employee of the Library of Congress.

As a D.C. resident who lived in Dupont Circle for 45 years, Jim became well acquainted with the challenges and abuse D.C. tenants face. He established the D.C. Tenants Advocacy Coalition (TENAC) in 1992 and became the lead advocate for tenants for rent control in the District. His advocacy for tenants' rights brought him before the D.C. Council, and his expertise led to legislation such as the creation of the Office of the Tenant Advocate (OTA), the confirmation of the Chief Tenant Advocate and the Tenants' Right To Organize Act. Jim's leadership will be especially missed today, when the high cost of housing is perhaps the most important issue facing our city.

With the passing of Jim McGrath this month, the District has lost a friend—and so have I. Jim McGrath devoted his life to the tenants of this city and became the face and soul of tenants' rights. Jim was the acknowledged leader of citizen efforts to protect tenants in this highcost city.

Madam Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring James ''Jim'' McGrath, my friend and a leader in our city, for his life of service. I extend my deepest condolences to Jim's family.

LT. COL. JAMES ''JAY'' VALLARIO

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. COOK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Colonel James ''Jay'' Vallario following nearly 25 years of dedicated service as a United States Marine. Jay was born in San Francisco, California in 1976. He is a graduate of Commodore Sloat Elementary School, Aptos Middle School, and Saint Ignatius College Preparatory. He holds a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Business Administration from the University of San Diego. He enlisted in the Marine Corps Reserves in September of 1995, and served as a Rifleman and a M1A1 tank crewman. He was commissioned a Second Lieutenant in April 1999, and then began active service.

A career AV–8B Harrier attack pilot, Jay completed two operational tours with Marine Attack Squadron 311 and one with Marine Attack Squadron 211. He served in all departments within a Marine Attack Squadron including assignments as the Aviation Safety Officer, Airframes Officer, Weapons and Tactics Instructor, Operations Officer. and Executive Officer. He completed two deployments with the 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit, one deployment with the 15th Marine Expeditionary Unit, and one deployment with the 11th Marine Expeditionary Unit. While serving as the Air Combat Element Executive Officer and AV–8B Detachment Officer in Charge of the 11th Marine Expeditionary Unit, Jay conducted combat sorties from the USS Makin Island in support of Operations Inherent Resolve and Enduring Freedom.

Jay's other duties included assignment to 3d Battalion, 4th Marines, with whom he served as a Forward Air Controller in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom: Marine Aviation Training Support Squadron Yuma Officer in Charge: and, assignment to the 55th Fighter Squadron, with whom he served as a Marine Exchange F–16CJ Pilot. During his United States Air Force exchange tour Jay deployed to Aviano Air Base, Italy, and conducted combat sorties into Libya in support of Operation Unified Protector. From April 2015 to February 2016, Jay served on the staff of the Deputy Commandant of the Marine Corps for Aviation. Jay commanded the AV–8B Fleet Replacement Squadron, VMAT–203, from June 2016 to January 2018. While in command, he was responsible for initial and refresher training of Marine Corps Harrier attack pilots.

Upon relinquishing command, Jay assumed the billet of Marine Aircraft Group 14 Executive Officer, where he served until July 2018. From July 2018, until his retirement on 1 April 2020, Jay was assigned to the Marine Corps Office of Legislative of Affairs where he served as a liaison to Navy Office of Legislative Affairs, and managed the Navy's Expeditionary Warfare, Air Warfare, Military Sealift, and F–35 acquisition portfolios.

Upon his retirement from active service in the United States Marine Corps, Jay will begin work as a Professional Staff Member on the House Armed Services Committee, where he will manage the readiness portfolios of the United States Air Force and United States Space Force.

Jay is married to Adrianna, from Denton, Texas. They have two children—Maia (6), and Evan (4)—and reside in Alexandria, Virginia.

I ask the House to join me in congratulating Lieutenant Colonel Vallario and his family for his service to our Nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANAITON

HON. WILLIAM R. TIMMONS, IV

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. TIMMONS. Madam Speaker, I missed votes on Thursday, March 5th, due to full-time military duties with the South Carolina Air National Guard. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 87; YEA on Roll Call No. 88; YEA on Roll Call No. 89; and NAY on Roll Call No. 90.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CREATIVE IMAGE BEAUTY SALON

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Creative Image Beauty Salon in Dearborn. Its years of dedicated service to our community are worthy of commendation.

Creative Image Beauty Salon has served Dearborn residents since 1997. The salon offers a variety of services designed to meet the individual needs of each customer, and they provide exceptional service thanks to the staffs many years of experience. The owner of Creative Image Beauty Salon, Haitham Mehanna, is a dedicated business owner with a commitment to satisfying his customers and enriching the Dearborn community. Mehanna is recognized among his family, peers, and clients as an honest and generous man who is eager to always lend a helping hand to local causes, working tirelessly to improve the community. Thanks to his leadership and the highclass work of his staff, Creative Image Beauty Salon has become an integral part of Dearborn, as it has united the city and consistently provides quality services to all its clients.

Today, we celebrate Creative Image Beauty Salon for its continued commitment to the Dearborn community. The salon's dedication to caring for every person who walks through the door is truly remarkable and serves a model that other businesses should endeavor to match. Each staff member goes above and beyond, striving to provide the best services possible. Without a doubt, the Creative Image

Beauty Salon will remain an economic and social asset to the city of Dearborn for years to come.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in celebrating Creative Image Beauty Salon. We are grateful for the salon's positive impact on our community and wish it continued success in the years ahead.

DINAH JAHNS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Dinah Jahns for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Dinah Jahns is a student at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Dinah Jahns is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Dinah Jahns for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING GRETA JOHANSSON, SBA DISTRICT DIRECTOR, NEW HAMPSHIRE

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Greta Johansson for her service as the Director of the New Hampshire office of the United States Small Business Administration (SBA).

Greta retires after 38 years of dedicated service to our nation's small businesses. Throughout her career, she has distinguished herself as a true leader in small business development and finance in the Granite State. Greta started her career with the SBA's Disaster Assistance office providing critical support to businesses that experienced natural disasters. She subsequently went on to serve in a key role in the Connecticut District Office as Deputy District Director for more than 14 years. Since 2011, Greta has led the New Hampshire District Office of the SBA. In her current role she has led the office's delivery of SBA programs and services throughout New Hampshire, working with lenders, resources partners, and economic development entities to foster entrepreneurship and business growth. Greta has distinguished herself as true leader in the Granite State business community and the positive impact she made will be seen for many years to come.

On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire's Second Congressional District, I commend Greta Johansson for her service in supporting the Granite State's small business and entrepreneurs. I look forward to our continued work together to support the small business community.

TRIBUTE TO TAMI KAGAN–ABRAMS—28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Tami Kagan-Abrams of the Hollywood Hills neighborhood of Los Angeles, California. Ms. Kagan-Abrams is a loving wife and mother, with a passion for volunteering and philanthropy, and has devoted her time to organizations and programs that benefit children and women.

Tami spent 10 years working in program management at Yahoo. She served on the board of directors for the Yahoo Employee Foundation, an employee-led and funded organization that grants funds to non-profit initiatives championed by the employee donors. Through the foundation, Tami successfully advocated for grants for JFS { Hope, one of only a few domestic violence shelters to house entire families and teenage boys, and The Mr. Holland's Opus Foundation, a non-profit organization that donates musical instruments to under-funded music programs and offers support services to school districts across the nation. Ms. Kagan-Abrams also spent 6 years with The Walt Disney Company, where she participated with the Disney VoluntEARS program, mentoring Army veterans transitioning back into civilian life and bringing her team to volunteer for JFS { Sova, a Community Food and Resource Program which provides supportive services and free groceries to over 9,000 people.

A decade ago, Tami began volunteering with the Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles (JFS) Young Leader Group, and after leading the Young Leaders for an annual term, she joined the JFS board of directors. As a board member, she assists with fundraising, provides direction and support through different committees, and is currently serving as the Public Policy committee chair. In addition to her efforts with the JFS, Ms. Kagan-Abrams chairs the Discretionary Funds Task Force for Los Angeles City Council District 4 and serves on the volunteer steering committee as the Projects Director for Abundant Housing Los Angeles.

Ms. Kagan-Abrams received her bachelor's degree in Communication from the University of California, Los Angeles, followed by her Master's in Communication Management from the University of Southern California. Tami lives in the Hollywood Hills with her husband and daughter.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring this exceptional, well-respected woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Tami Kagan-Abrams.

RECOGNIZING GHANAIAN AMERICANS

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the Ghanaian Americans and their contributions.

The United States of America is home to hundreds of thousands of people of Ghanaian heritage—including those who were born on this soil, those whose family emigrated for economic opportunity, and those who recently traced their roots to ancestors taken from Ghana as part of the Transatlantic slave trade.

The U.S. and Ghana share a long history with Kwame Nkrumah studying in American universities and working alongside Civil Rights leaders before becoming President of the first sub-Saharan African country to gain independence from colonization on March 6, 1957.

Today, the relationship between the two countries has deepened with the Year of Return and Ghana being among the top five African countries with a fast-growing immigrant population in the U.S. Last year Speaker PELOSI led a Congressional delegation to Ghana, where she called the trip ''transformative,'' recognizing the great strides the country has made since gaining independence.

However, today more than ever, Ghanaians living in the United States worry about immigration policies as well as accessing health and economic opportunities once promised by the American dream. In 2020, when everyone should be counted by the U.S. Census, many Ghanaians will surely be undercounted and underrepresented due to viral misinformation.

Ghanaian Americans are an essential fabric in the tapestry of America from the cab driver to the medical doctor. You will find them in all parts of the country from Chicago to New York to suburban Ohio and Massachusetts. The culture is hard to ignore with sumptuous food, the iconic Kente cloth, storytelling, inventions, architecture, and music.

This is important to remember as the United States continues to encourage democracy and bolster partnerships with Ghana in recognizing the 63rd anniversary of Ghana's independence, its thriving heritage, and the long-standing positive relationship between our two countries.

CELEBRATING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, today, we rise to celebrate Women's History Month and reflect on the generations of American women and their many contributions that have brought us to this place in our history.

Every March, we honor the countless contributions that women have made to this nation. Fearless leaders like the late Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, Coretta Scott King, Dorothy Heights, Dolores Huerta, Patsy Mink and Wilma Mankiller paved the way for us. We

would not be where we are today without them.

March is also our time to reflect on the work that remains to achieve true equality. Last year, we saw women challenging the status quo everywhere from sports and politics to emerging STEM fields and corporate boards. In fact, I am proud to serve in this Congress that has 127 women—the most in U.S history.

But too many women are still fighting to break down barriers.

The injustices that remain are many. Whether it is unequal pay or attacks on reproductive health, the persistent shadow of sexism and prejudice still undermines women in our society.

But I know that women are resilient.

And throughout it all, we are standing strong.

Today, I am reminded of the words of my mentor, Shirley Chisholm. She said, ''If they don't give you a seat at the table, bring a folding chair.''

I hope women and girls everywhere will bring their folding chairs and stay at the table. Because this month is more than a celebration of our past—it's a call for a better future tomorrow.

Happy Women's History Month.

CJ KRAMER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud CJ Kramer for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

CJ Kramer is a student at Three Creeks K–8 and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by CJ Kramer is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to CJ Kramer for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO FLORDELINA ''LENNI'' LARA—28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Flordelina ''Lenni'' Lara of the Atwater Village neighborhood of Los Angeles, California.

Flordelina ''Lenni'' Lara is a devoted wife to her husband, Yiu Lunglem, and mother of their two wonderful sons, Kyle and Lucas. Emphasizing education as a priority, Lenni has been a dedicated member of the Glenfeliz Boulevard Elementary School community since her family arrived in the neighborhood six years ago. She has taken on a prominent leadership role at the school where she dedicates her time to ensure the school runs smoothly and is a warm and nurturing environment for students and parents alike. Lenni brings a positive attitude and strong work ethic to all that she does and serves as a role model for the students at the school.

A selfless advocate for children and education, Ms. Lara is responsible for supporting the development of several new programs at Glenfeliz Boulevard Elementary School. She played a critical role in creating a technology program with a 5-year vision, and volunteers in classrooms with technology instruction. She has been a member of the school's governance committee and has served as a Parent Teacher Association officer for three years. Lenni volunteers with the school's cooking classes by assisting the professional chefs who teach parents and students healthy ways to cook and eat. She also dedicates her time to helping the school organize activities, fundraisers, and projects that benefit the entire student body.

In addition to her work with the school, Lenni is a highly respected and an admired member of her community. She assists other parents to find their voices within the school community and encourages them to get involved in school-related activities.

Glenfeliz Boulevard Elementary School depends upon Ms. Lara to support the school in every way needed. Her contributions are consistent and impactful—each and every student benefits from her generous work.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring this exceptional, well-respected woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Flordelina ''Lenni'' Lara.

HONORING RUBY ANN WHITTLE SMITH

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me as I rise to pay tribute to Ruby Ann Whittle Smith and celebrate her 100th birthday.

Mrs. Smith was born on March 15, 1920, to George and Dora Whittle in South Hill, Virginia. In 1923, the Whittle Family moved from Virginia to Baltimore, Maryland. After a short stay there, they moved to New Jersey where, in 1925, they settled into their home in Orange. Mrs. Smith attended the Orange Public Schools until her graduation from Orange High School in 1940.

After high school, Mrs. Smith furthered her education at the New York Institute of Dietetics. Once she graduated, she worked as an intern at Provident Hospital in Baltimore, MD. When she finished her internship, Mrs. Smith returned to New Jersey and became a dietician at the Community Hospital in Newark, NJ. Eventually, she left the hospital and began a career at the Western Electric Company, a subsidiary of AT&T, in Kearney, NJ, where she made telephones for distribution. She worked in the Western Electric office for 30 years before she retired in 1985.

She was supported throughout her life by her husband, Willie E. Smith, Sr. They were married for 37 years. In addition, she was an active member of New Hope Baptist Church in East Orange and served as a volunteer to Hospice, Inc. Many church members continue to visit Mrs. Smith to this day through the New Hope Visiting Ministry. She was a very active member of the East Orange Senior Citizens Exercise and Wellness Program. She enjoyed the program's social events, participated in the exercise programs, transported those who needed a ride around town, and rode in Memorial Day parades.

Today, she spends her time with friends at the Orange Retirement Club in East Orange, where she enjoys the exercises, BINGO, lunch, outings and plenty of fun.

Madam Speaker, I ask my fellow members of the U.S. House of Representatives to join me and recognize Ruby Ann Whittle Smith for bringing joy and love to the people of my district for 100 years.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ADVANCING THE QUALITY AND UNDERSTANDING OF AMERICAN AQUACULTURE (AQUAA) ACT

HON. COLLIN C. PETERSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. PETERSON. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letter from Stronger America Through Seafood (SATS) reflecting their support for my recently introduced Advancing the Quality and Understanding of American Aquaculture (AQUAA) Act, H.R. 6191, which will enable the growth of sustainable U.S. marine aquaculture.

MARCH 11, 2020.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We are contacting you regarding the Advancing the Quality and Understanding of American Aquaculture (AQUAA) Act, legislation sponsored by Reps. Collin Peterson (D–MN) and Steven Palazzo (R–MS) that will enable the growth of sustainable U.S. marine aquaculture.

Demand for healthful, affordable, and sustainable protein is increasing dramatically. Globally, aquaculture is one of the fastest growing forms of food production. According to the World Bank, by 2030, aquaculture's share in global seafood production will expand to supply over 60% of fish for human consumption, whereas wild-capture seafood production will remain steady. Marine aquaculture requires no land, minimal fresh water and a relatively small amount of space to provide abundant, healthful seafood making it the most efficient means of animal protein production. Further, farmed seafood provides a source for local, traceable, affordable meal options that benefit public health.

The United States' long coastline, expansive Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), skilled labor force, superior technology, ample feed sources, and growing seafood market put it at the top of the list of countries with aquaculture potential. In fact, a doubling of U.S.

aquaculture production to about 1 million tons could create an additional 50,000 direct and indirect jobs, assuming 20 direct jobs per 1,000 tons of seafood produced, or five jobs per 1,000 tons in equipment, feeds, processing, marketing, and food service. These jobs could provide stable, year-round employment opportunities in coastal and fishing communities where opportunities are often limited and seasonally dependent.

Unfortunately, the U.S. ranks only 16th globally in aquaculture production. The problem? U.S. marine aquaculture is constrained by regulatory hurdles, including overlapping jurisdiction of federal, state, and local governments, and the absence of a clearly-defined permitting process. As a result, American investment, jobs, and technology are forced overseas while our dependence on imported seafood continues to rise—The U.S. now imports 91% of our seafood. Until Congress acts, the economic, environmental and societal benefits of aquaculture will remain inaccessible in the U.S.

To remedy these challenges, the AQUAA Act establishes a clear permitting process for U.S. marine aquaculture and prioritizes environmental and societal health by establishing National Standards for Sustainable Offshore Aquaculture. AQUAA leverages modern siting and monitoring technologies to mitigate impacts on other ocean-based industries and ecosystems. It also provides for strict federal enforcement and includes a process for robust public input which ensures that coastal communities and states are considered prior to permitting new operations. In short, AQUAA provides much-needed regulatory certainty for U.S. marine farmers while also preserving the environment, local economies and public health. AQUAA will lead to increased U.S. seafood production that benefits ALL Americans.

With quick action by the U.S. Congress, Americans may soon see marine aquaculture become a reality for the betterment of our businesses and of our citizens. Please contact us for more details on how AQUAA might benefit your constituents.

Sincerely,

STRONGER AMERICA THROUGH SEAFOOD.

Bill Taylor and Bill Dewey, Taylor Shellfish, Shelton, WA; Jessee Mitchell, Wenger, Sabetha, KS; Todd Madsen, Blue Ocen Mariculture, Kona, HI; Max Holtzman, Pontos Aqua Advisory, Washington, D.C.; Michael Cigliano, Santa Monica Seafood, Santa Monica, CA; Bill DiMento, High Liner Foods, Portsmouth, NH; Horace G. Dawson, Red Lobster Seafood Co., Orlando, FL; Mark Frisch, Sea Best, Inc., Jacksonville, FL; David Kelly, InnovaSea, Boston, MA; Chris Stock, Zeigler Bros., Inc., Gardners, PA; Kathryn Unger, Cargill, Wayzata, MN; Tony Dal Ponte, Pacific Seafood, Clackamas, OR; Sean O'Scannlain, Fortune International, Bensenville, IL; Brad Christie, Sysco, Houston, TX; Allen LeBalnc, Calysta, Menlo Park, CA; Omar Alfi, Pacifico Aquaculture, San Diego, CA.

GRETCHEN KUKA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Gretchen Kuka for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Gretchen Kuka is a student at Three Creeks K–8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Gretchen Kuka is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Gretchen Kuka for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

FEED OUR VETS

HON. ANTHONY BRINDISI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. BRINDISI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the "Feed Our Vets" nonprofit organization located in New York Mills, NY and to recognize the volunteer staff for providing food assistance to our veterans who are experiencing financial challenges.

Veterans have played an essential role in defending our nation, and we must show our gratitude for their service and sacrifice by ensuring that they are not left behind on the battlefield of hunger once they return home.

I ask that my colleagues in the House join me in honoring "Feed Our Vets" and their volunteers for providing this invaluable service to our veterans in Central New York.

TRIBUTE TO VICTORIA MALONE—28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Victoria Malone of Montrose, California.

Victoria Malone is a devoted wife and mother with a lifelong passion for giving back to her community. She has been a part of the Montrose community since her teenage years, when she attended Crescenta Valley High School (CVHS) before going on to study at San Diego State University.

As the Executive Director of the Montrose-Verdugo City Chamber of Commerce (MVCC), Ms. Malone has positively impacted many small businesses, and having owned and operated her own business in the area, she has made it her mission to provide vital support to the local businesses. Victoria has helped the chamber become financially sustainable, thus allowing the MVCC to provide numerous charitable donations back to the Montrose community, and she leads the chamber in organizing the annual Montrose Oktoberfest, a community event that has been produced for over four decades.

In addition to her work with the MVCC, Victoria devotes her time to volunteering for several local events and organizations. She has volunteered for the Montrose Shopping Park Association Small Business Saturday and the association's Arts and Crafts Festival as Street and Traffic Patrol, and for several years, for the Montrose Christmas Parade Association. Victoria and her husband, Michael Marshall volunteered at the Crescenta Valley Fireworks Association event, where they worked from set-up to clean-up, and also at the 2018 Prom Plus event for CVHS students. Ms. Malone and her family helped pay off the lunch meal debt for CVHS students and families who were struggling to cover that expense. In addition, for the last two decades, they have opened up their home to several rescue dogs who were in search of their forever homes.

One of the greatest examples of Victoria's generosity is the four weeks that she spent volunteering in Kathmandu, Nepal, where she assisted an orphanage that helped children and elder women. Victoria donated school supplies, clothing, and backpacks, provided art instruction to the children, and helped manage the kitchen and supplies. Using her background as a life coach, she donated her services to local Nepalese women at a Woman's Empowerment Workshop.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring this exceptional, well-respected woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Victoria Malone.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RESILIENT ELECTIONS DURING QUARANTINES AND NATURAL DISASTERS ACT OF 2020

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, the Novel Coronavirus ("COVID–19") has already infected more than 100,000 people worldwide and killed more than 4,000 people. Meanwhile, millions of Americans are anxious about their health, safety, and job security. Earlier today, the World Health Organization officially declared COVID–19 a global pandemic and the director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases acknowledged that COVID–19 is "going to get worse."

Without broad congressional action, COVID–19 has the potential to disrupt every aspect of American society, including the 2020 primary and general elections. The virus will likely impact voters who cannot leave their homes as well as those who are under mandatory or self-imposed quarantines at the recommendation of health experts. To make matters worse, the Election Assistance Commission has found that 58 percent of all poll workers in 2018 were over 60—the prime at-risk population for COVID–19.

The Resilient Elections During Quarantines and Natural Disasters Act of 2020 requires that states and localities create and publish a plan to operate their elections if large numbers of voters or poll workers have been subjected to a mandatory quarantine or a self-quarantine at the advice of government officials or health experts. In the event that a quarter of states declaring an emergency related to COVID–19,

another infectious disease, or a natural disaster, this legislation also requires states to offer all voters the ability to vote by absentee ballot. Finally, this legislation requires that states offer prepaid self-sealing postage to voters who vote absentee in order to reduce the risk associated with infection at post offices.

It is critical that we take a broad view of the response to COVID–19 and ensure that our elections are safe, secure, and accessible to all.

IN RECOGNITION OF ANAN AMERI AS SHE IS NAMED THE 2020 ARAB AMERICAN OF THE YEAR

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Anan Ameri as she is named the 2020 Arab American of the Year by ACCESS. Dr. Ameri's lifetime of community service and activism is worthy of commendation, and we are proud to recognize her achievements today.

Anan Ameri is a pillar of Washtenaw County. For over forty years, she has dedicated her career to advocating for social justice and equity, upholding immigrant rights, and preserving Arab American stories. Dr. Ameri, an author, educator, and activist, is especially known in our community as the founding director for the Arab American National Museum. Thanks to her steadfast leadership and revolutionary vision, she secured the museum's Smithsonian affiliation, making it the only Arab American organization in the prestigious network. In addition, Dr. Ameri is the national president of the Palestine Aid Society of America and was inducted to Michigan's Hall of Fame for her extraordinary efforts in 2016.

Today, we celebrate Anan Ameri for her lifetime of service to her community. Born in Damascus, Syria and raised in Amman, Jordan, Dr. Ameri understands the daily trials and tribulations immigrants experience. As such, she has advocated for their voices and continues to fight to ensure their rights are upheld. Beyond her career in activism, she also has served as a mentor to young woman. She has nurtured women to pursue their dreams, strive for excellence, and embrace their heritage. Dr. Ameri truly embodies the hopes and dreams of immigrants coming to America and has made a difference in our Michigan community. Her years of service 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 Dr. Anan Ameri. Her decades of selfless service make her a deserving recipient of the Arab American of the Year Award. I am grateful for her lasting impact and wish her continued success in the years ahead.

ETHAN PERINN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ethan Perinn for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Ethan Perinn is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ethan Perinn is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ethan Perinn for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DARIN LaHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I missed votes on February 11, February 12, and February 13 because I attended funeral services for my district staffer, Barb Baker. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 57; NAY on Roll Call No. 58; YEA on Roll Call No. 59; NAY on Roll Call No. 60; YEA on Roll Call No. 61; YEA on Roll Call No. 62; YEA on Roll Call No. 63; YEA on Roll Call No. 64; YEA on Roll Call No. 65; YEA on Roll Call No. 66; YEA on Roll Call No. 67; YEA on Roll Call No. 68; NAY on Roll Call No. 69; and NAY on Roll Call No. 70.

TRIBUTE TO BARBARA WEBER—28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Barbara Weber of La Cañada Flintridge, California.

Born on a military base in Southern California, Barbara Gillis grew up in several states, including Massachusetts, Ohio, Michigan and Texas. Graduating as the Valedictorian from Ladycliff College in Highland Falls, New York, Barbara majored in math and minored in chemistry, and earned a job at Bell Labs in New Jersey where she met her husband, Bill. Barbara and Bill moved to Pasadena, California in 1967 where Bill was employed at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL). After teaching kindergarten at a local school, Ms. Weber soon joined the staff at JPL.

Barbara was one of the few women working at JPL in 1969, and she single-handedly changed their maternity policy regarding pregnant employees by working until her due date. She stayed at JPL until 1974, when she and Bill bought their house in La Cañada Flintridge. Ms. Weber then took classes in computing and accounting at Pasadena City College and began consulting for local businesses.

Barbara's volunteer work in the community is extensive. She has served on the boards of several La Cañada Flintridge Parent-Teacher Associations, assisted with various La Cañada Unified School District bond measures and was a classroom volunteer at Paradise Canyon Elementary School. Other organizations that have benefited from her volunteer service include Huntington Hospital, La Cañada Newcomers Club, the Assistance League of Flintridge and Caltech Women's Club, and she is a founding member of the Caltech Women's Investment Club. In addition, Ms. Weber is a Eucharistic Minister at St. Bede the Venerable Church, where she was a leader in the Peace and Justice Ministry, and since 1984, has been an active member of St. Bede's Skidettes which prepare and deliver daily lunches to the homeless at various shelters in the Los Angeles area.

Barbara and her husband, Bill enjoy spending time with their three children, Billy, Christa and David and seven grandchildren.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring this exceptional, well-respected woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Barbara Weber.

HONORING ANNIE VIRGINIA JOHNSON RICE

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me as I rise to pay tribute to Annie Virginia Johnson Rice and celebrate her 100th birthday.

Annie Virginia Johnson Rice was born in Brightwood, Virginia on March 12, 1920. She was the sixth of 11 children born to the late Ernest and Louise Johnson and educated in the Madison County School System. She received her early Christian education at the Chestnut Grove Baptist Church, where she was baptized in the Robinson River.

Annie moved to Washington, D.C. as a young woman and soon developed a keen appreciation for many of Washington's cultural attractions.

Her life's work was caring for her children and late husband. She was the adoring wife of the late James A. Rice and a devoted mother, grandmother, great grandmother and great, great grandmother.

She is similarly committed to her church and community. Annie is a long-time member of Simms United Methodist Church and has served as a communion steward, church

greeter, and assisted with the acolytes for many years.

In addition, Annie was an active volunteer with the Meals on Wheels Program for more than 20 years. The program allowed her to do what she enjoys most—travel around her adopted hometown to improve the lives of others.

But Annie's favorite passion is hats. At church, she can be found in her pew regally adorned in one of her many decorated hats with matching gloves and handbag. Her favorite color is purple, but her accessories can be a rainbow of colors.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and recognize Annie Virginia Johnson Rice for bringing joy and love to so many people and celebrate her 100th birthday.

DJILL SUMAKUL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 11, 2020

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Djill Sumakul for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Djill Sumakul is a student at Oberon Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Djill Sumakul is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Djill Sumakul for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassador for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 12, 2020 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 24

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

SD–538

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Economic Policy

To hold hearings to examine winning the economic competition between the United States and China.

SD–538

MARCH 25

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Cybersecurity

To hold hearings to examine the findings of the Cyberspace Solarium Commission.

SD–G50

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2021 for Indian programs.

SD–628

MARCH 31

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Personnel

To hold hearings to examine the final recommendations and report of the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service.

SD–G50

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1677–S1711

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3434–3450, and S. Res. 539–541. **Page S1703**

Measures Passed:

Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability: By 53 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 70), Senate passed H.J. Res. 76, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability". **Pages S1678–85**

AmeriCorps: Senate agreed to S. Res. 540, recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States. **Page S1707**

Maine 200th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 541, recognizing and celebrating the 200th anniversary of the entry of Maine into the Union as the 23d State. **Page S1707**

Savanna's Act: Senate passed S. 227, to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S1708–09**

Not Invisible Act: Senate passed S. 982, to increase intergovernmental coordination to identify and combat violent crime within Indian lands and of Indians, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S1709–10**

Authorizing the Use of Emancipation Hall: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 91, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the Chinese-American veterans of World War II. **Page S1710**

Measures Indefinitely Postponed:

Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability: Senate indefinitely postponed S.J. Res. 56, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability". **Page S1685**

House Messages:

Taiwan Allies International Protection and Enhancement Initiative (TAIPEI) Act: Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 1678, to express United States support for Taiwan's diplomatic alliances around the world. **Page S1710**

Danly Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, March 12, 2020, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of James P. Danly, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and that notwithstanding Rule XXII, the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination occur at 11:45 a.m., and that all post-cloture time expire at 1:45 p.m. **Page S1710**

Messages from the House: **Page S1702**

Measures Referred: **Page S1702**

Executive Communications: **Page S1702**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S1702–03**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1703–05**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1705–07**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1701–02**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1707**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—70) **Page S1685**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:06 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 12, 2020. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1710.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2021 for the Navy and Marine Corps, after receiving testimony from Thomas B. Modley, Acting Secretary of the Navy, Admiral Mike Gilday, Chief of Naval Operations, and General David H. Berger, Commandant of the Marine Corps, all of the Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: GAO AND CBO

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2021 for the Government Accountability Office and Congressional Budget Office, after receiving testimony from Gene Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office; and Phillip Swagel, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

APPROPRIATIONS: HUD

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2021 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, after receiving testimony from Ben Carson, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

APPROPRIATIONS: ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2021 for the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation within the Department of the Interior, after receiving testimony from R.D. James, Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), and Lieutenant General Todd Semonite, Commanding General and Chief of Engineers, Army Corps of Engineers, both of the Department of Defense; and Brenda Burman, Commissioner for the Bureau of Reclamation, and Timothy R. Petty, Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, both of the Department of the Interior.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower concluded a hearing to examine Marine Corps ground modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2021 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from James F. Geurts, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition, and Lieutenant General Eric M. Smith, USMC, Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Development Command, and Deputy Commandant for Combat Development and Integration, both of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded a hearing to examine personnel programs in the Department of Defense in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2021 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Thomas P. McCaffery, Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs, Virginia S. Penrod, Acting Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Thomas A. Constable, Acting Assistant Secretary for Readiness, Elizabeth P. Van Winkle, Executive Director, Office of Force Resiliency, E. Casey Wardynski, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Gregory J. Slavonic, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, John A. Fedrigo, Performing the Duties of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Lieutenant General Thomas C. Seamands, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, G–1, Vice Admiral John B. Nowell, Jr., USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Manpower, Personnel, Training, and Education, N–1, Lieutenant General Brian T. Kelly, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower, Personnel and Services, and Lieutenant General Michael A. Rocco, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, all of the Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1046, to establish the Office of Internet Connectivity and Growth, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3132, to extend the Undertaking Spam, Spyware, And Fraud Enforcement With Enforcers beyond Borders Act of 2006;

S. 3191, to increase the capacity of research and development programs of the Federal Government that focus on industries of the future, with an amendment;

S. 3248, to reauthorize the United States Anti-Doping Agency, with an amendment;

S. 3303, to amend title 49, United States Code, to promote transportation career opportunities and improve diversity in the workforce, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 835, to impose criminal sanctions on certain persons involved in international doping fraud conspiracies, to provide restitution for victims of such conspiracies, and to require sharing of information with the United States Anti-Doping Agency to assist its fight against doping; and

Routine lists in the Coast Guard.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Neil Jacobs, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, Finch Fulton, of Alabama, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation, and John Chase Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be Inspector General, Federal Communications Commission, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Douglas Benevento, of Colorado, to be Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, who was introduced by Senators Gardner and Daines, and David A. Wright, of South Carolina, who was introduced by Representative Duncan, and Christopher T. Hanson, of Michigan, who was introduced by Senator Feinstein, both to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Kipp Kranbuhl, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Sarah C. Arbes, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, and Jason J. Fichtner, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board.

SYRIA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Assad's campaign against the Syrian people, including S. 52, to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, encourage a negotiated political settlement, and hold Syrian human rights abusers accountable for their crimes, after receiving testimony from Caesar, Syrian Military Defector; Omar Alshogre, Syrian Emergency Task Force; and Raed al-Saleh, Syria Civil Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 3045, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to protect United States critical infrastructure by ensuring that the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency has the legal tools it needs to notify private and public sector entities put at risk by cybersecurity vulnerabilities in the networks and systems that control critical assets of the United States, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2757, to waive the imposition of a civil fine for certain first-time paperwork violations by small business concerns, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3412, to require a guidance clarity statement on certain agency guidance;

S. 2502, to ban the Federal procurement of certain drones and other unmanned aircraft systems, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2722, to prohibit agencies from using Federal funds for publicity or propaganda purposes, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3418, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to allow the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide hazard mitigation assistance to reduce risks from disasters and natural hazards, and other related environmental harm;

S. 3207, to require the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to establish a Cybersecurity State Coordinator in each State, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3332, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the halt in pension payments for Members of Congress sentenced for certain offenses;

H.R. 3675, to require a review of Department of Homeland Security trusted traveler programs;

H.R. 2589, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a homeland intelligence doctrine for the Department of Homeland Security, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 4761, to ensure U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers, agents, and other personnel have adequate synthetic opioid detection equipment, that

the Department of Homeland Security has a process to update synthetic opioid detection capability;

H.R. 5273, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a plan to increase to 100 percent the rates of scanning of commercial and passenger vehicles entering the United States at land ports of entry along the border using large-scale non-intrusive inspection systems to enhance border security, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 4713, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department of Homeland Security, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 4739, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to protect U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers, agents, other personnel, and canines against potential synthetic opioid exposure, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2847, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 42 Main Street in Slatersville, Rhode Island, as the ''Specialist Matthew R. Turcotte Post Office'';

S. 2945, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 171 South Maple Street in Dana, Indiana, as the Ernest ''Ernie'' T. Pyle Post Office;

S. 3257, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 311 West Wisconsin Avenue in Tomahawk, Wisconsin, as the ''Einar 'Sarge' H. Ingman, Jr. Post Office Building'';

S. 3365, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Crosby Street in Mansfield, Louisiana, as the ''Dr. C.O. Simpkins, Sr., Post Office'';

H.R. 1833, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 Tulip Avenue in Floral Park, New York, as the ''Lieutenant Michael R. Davidson Post Office Building'';

H.R. 3207, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 114 Mill Street in Hookstown, Pennsylvania, as the ''Staff Sergeant Dylan Elchin Post Office Building'';

H.R. 3329, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5186 Benito Street in Montclair, California, as the ''Paul Eaton Post Office Building'';

H.R. 4794, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8320 13th Avenue in Brooklyn, New York, as the ''Mother Frances Xavier Cabrini Post Office Building'';

H.R. 4981, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2505 Derita Avenue in Charlotte, North Carolina, as the ''Julius L. Chambers Civil Rights Memorial Post Office'';

H.R. 5037, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3703 North Main Street in Farmville, North Carolina, as the ''Walter B. Jones, Jr. Post Office''; and

H.R. 3317, to permit the Scipio A. Jones Post Office in Little Rock, Arkansas, to accept and display a portrait of Scipio A. Jones.

EARN IT ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 3398, to establish a National Commission on Online Child Sexual Exploitation Prevention, focusing on holding the tech industry accountable in the fight against online child sexual exploitation, after receiving testimony from John Shehan, and Nicole, both of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Alexandria, Virginia; Jared Sine, Match Group, Dallas, Texas; and Mary Graw Leary, Catholic University of America Columbus School of Law, and Elizabeth Banker, Internet Association, both of Washington, D.C.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 27 public bills, H.R. 6187–6213; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 896, were introduced. **Pages H1660–61**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1662–63**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1591**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:54 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H1597**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rev. Jonathan Slavinskas, St. Bernard's Church of Our Lady of Providence Parish, Worcester, Massachusetts. **Page 1597**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H1597–98, H1640**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Tuesday, March 10th.

Support for Veterans in Effective Apprenticeships Act: S. 760, to enable registered apprenticeship programs to better serve veterans, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 412 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 97. **Pages H1613–14**

Secure 5G and Beyond Act of 2020: The House agreed to take from the Speaker's table and pass S. 893, to require the President to develop a strategy to ensure the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems and infrastructure in the United States and to assist allies and strategic partners in maximizing the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems, infrastructure, and software. **Pages H1614–15**

USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act of 2020: The House passed H.R. 6172, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, by a yea-and-nay vote of 278 yeas to 136 nays, Roll No. 98. Subsequently, Representative Buck offered an amendment to the title, which was rejected by a recorded vote of 35 ayes to 376 noes, Roll No. 99. **Pages H1622–37**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment printed in H. Rept. 116–415 shall be considered as adopted. **Page H1622**

H. Res. 891, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68), the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2486) and the bill (H.R. 6172) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 223 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 96, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 95. **Pages H1599–H1613**

Directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress: The House 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, by a recorded vote of 227 ayes to 186 noes, Roll No. 101. **Pages H1615–22, H1637–40**

Rejected the McCaul motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 198 ayes to 212 noes with one answering ''present'', Roll No. 100. **Pages H1637–39**

H. Res. 891, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68), the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2486) and the bill (H.R. 6172) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 223 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 96, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 95. **Pages H1599–H1613**

Dignity in Aging Act: The House agreed to take from the Speaker's table and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 4334, to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2020 through 2024. **Pages H1640–48**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, March 12th. **Page H1648**

Recess: The House recessed at 7:30 p.m. and reconvened at 11:10 p.m. **Page H1659**

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate today and message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appear on pages H1615 and H1640.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1612–13, H1613, H1613–14, H1636–37, H1637, H1639, and H1639–40. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of the Interior. Testimony was heard from David Bernhardt, Secretary, Department of the Interior.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a budget hearing on the Department of the Treasury. Testimony was heard from Steven Mnuchin, Secretary, Department of the Treasury.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the National Labor Relations Board. Testimony was heard from John Ring, Chairman, National Labor Relations Board; and Peter Robb, General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board.

APPROPRIATIONS—FEDERAL COMMUNICATION COMMISSION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held a budget hearing on the Federal Communication Commission. Testimony was heard from Ajit Pai, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission; and Jessica Rosenworcel, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Federal Aviation Administration. Testimony was heard from Steve Dickson, Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS—IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Department of Homeland Security held a budget hearing on the Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Testimony was heard from Matthew T. Albence, Deputy Director and Senior Official Performing the Duties of the Director, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security.

U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND (CENTCOM)

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing entitled ''U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM)'' Testimony was heard from General Kenneth F. McKenzie, Jr., Commander, U.S. Central Command. This hearing was closed.

APPROPRIATIONS—FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Food and Drug Administration. Testimony was heard from Stephen M. Hahn, M.D., Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

APPROPRIATIONS—ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the Architect of the Capitol. Testimony was heard from J. Brett Blanton, Architect of the Capitol.

IMPACT OF PFAS EXPOSURE ON SERVICEMEMBERS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled ''Impact of PFAS Exposure on Servicemembers''. Testimony was heard from Maureen Sullivan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Environment, Department of Defense; and public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the Government Publishing Office. Testimony was heard from Hugh Halpern, Director, Government Publishing Office.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY—ENERGY, OFFICE OF SCIENCE, AND ENVIRONMENTAL

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Energy Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy, Office of Science, and Environmental. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Energy officials: Chris Fall, Director, Office of Science; Lane Genatowski, Director, Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy; and William White, Senior Advisor to the Under Secretary of Science for Environmental Management.

U.S. AFRICA COMMAND (AFRICOM)

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing entitled ''U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM)'' Testimony was heard from General Stephen J. Townsend, U.S. Army, Commander, U.S. Africa Command. This hearing was closed.

NATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES AND U.S. MILITARY ACTIVITY IN NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''National Security Challenges and U.S. Military Activity in North and South America''. Testimony was heard from Kenneth P. Rapuano, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense

and Global Security, Department of Defense; Admiral Craig S. Faller, U.S. Navy, Commander, U.S. Southern Command; and General Terrence J. O'Shaughnessy, U.S. Air Force, Commander, U.S. Northern Command.

REVIEWING DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY STRATEGY, POLICY, AND PROGRAMS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021: MAINTAINING A ROBUST ECOSYSTEM FOR OUR TECHNOLOGICAL EDGE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Intelligence and Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing entitled ''Reviewing Department of Defense Science and Technology Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Fiscal Year 2021: Maintaining a Robust Ecosystem for Our Technological Edge''. Testimony was heard from Michael D. Griffin, Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, Office of the Secretary of Defense; Bruce D. Jette, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology, Department of the Army; James F. Geurts, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition, Department of the Navy; and William Roper, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of the Air Force.

SEALIFT AND MOBILITY REQUIREMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces; and Subcommittee on Readiness held a joint hearing entitled ''Sealift and Mobility Requirements in Support of the National Defense Strategy''. Testimony was heard from General Steve Lyons, Commander, U.S. Transportation Command; Mark H. Buzby, Maritime Administrator, U.S. Maritime Administration; Vice Admiral Ricky L. Williamson, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Fleet Readiness and Logistics (N4), Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy; and Lieutenant General David S. Nahom, U.S. Air Force, Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Programs, Department of the Air Force.

PROTECTING CONGRESS' POWER OF THE PURSE AND THE RULE OF LAW

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Protecting Congress' Power of the Purse and the Rule of Law''. Testimony was heard from Thomas H. Armstrong, General Counsel, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

THE HEALTHY FAMILIES ACT (H.R. 1784): EXAMINING A PLAN TO SECURE PAID SICK LEAVE FOR U.S. WORKERS

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing entitled ''The Healthy Families Act (H.R. 1784): Examining a Plan to Secure Paid Sick Leave for U.S. Workers''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a markup on H.R. 5279, the ''Cosmetic Safety Enhancement Act of 2019''; H.R. 5668, the ''MODERN Labeling Act of 2020''; H.R. 5663, the ''Safeguarding Therapeutics Act''; H.R. 4866, the ''National Centers of Excellence in Continuous Pharmaceutical Manufacturing Act of 2019''; H.R. 4712, the ''Fairness in Orphan Drug Exclusivity Act''; H.R. 2117, the ''FASTER Act of 2019''; H.R. 2468, the ''School-Based Allergies and Asthma Management Program Act''; H.R. 2271, the ''Scarlett's Sunshine on Sudden Unexpected Death Act''; H.R. 4801, the ''Healthy Start Reauthorization Act of 2019''; H.R. 1379, the ''Ensuring Lasting Smiles Act''; H.R. 2477, the ''BENES Act of 2019''; H.R. 5534, the ''Comprehensive Immunosuppressive Drug Coverage for Kidney Transplant Patients Act''; and H.R. 3935, the ''Protecting Patients Transportation to Care Act''. H.R. 5279, H.R. 5668, H.R. 4712, H.R. 2117, H.R. 2468, H.R. 4866, H.R. 2271, H.R. 2477, H.R. 5534 were forwarded to the full Committee, as amended. H.R. 5663, H.R. 4801, H.R. 1379, H.R. 3935 were forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

HOLDING WELLS FARGO ACCOUNTABLE: EXAMINING THE ROLE OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS IN THE BANK'S EGREGIOUS PATTERN OF CUSTOMER ABUSES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Holding Wells Fargo Accountable: Examining the Role of the Board of Directors in the Bank's Egregious Pattern of Customer Abuses''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE CRISIS IN IDLIB

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism held a hearing entitled ''The Crisis in Idlib''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ANTAGONIZING THE NEIGHBORHOOD: PUTIN'S FROZEN CONFLICTS AND THE CONFLICT IN UKRAINE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, Energy, and the Environment held a

hearing entitled ''Antagonizing the Neighborhood: Putin's Frozen Conflicts and the Conflict in Ukraine''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SECURING AMERICA'S TRANSPORTATION AND MARITIME SYSTEMS: A REVIEW OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2021 BUDGET REQUESTS FOR THE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AND THE U.S. COAST GUARD

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation and Maritime Security held a hearing entitled ''Securing America's Transportation and Maritime Systems: A Review of the Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Requests for the Transportation Security Administration and the U.S. Coast Guard''. Testimony was heard from David Pekoske, Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security; and Admiral Karl L. Schultz, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard.

RESOURCING DHS' CYBERSECURITY AND INNOVATION MISSIONS: A REVIEW OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2021 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE CYBERSECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY AGENCY AND THE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DIRECTORATE

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Innovation held a hearing entitled ''Resourcing DHS' Cybersecurity and Innovation Missions: A Review of the Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Request for the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency and the Science and Technology Directorate''. Testimony was heard from Chris Krebs, Director, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Department of Homeland Security; and Andre Hentz, Acting Deputy Under Secretary for Science and Technology, Department of Homeland Security.

CONFRONTING THE CORONAVIRUS: THE FEDERAL RESPONSE

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Confronting the Coronavirus: The Federal Response''. Testimony was heard from Ken Cuccinelli, Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of Homeland Security; and Stephen C. Redd, M.D., Deputy Director for Public Health Service and Implementation Science, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1548, for the relief of Maria Carmen Castro Ramirez and J. Refugio Carreno Rojas; H.R. 5602, the ''Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act of 2020''; H.R. 2733, the ''Savanna's Act''; H.R. 2438, the ''Not Invisible Act of 2019''; and H.R. 6100, the ''Strengthening the Opposition to Female Genital Mutilation Act''. H.R. 1548 and H.R. 6100 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 5602, H.R. 2733, and H.R. 2438 were ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 139, the ''Springfield Race Riot National Historic Monument Act''; H.R. 1162, the ''Water Recycling Investment and Improvement Act''; H.R. 2473, the ''Securing Access for the central Valley and Enhancing (SAVE) Water Resources Act''; H.R. 3094, to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806, and for other purposes; H.R. 3250, the ''Julius Rosenwald and the Rosenwald Schools Act of 2019''; H.R. 3349, the ''Republic of Texas Legation Memorial Act''; H.R. 3723, the ''Desalination Development Act''; H.R. 4153, the ''Health Care Access for Urban Native Veterans Act''; H.R. 4891, the ''Western Water Security Act of 2019''; H.R. 5068, the ''Women Who Worked on the Home Front World War II Memorial Act''; and H.R. 5126, the ''Direct Enhancement of Snapper Conservation and the Economy through Novel Devices Act of 2019''. H.R. 4891, H.R. 5068, H.R. 5126, H.R. 139, H.R. 1162, H.R. 2473, H.R. 3094, H.R. 3250, H.R. 3349, and H.R. 3723 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 4153 was ordered reported, without amendment.

CORONAVIRUS PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee began a hearing entitled ''Coronavirus Preparedness and Response''.

FAMILIES FIRST CORONAVIRUS RESPONSE ACT

Committee on Rules: Full Committee began a hearing on H.R. 6201, the ''Families First Coronavirus Response Act''. Testimony was heard Chairman Lowey, Chairman Pallone, Chairman Scott of Virginia, and Representatives Granger, Burgess, Foxx, Sewell, and Estes.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a hearing entitled ''Reauthorization of the National Institute of Standards and Technology''. Testimony was heard from Walter G. Copan, Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology, and Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 6079, ''Microloan Improvement Act of 2020''; H.R. 6078, ''Microloan Transparency and Accountability Act of 2020''; H.R. 6133, to reauthorize the State Trade Expansion Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; and H.R. 6021, the ''Northern Mariana Islands Small Business Development Act''. H.R. 6079, H.R. 6078, H.R. 6133, and H.R. 6021 were ordered reported, without amendment.

FEMA'S PRIORITIES FOR 2020 AND BEYOND: COORDINATING MISSION AND VISION

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management held a hearing entitled ''FEMA's Priorities for 2020 and Beyond: Coordinating Mission and Vision''. Testimony was heard from Peter T. Gaynor, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

COMBATTING CHILD POVERTY IN AMERICA

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Worker and Family Support held a hearing entitled ''Combatting Child Poverty in America''. Testimony was heard from Joy Bivens, Agency Director, Department of Job and Family Services, Franklin County, Ohio; and public witnesses.

NSA BUDGET HEARING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''NSA Budget Hearing''. This hearing was closed.

Joint Meetings

THE AMERICAN LEGION LEGISLATIVE PRESENTATION

Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs: Committee concluded a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of The American Legion, after receiving testimony from James W. Oxford, Joseph Sharpe, Daniel Seehafer, Melissa Bryant, Chanin Nuntavong, Ralph Bozella, and Vincent Troiola, all of The American Legion, Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 2020

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: to hold hearings to examine agriculture innovation and the Federal biotechnology regulatory framework, 10 a.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2021 for the Department of Agriculture, 10:30 a.m., SD–138.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine United States Central Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2021 and the Future Years Defense Program; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC–217, 9 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on the Budget: to hold hearings to examine the Government Accountability Office's annual report on the nation's fiscal health, 10:30 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of John Leonard Badalamenti, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida, William Scott Hardy, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, John F. Heil III, to be United States District Judge for the Northern, Eastern and Western Districts of Oklahoma, David Cleveland Joseph, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, Anna M. Manasco, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, Drew B. Tipton, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Stephen Sidney Schwartz, of Virginia, Kathryn C. Davis, of Maryland, and Edward Hulvey Meyers, of Maryland, each to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims, and Vincent F. DeMarco, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of New York, Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: to hold hearings to examine the coronavirus and America's small business supply chain, 10:30 a.m., SR–428A.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: business meeting to consider the nomination of Scott J. Laurer, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, 11:45 a.m., S–216, Capitol.

Select Committee on Intelligence: closed business meeting to consider pending intelligence matters, 1:45 p.m., S–219, Capitol.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, hearing entitled ''Public Witness Day'', 8:30 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, hearing entitled ''Member Day'', 9 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled ''Navy and Marine Corps Installations and Quality of Life'', 9 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing entitled ''FY21 Navy and Marine Corps Readiness Posture'', 9 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing entitled ''FY21 Priorities for Missile Defense and Missile Defeat Programs'', 9:30 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change, markup on H.R. 6160, to extend the chemical facility anti-terrorism standards program of the Department of Homeland Security; and H.R. 5544, the ''American Innovation and Manufacturing Leadership Act of 2020'', 9 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States, hearing entitled, ''The Irreparable Environmental and Cultural Impacts of the Proposed Resolution Copper Mining Operation'', 9 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, continue hearing entitled ''Coronavirus Preparedness and Response'', 11 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, continue hearing on H.R. 6201, the ''Families First Coronavirus Response Act'', 8 a.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy, markup on H.R. 6084, the ''Water Power Research and Development Act''; H.R. 6097, the ''Nuclear Energy Research and Development Act''; H.R. 4481, the ''Securing Energy Critical Elements and American Jobs Act of 2019''; and H.R. 4733, the ''Low-Dose Radiation Research Act of 2019'', 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, business meeting to reauthorize the Women Veterans Task Force; and markup on H.R. 712, the ''VA Medical Cannabis Research Act''; H.R. 1647, the ''Veterans Equal Access Act''; H.R. 2224, the ''Homeless Veterans with Children Reintegration Act''; H.R. 3798, the ''Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act''; H.R. 6140, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the Edith Nourse Rogers STEM Scholarship program; H.R. 6018, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to collect overpayments of specially adapted housing assistance; H.R. 6157, to improve the GI comparison tool program and update oversight of schools who convert from a profit to a non-profit school; legislation on the Veterans' Compensation COLA Act; H.R. 5284, the ''Vet OUTREACH Act''; H.R. 2816, the ''Vietnam Era Veterans Hepatitis-C Testing Enhancement Act''; H.R. 2628, the ''VET CARE Act''; H.R. 1527, the ''Long Term Care Veterans Choice Act''; H.R. 5750, the ''Streamlining GI Bill Processing Act of 2020''; H.R. 5781, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make an individual who is eligible for educational assistance under chapter 33 of such title, transfers such educational assistance to a dependent, and fails to complete a service agreement, solely liable for any overpayment of such educational assistance; S. 3084, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the limitation on pay for certain high-level employees and officers of the Department of Veterans Affairs; H.R. 6036, the ''VA Family Leave Act of 2020''; and H.R. 5766, the ''VET TEC Expansion Act'', 9 a.m., HVC–210.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Subcommittee on Counterterrorism, Counterintelligence, and Counterproliferation, hearing entitled ''FBI Budget Hearing'', 10 a.m., HVC–304. This hearing is closed.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 12

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of James P. Danly, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 11:45 a.m. If cloture is invoked on the nomination, Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination at 1:45 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, March 12

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486—Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Adams, Alma S., N.C., E297
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E301
Brindisi, Anthony, N.Y., E301
Cook, Paul, Calif., E298
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E299
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E297, E298, E302
Garamendi, John, Calif., E296
García, Jesús G. ''Chuy'', Ill., E295
Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E296
Kelly, Trent, Miss., E293
Kuster, Ann M., N.H., E299
LaHood, Darin, Ill., E302
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E295, E299
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E294
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E298
Payne, Donald M., Jr., N.J., E300, E302
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E293, E294, E295, E296, E298, E299, E300, E301, E302, E303
Peterson, Collin C., Minn., E300
Raja, Krishnamoorthi, Ill., E293
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E293, E295, E297, E299, E300, E301, E302
Smith, Jason, Mo., E293
Taylor, Van, Tex., E296
Timmons, William R., IV, S.C., E298
Watson Coleman, Bonnie, N.J., E294

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.