



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 2019

No. 71

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,
May 1, 2019.

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

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

CONGRATULATING DAVID BLOM ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deepest gratitude and to recognize the career of David P. Blom, who is retiring as president and CEO of OhioHealth after 36 years. David became president of Grant Medical Center, located in downtown Columbus in my district.

Dave set out to make healthcare more accessible to underserved and di-

verse populations. Providing care to our most at-risk population was a focus of his for 30 years, and it is one that he has never lost. Mr. Speaker, I know that firsthand because I had the opportunity to witness his work.

I am so honored that David is with us today in the gallery.

As president of the entire OhioHealth system for the past 17 years, Dave has molded and elevated OhioHealth's commitment to all of the communities it serves as the largest hospital system in central Ohio.

Let me tell Members what I have witnessed.

When we talked about our babies and infant mortality, I remember it so well when Dave made that call and said we are going to keep our babies healthy. Thus, he spearheaded Wellness on Wheels' Women's Health, or as we like to call it in our home district, WOW, and what a wow it has been.

There is not enough time for me to highlight all the things that this incredible leader has done, but let me fast-forward to my time in Congress. I can remember how and when Congressman STEVE STIVERS and I talked about the great work, and there was an opportunity when then-Speaker Boehner wanted to revise the whole system for our veterans. STEVE STIVERS, a veteran, and Dave Blom, caring about our veterans, thus, he was appointed to the Federal commission to reform the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I can remember the exciting day when Dave Blom walked into my office, and it was the same day that we were having the House Chamber's joint session to hear the Japanese Prime Minister. I remember how excited he was to hear that we were going to host the Japanese Prime Minister, how great it was when he sat front and center in the gallery to hear that message.

The list goes on and on, but today is simply a day to say the two most powerful words that I can say about a great

leader, about someone who has changed the healthcare system not just for my district or Columbus, but for the Nation, and those two words are "thank you."

Thank you for being a leader. Thank you for being a public servant. But most of all, Dave P. Blom, thank you, thank you for being my friend. I salute you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to avoid referencing occupants of the gallery.

CONGRATULATING DAVID BLOM ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of Dave Blom as he retires after 17 years of service as president and CEO of OhioHealth this July.

While his leadership in the industry is unparalleled, as a veteran, I want to focus on what strikes me about Dave the most, and that is his commitment to improving access to healthcare for those who have served our Nation.

In 2014, the Department of Veterans Affairs was facing rising numbers nationally, and, unfortunately, many veterans were not receiving the good care that they deserved. As a result, the Congressional Commission on Care was formed, a 15-person task force that would make recommendations about how to best serve our Nation's veterans with healthcare.

I knew Dave's knowledge of healthcare and longstanding commitment to our Nation's heroes made him an outstanding candidate for that Commission, and I was proud to work with my colleagues, Representative BEATTY and Representative Tiberi, at the time, to secure him an appointment from Speaker Boehner.

In 2015, Dave Blom and the Commission got to work. After over 10 months

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H3343

of effort, they ultimately produced 18 reforms for the VA and Congress, including the VA Mission Act, which gives veterans access to local providers outside the VA system and guarantees timely access to care.

Dave was a vital contributor to these reforms, and I know he counts his time on the Commission among the most rewarding experiences of his life.

It is impossible to quantify the impact that he has had on the lives of millions of veterans and their families across this country, but it is certain to resonate with veterans far into the future.

I am incredibly grateful for Dave's service and his leadership, and I wish him all the best in his next chapter of life. I am confident that he will remain involved in central Ohio and its communities for a long time to come. I am also fortunate to call him a friend. He is a great leader in healthcare, and he has been a great leader for our country.

I thank Dave Blom for his service to our veterans, and I congratulate him on an incredible career in healthcare.

STOP ANTI-SEMITISM

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, our Nation was again stunned by yet another horrific attack on Americans gathered at worship. Saturday's shooting at the Chabad of Poway synagogue in California came as Jews around the world celebrated the last day of Passover.

One woman, Lori Gilbert Kaye, was murdered in the attack and three others were wounded. I continue to pray for the recovery of those injured in the shooting and offer my deepest condolences to the family and friends of the victims.

The latest attack happened exactly 6 months to the day after the assault on worshipers at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, which claimed the lives of 11 people, the deadliest attack on the American Jewish community in our history.

These shootings were committed against a backdrop of rising anti-Semitism both here at home and around the world.

According to the Anti-Defamation League, in 2017, anti-Semitic incidents surged in the United States by 57 percent. This represented the largest single-year increase on record and the second highest number of incidents since the ADL started tracking such data in 1979. In 2018, we saw nearly the same number of reported incidents as in 2017.

In recent weeks, there have been other chilling displays of anti-Semitism beyond our borders as well. In February, a Belgian carnival float featured grotesque caricatures of Orthodox Jews standing on large piles of money. On Easter Sunday in a small Polish village, adults and children beat and burned an effigy of Judas, but the

effigy did not look like a character from Biblical times. Rather, it was a stereotypical Orthodox Jew dressed in ninth century Hasidic garb.

Feeding into these dangerous incidents, just last week, the international edition of The New York Times published a disgusting anti-Semitic cartoon. The paper subsequently apologized, but the damage was already done. It was an astonishing editorial failure by one of the Nation's most important papers of record. I was pleased today to see the editorial board of the Times directly address this issue.

Especially at these times of growing anti-Semitism, we must all be extra vigilant, lest we add fuel to the flames of hate and intolerance.

Whenever and wherever we see anti-Semitism, we must speak out to stanch it, for what begins as stereotypes and cartoons far too often leads to violence that has claimed so many lives throughout our history.

Our Nation was founded on the idea that every American of every religion has the fundamental right to practice their faith without fear of persecution or violence. This was established in the very first amendment to our Constitution and enshrined in our Bill of Rights. But this right has been shattered far too many times at the synagogues in Poway and Pittsburgh; at an African American church in Charleston, South Carolina; and at a Sikh temple in Oak Creek, Wisconsin.

I will not repeat the Poway shooter's name or give him the notoriety he sought, but it is clear that he was motivated by white supremacism and anti-Semitism, citing the shootings at the mosque in Christchurch, New Zealand, and the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh in his manifesto.

The sad truth is, far-right white supremacists have been responsible for more terror attacks and deaths in the United States in the past two decades than any other domestic extremist movement. We need to update our laws to reflect the growing threat of domestic terrorism.

That is why I introduced, with Senator RICHARD DURBIN, the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act, legislation that would strengthen coordination among the Federal agencies in monitoring radicalized groups and individuals and, hopefully, preventing hateful acts of violence.

This is a necessary first step to help our law enforcement agencies contain the threat, and I urge my colleagues to join me on this legislation.

We also have a duty to responsibly update our gun laws. I am proud that this House voted earlier this year to pass universal background checks and close the Charleston loophole, a loophole that allowed the Emanuel AME shooter to acquire a firearm before the results of his FBI background check were complete.

We need the Senate to stop stonewalling and bring these bills up for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but reflect that, this week, the United States is observing Holocaust Remembrance Week and honoring the 6 million Jews and millions of others murdered by the Nazi regime.

In the memory of all of those lost to anti-Semitism and other forms of hate, we have a moral responsibility to stamp out intolerance and prejudice in our time. Otherwise, as the late Elie Wiesel famously said: "To forget the victims means to kill them a second time."

HONORING HOLOCAUST VICTIMS

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 6 million Jewish men, women, and children who were violently murdered for their religious beliefs by the Nazi regime.

This week remembers the victims who lost their lives to this evil regime and honors the survivors who beat the unthinkable odds.

Sonia Warshawski, a Kansan from Overland Park, was a young teenager when Nazi Germany invaded her home in Poland. She was imprisoned, locked inside a Nazi concentration camp, and then later sent to the Auschwitz death camp. There, she saw human hatred in a way many of us today cannot comprehend.

Sonia tells a story of waking up each day suffering from starvation and seeing thousands of bodies stacked where she was imprisoned. She watched as her mother was forced into a gas chamber. And still, through this torture and through it all, she never gave up hope or abandoned her faith.

Sonia will not forget the hatred and horrific injustice that the murderous Nazi regime put her and millions of others through in the name of anti-Semitism and neither will this country.

As the most well-documented genocide in human history, a genocide documented and confirmed by General Eisenhower, the evil and unimaginable torture throughout the Holocaust will forever haunt us. We must never tolerate or overlook anti-Semitism in any form.

In 2017, I had an emotional experience at the Holocaust museum in Israel with my wife. There, we met and heard from many survivors and walked through the Hall of Names honoring the 6 million victims of the Holocaust.

Sadly, we have recently seen the ugly face of anti-Semitism rearing its ugly head. We must continue to fight it with full force. It should be made abundantly clear to those with this deep hatred of Jewish people in their heart that this country has zero tolerance for this type of evil.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with the survivors like Sonia and those who lost their lives during the darkest days in the history of our world, and I stand against anti-Semitism.

□ 1015

JUDICIAL OVERREACH

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss my disappointment at the judicial overreach by my home State's supreme court this past Friday.

In a 6-1 vote, the radical Kansas courts ruled the State's constitution guarantees unlimited rights to an abortion. This verdict came in response to a 2015 State law that prohibits performing a dismemberment abortion procedure in the second trimester, except when necessary to save the life of the mother. Two doctors who performed this barbaric and painful procedure in the second trimester of pregnancy have challenged the law.

As someone who has dedicated my career to bringing life into this world and has delivered 5,000 babies in my home State of Kansas, please forgive me and allow me to be graphic for just a moment.

This horrid procedure literally tears the live baby apart limb by limb in the womb and then evacuates the dismembered baby body parts one at a time from the uterus. Then the person who performs the procedure pieces these parts back together to make sure they have removed the entire baby. This very pain-capable baby literally bleeds to death to end its life.

Sadly, the method is used today in 95 percent of second trimester abortions, even though the child's heart is beating and the baby is breathing and, as I said earlier, is quite capable of feeling pain. It is despicable, and this procedure should be banned nationwide.

It sickens me to the core that the Kansas Supreme Court violated the sanctity of life and voted to deny the rights of the unborn in our State.

Today, I call upon our State legislators to quickly pass a constitutional amendment that overrules and protects these precious babies.

Many of us have fought our whole life to defend the unborn. Now, we must all fight harder than ever. I ask for you to fight alongside me.

HONORING REV. DR. CHARLES E. BOOTH

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I know that Representative JOYCE BEATTY would join me today in what I am about to say.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a great American and a distinguished man of God, the Reverend Dr. Charles E. Booth. Dr. Booth transitioned from this earthly plain on Saturday, March 23, 2019, after a valiant battle with cancer.

Dr. Booth's life and mine moved along many of the same paths. Through those shared experiences, we developed a deep personal bond.

He was born in my hometown of Baltimore, Maryland, on February 4, 1947,

to Hazel Willis Booth and William W. Booth. He attended the same high school as I did, Baltimore City College High School in Baltimore. We also attended the same college, Howard University.

Dr. Booth went on to earn a master's of divinity degree from Eastern Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He then earned a doctorate of ministry degree from United Theological Seminary in Dayton, Ohio.

As a testament to his commitment to Christian education, Dr. Booth served as a member of the board of trustees of that institution from 2011 until his recent passing.

At the age of 23, Dr. Booth pastored his first church, St. Paul's Baptist Church in West Chester, Pennsylvania. In 1978, he became pastor of Mount Olivet Baptist Church in Columbus, Ohio, where he remained the faithful leader for 41 years.

Dr. Booth proudly made Columbus his home, but he never forgot his roots. He visited Baltimore often to preach at various churches and spend time with family and friends. In fact, he preached revival services each year in my own church, the New Psalmist Baptist Church, where Dr. Bishop Walter Scott Thomas, Sr., is the pastor. When I was not in Washington, I was at church to listen to his prolific sermons.

As the son of two preachers, I understand the power of the preached word, and Dr. Booth could deliver like none other. They often called him a preaching machine. He had a commanding presence in the pulpit with his towering stature and baritone voice. He studied the Bible voraciously and had the uncanny ability to make Biblical text relevant to the issues we face today in our daily lives. At a time when people are turning away from traditional religion, Dr. Booth made Christianity accessible and inspired people to deepen their faith.

Dr. Booth was a pastor's pastor. He traveled the world to preach the gospel, and he was tremendously respected by his peers. He found joy in mentoring young preachers and made time to listen to their concerns and offer his counsel.

In 2011, Dr. Booth founded the Charles E. Booth Preaching Conference, which focuses on the tenets of keeping passion in one's preaching, Christ-centered preaching in contemporary life, building relationships with preachers, strengthening the preacher's devotional life, and remaining true to the sermonic ingredients of information and inspiration.

Education was central to Dr. Booth's life. Not only was he continually learning, but he also encouraged others to use education as a key to open doors of opportunity. In 1994, he founded the Gloria S. Friend Academy, a fully accredited elementary school at his church that emphasized academic excellence and cultural enrichment centered on African American history. Dr. Booth also authored several books focused on Christian education.

A pillar in his community, Dr. Booth used his position as a faith leader to be a strong voice for the voiceless. He worked tirelessly to help create solutions to issues such as poverty, homelessness, unemployment, and access to quality healthcare.

As I mourn the loss of my friend, I am comforted by the inspiring legacy he leaves for all of us. In the New Testament book of Titus, the Apostle Paul writes: "Show yourself in all respects to be a model of good works, and in your teaching show integrity, dignity, and sound speech."

Dr. Booth lived this creed. Through his example, he encouraged everyone he encountered to do the same.

He leaves to mourn his wonderful wife, Crystal. He was a tremendous blessing to his family, his church, his Nation, and, indeed, the world.

He will be sorely missed, but we give great thanks that God allowed our lives to eclipse with his.

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, as we approach Teacher Appreciation Week, I would like to recognize an extraordinary educator in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who is making a difference in the lives of our community's young people.

George Daka, a U.S. history teacher at Bensalem High School, was recently selected as an honoree for the 13th annual Teacher as Hero Awards. Later this month, George will receive his award at the National Liberty Museum in Philadelphia alongside 11 other outstanding educators from Pennsylvania and Delaware.

George sees his job as more than just teaching his students about history, and he seeks to inspire them about our Nation's rich traditions. We applaud George on this well-deserved award, and we wish him and his family all the best.

We would also like to thank Kathryn Hinshaw, an English teacher at Bensalem High School, for nominating George for this well-deserved honor.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF MARJORIE BURTIS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 100th birthday of a Bucks County resident who is sharing her talent and creativity with others.

Last month, Langhorne resident Marjorie Burtis celebrated her incredible milestone with more than 100 family members and friends.

This was no ordinary birthday celebration, however. It also served as the unveiling of Marjorie's new art exhibit at the Bucks County Visitor Center.

Despite her many life experiences, Marjorie discovered her passion for watercolor painting merely 12 years ago after taking an art class. Since that

time, she has sharpened her skills, with one fine arts professional saying Marjorie paints “as a realist.”

Mr. Speaker, we wish Marjorie a very happy belated 100th birthday, and we congratulate her on her exhibit.

We thank Marjorie and her family for all that they do in our community.

RECOGNIZING THE BENSALEM HIGH SCHOOL JAZZ BAND

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a talented group of young musicians from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who were recently honored for their performances.

Last month, the Bensalem High School Jazz Band traveled to perform in the Cavalcade of Bands Jazz Championships. Bensalem High School Jazz Band, well-known for their outstanding performances, was the only band given the superior rating at the event and was also named grand champion.

This is the third time that Bensalem High School Jazz Band has been named grand champion over the past 11 years, a testament to the band’s skills, dedication, and work ethic.

Critical to the success of these young people is the director of the Bensalem High School Jazz Band, Michael Zimmerman. We extend our gratitude to him for working with our community’s youth and students to sharpen their musical abilities, and we congratulate all performers in the Bensalem High School Jazz Band for their earned distinctions.

RECOGNIZING MILTON “WOODY” WOODSIDE

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Milton “Woody” Woodside for serving more than 30 years as president of the Brunswick-Golden Isles Chamber of Commerce.

After graduating from the Citadel, Mr. Woodside has dedicated his entire career to public service. Without his work, coastal Georgia would likely look very different than it does today.

To start, he worked 13 years for the First Congressional District of Georgia with Representatives Bo Ginn and Lindsay Thomas. Since his work with the House of Representatives, he has held the top position with the Chamber of Commerce and is one of the longest continually serving chamber leaders in Georgia.

In his position with the chamber, Mr. Woodside advocated for the creation of the South Georgia Parkway, funding to deepen the Port of Brunswick, a replacement for the Sidney Lanier Bridge, the building of both the Golden Isles Convention Center along with the Career Academy, and much more.

Whether it was at the Capitol in Washington, D.C., the statehouse in Georgia, or the mayor’s office in Brunswick, Mr. Woodside was constantly working to help Brunswick

grow. Although he is retiring on May 15, I am sure that Mr. Woodside will continue to help the Brunswick community in any way he can.

Woody, thank you for your service. You have been an inspiration to all of us. You were an icon in our community. Our community thanks you, our State thanks you, our country thanks you, and I thank you, my friend.

REMEMBERING ROY KENT HODNETT

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mr. Roy Kent Hodnett who passed away at the age of 98 on Friday, April 26.

Known throughout Glynn County in the First Congressional District as a gentleman with a caring personality, he brightened the day of everyone around him.

He served in France during World War II directly after D-day, earning the Purple Heart, Bronze Star, and Victory Medal. When he came home to the United States, he stopped in St. Simons Island while vacationing, fell in love with the area, bought a home that same weekend, and started raising a family.

While there, he built one of the most successful companies in the area, Hodnett Cooper Real Estate and Vacation Rentals.

Through all of this, Mr. Hodnett’s passion was with his family and his community. For him, the key to a successful business was having a wife of 75 years who has stood beside him and believed in him. He also mentored and advised countless young people, helping them to find their own paths through life.

I am proud to have had Mr. Hodnett spend so much of his life in the First Congressional District of Georgia. His family and friends will be in my thoughts and prayers during this time.

FIGHTING CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be cosponsoring H.R. 9, which we will be voting on this week.

H.R. 9 reaffirms the United States’ commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It is long past time that we do more to fight climate change.

Fighting climate change has been a priority of mine since I got to Congress more than a decade ago. In 2007, in an era of divided government, we were able to make some progress. I was able to get two bills passed into law that address climate change. One required the Federal Government to cut energy usage by installing energy-efficient light bulbs in Federal buildings. The other created a new prize competition to encourage development of clean transportation fuel. It seemed that we were starting to take climate change seriously.

In 2009 and 2010, more steps were taken. In order to make a major break-

through, in 2009, I helped introduce the first bipartisan bill to impose a revenue-neutral carbon fee. However, in 2010, Congress failed to pass major climate legislation, and since then, we have failed to make more progress.

Today, I have renewed hope. H.R. 9 is a good first step, but much more needs to be done. I am an original cosponsor of the bipartisan Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act, which would institute a carbon fee with the revenue returned to Americans with a dividend check. This bill would bring greenhouse gas emissions down 90 percent by 2050.

I have sponsored several other climate change bills, including the Challenges & Prizes for Climate Act, which would incentivize and reward development of innovative solutions with direct benefits to the climate. These are all ways to harness American ingenuity to solve our climate crisis.

□ 1030

In doing so, by coming up with an American solution, we could build our economy and create more jobs. We know, as Americans, that we can get this done, and we must do it. Now is the time for us to act.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Utahns believe in being good stewards of our planet, leaving the Earth better than we found it.

When I served as the mayor of Provo, we pursued policies to construct LEAD-certified buildings, create more environmentally friendly transit options, and educate our residents on how they can be better stewards of the environment. We considered these efforts to be meaningful steps in the right direction.

But, imagine my surprise when I arrived in Congress and learned of the dangerous winner-take-all system of governing that has overtaken Washington, especially on issues impacting the environment.

Instead of a pragmatic approach to a positive change through small and consistent consensus, an all-or-nothing approach dominates the debate and villainizes all but the most extreme positions.

Congress is a place where ideological purity is rewarded more than results. It is easy to vote on a messaging bill that the sponsor knows will never be passed into law and then go home and take the applause from the like-minded constituents, but it is difficult to leave the echo chambers and work across the aisle with individuals who have different backgrounds than yourself and find common ground.

The most obvious example of this is the climate change debate in our country where, today, my Democratic colleagues have taken the easy path. The

bill we are voting on today has 224 Democratic sponsors and not a single Republican sponsor.

Instead of working with Republicans on our four-part approach to addressing climate change through innovation, conservation, adaptation, and preparation, we are sending a partisan bill to die in the Senate.

I attempted to work with my colleagues on this bill. I offered a good-faith amendment that would increase transparency and competition by comparing emissions produced by all the countries in the Paris Agreement. This amendment wasn't even allowed a vote by the Democratic leadership, although there was no problem allowing votes from their Democratic friends' amendments.

In fact, only three Republican amendments will be considered, and 26 Democratic amendments will be offered for debate.

It is as if my colleagues on the other side are afraid of hurting the feelings of China and Russia by pointing out that they are not pulling their weight.

I have long been a proponent for the environment, and I was proud to receive the Utah Clean Air Partnership Person of the Year award in 2017. I have championed hundreds of thousands of acres of bipartisan conservation in Utah.

I, like all Utahns, care deeply about conserving our planet and our way of life for future generations, but I cannot vote for H.R. 9 because I believe it further divides us apart, reinforcing the false narrative that all Republicans don't care about the environment because they are unwilling to get on board with an all-or-nothing, unrealistic approach to addressing climate change.

H.R. 9 completely ignores the serious and legitimate concerns about the cost and effectiveness of the Paris Agreement.

H.R. 9 ignores that President Obama's pledge to the Paris Agreement could cost the United States \$250 billion and nearly 3 million jobs in this next 6 years; and it ignores that, in the next 20 years, this commitment could cost us \$3 trillion and 6.5 million American jobs.

H.R. 9 also ignores that, because of innovation and technological improvement, the United States is already leading the world in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Since 2000, the United States has decreased annual carbon dioxide emissions by nearly 800 million tons, the largest absolute decline among all countries since 2000.

H.R. 9 ignores the fact that, if the United States cut CO₂ emissions to zero, it would not even come close to offsetting the emissions coming from the rest of the world.

H.R. 9 even ignores that the Paris Agreement allows China, the Earth's largest greenhouse gas polluter, to increase their emissions through 2030 with little evidence to show that they plan to comply in the future.

I have heard over and over that the U.S. must remain in the Paris Agreement to show leadership. And I ask you: What kind of leadership leads to double-digit unemployment in rural America but lets China off the hook?

I agree that America must continue to show leadership, but let's focus on leadership that goes back to the core principles of innovation, conservation, adaptation, and preparation. This bill fails to do any of that.

Let's continue leading the world and bettering our environment, but let's not pretend that H.R. 9 is a silver bullet to our evolving world.

I hope that we can stop with the easy, cheap rhetoric that offers false promises and divides our country even further and focus on those things that make meaningful change.

HONORING RALPH VANNI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend Ralph Vanni, the senior House audio technician who retired earlier this month.

For 34 years, Ralph has been the man behind this microphone and every microphone in this Chamber. When he took his job as the House technician in 1985, Ralph was no stranger to Capitol Hill. At the age of 16, he landed an internship with the then-Senate majority leader.

After two more internships and graduating college, Ralph had a hand in nearly every corner of the Capitol building, from doorkeeper for the Sergeant at Arms to working in the Senate Cloakroom.

In his most recent role, Ralph saw six Presidents give their State of the Union speeches, but the day he has said he will never forget is running audio from that perch right up there for Pope Francis' address to this Chamber in 2015.

I remember meeting Ralph on my first day as a newly elected Member of Congress during orientation in 2013. With the Speaker's permission, we could take photos on the House floor that day, and I took a minute to take one with Ralph and some of his team and the many folks who do a wonderful job guarding this Chamber every day.

Ralph became my friend that day and has been my friend for the last 6½ years I have had the chance to serve in this great institution. I wish him the best in his retirement. And I want to thank him personally, on behalf of every Member of Congress who stands behind any microphone in this institution.

Ralph made us sound better, and we appreciate him for doing that. I wish him good luck in his retirement and thank him for all his years of service.

I am going to miss Ralph, looking up in that perch, but I am going to get to

know the folks who have replaced him so well. He has led a great generation into that seat to replace him now.

I thank Ralph Vanni.

SOLITO, SOLITA

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, innocent children shouldn't pay the price for the President's cruel immigration agenda. Steamrolling the facts and the law, he has implemented policy after failed policy, playing catch and release with his own cabinet.

As the President ratchets up his threats to close the border and cut aid to Central America, thousands of migrants are fleeing their home countries to seek refuge in the United States.

I recently met with the editors of the book "Solito, Solita"—Alone, Alone—a collection of oral histories that tells the stories of young refugees in their own words. I rise today to read excerpts from one of them, Gabriel Mendez.

His story begins in a poor, dangerous neighborhood in the capital of Honduras. He says:

When I was just a boy of 7, my cousins raped me for a long time—for a year. They raped me at the river, where they collected water—and in my own home.

... Some of my fellow students who belonged to the maras took weapons to school. I told the mareros that I didn't want to bring weapons to school. I was afraid of them. They also wanted me to bring drugs into school. I didn't want to do it, so I left that school. ... Now the maras were looking for me—to kill me. They were asking my neighbors if they knew me.

When Gabriel was 14, he convinced his mother, who was living in San Francisco, to pay a coyote \$6,000 to bring him to the United States. Gabriel recounted the horrors he encountered along the way.

... they kept us locked in a house with eight other people for a week. We kept moving. Many days passed without eating or drinking water.

We were taken to the river, where there was a raft. We crossed the river into the United States and moved to a safe house. We spent 4 nights in the desert, including the night of my 15th birthday.

... We came upon another group of people who'd been traveling 2 days ahead of us. A young man, under 18, had perished from exposure and lack of water and food. I got stuck in some barbed wire in the desert. The coyote kicked me, ripping my flesh to set me free.

... We got to Los Angeles on December 17, 2013. If we didn't pay more money, they threatened to cut off our heads and all kinds of horrible things. My mom said she'd give them another \$50, and they piled another 8 people in a van and brought us to San Francisco.

In San Francisco, Gabriel feared for years he would be sent back to Honduras. With the support of his mother and an attorney, he was eventually granted asylum.

Now he is a student at the University of California at Berkeley, with dreams of becoming a lawyer himself.

In an essay, he wrote:

My experience of childhood sexual and domestic abuse has shaped my dreams to become a lawyer, to defend victims and fight for children's rights around the world. My immigration lawyer was a role model for me because she listened to my experiences. I want to continue studying to help children feel protected by the law . . .

If we want to understand the why behind mass migration, we need to listen and learn from these stories.

As Members of Congress, it is our job to uplift these voices and use them to fix a broken immigration system. We must insist on due process for asylum seekers; we must insist on humane treatment of our families; and we must insist on aid to Central America to stem the drivers of migration.

Together, we can prevent more children from risking their lives.

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

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 42 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Andrew Chaney, First and Calvary Presbyterian Church, Springfield, Missouri, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Your throne of grace and salvation in prayer for the men and women of this Congress and their families to be blessed with Your peace and protection.

Give them strength to rely upon Your faithfulness, always serving others with compassion.

Give them strength to be a rock and a mighty fortress when feeling crushed by an avalanche of criticism.

Give them strength to collaborate and spur each other on toward good works. As iron sharpens iron, may they sharpen one another.

Give them strength to display courage with the power of persistence in advancing American ideals, their feet closely following Your steps without turning aside. For You are their guide, their moral compass. You are the way, the truth, and the life.

Secure their leadership in Your divine will, making them an instrument of Your blessing for every American, now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HIGGINS of New York 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 DR. ANDREW CHANEY

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LONG) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, today I have the honor of introducing my friend, the Reverend Dr. Andrew Chaney, along with his wife, Christine, and my wife, Barbara, in the gallery, and the Hargis family from Springfield, Missouri, members of the First and Calvary Church.

Reverend Chaney is a third-generation minister. Reverend Chaney serves as the senior minister at the historic First and Calvary Presbyterian Church in Springfield, Missouri, a church that is a very special place for my family. Reverend Chaney serves as an important spiritual voice for us and the Springfield community.

Congress has a longstanding tradition of beginning each day in prayer. I am privileged and honored to have the opportunity to welcome Reverend Dr. Andrew Chaney to the people's House as he opened today's session in prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

PAVING THE WAY FOR WOMEN IN STEM

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, or STEM, is an industry comprised of physicists, chemical and biomedical engineers, and professionals creating and developing innovative technologies.

Demand for workers in these fields is high, but women remain underrep-

resented, especially in engineering and computer sciences. According to a study by the National Girls Collaborative, women make up nearly 50 percent of the overall workforce but less than 30 percent of careers in STEM.

Women have made tremendous strides in this field over the last few decades, but women's underrepresentation in STEM limits discoveries and holds back our economy. Today I want to tell Members about an outstanding woman in my district who is paving the way for women in STEM.

Aria Soha from Batavia, Illinois, works as the installation coordinator for the Short-Baseline Neutrino Program at Fermi National Laboratory. Aria was an outstanding student in math throughout school and chose to major in physics her second year of college at Carnegie Mellon University.

In college, Aria worked relentlessly to find research opportunities and got the chance to build microwave telescopes, tools to examine high-energy radio waves that are hard to observe from the ground. After graduating, Aria accepted a job at Fermi Lab, a world-class research facility we are proud of in the 14th District.

There are so many hidden figures in STEM, and I am proud to shine a bright light on the strong, smart women in the 14th District leading and making a difference in our community.

REMEMBERING FORMER SENATOR RICHARD LUGAR

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize former Senator Richard Lugar, who passed away Sunday at the age of 87.

Senator Lugar served the State of Indiana for 36 years in Congress and was a leading voice on issues at home and abroad.

Senator Lugar was a man of strong integrity who stood by what he believed in, and Senator Lugar always was willing to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reach a shared goal: bipartisanship.

In 2003, the State Department established a Kennedy-Lugar YES Abroad program, named for Senator Lugar and Senator Ted Kennedy. The program provides scholarships for students from the United States and countries with significant Muslim populations to spend 1 year in the other's country. It fosters the same goals that Senator Lugar dedicated his life to achieving: understanding, collaboration, and friendship with the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Senator Lugar for his legendary service. Senator Lugar leaves a long record of legislative accomplishments. I offer my condolences to his family.

May Senator Lugar rest in peace, and may we learn from the example that he set.

MADTOWN ROBOTICS

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to congratulate Madera High School's robotics team for being crowned the world champions.

They are the home of the Coyotes, and this hardworking group of 15 students from my district, otherwise known as MadTown Robotics, beat out more than 400 teams not only throughout the country, but throughout the world, in a competition in Houston, Texas, in the last week. They worked long hours on this project, with each student member putting in more than 200 hours, including weekends.

The community celebrated their success last weekend with a parade through Madera and a rally at the school gym, which I participated in. I am exceptionally proud of these students, their teachers, and the faculty for their accomplishments.

Madera is a wonderful, growing area, which shows that the San Joaquin Valley is not only a world leader in agriculture, but also in innovation, for future generations across our country.

Congratulations, Madera High School.

Go, Coyotes.

MAY 1 IS THE DEADLINE FOR DISASTER SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we have failed our military and all the victims of 2018 disasters across the country.

On October 10, Tyndall Air Force Base took a direct hit from a category 5 hurricane. Over 6 months later, no disaster funding has been provided. Air Force Secretary Wilson warned us that if she did not receive supplemental funding by May 1, all new work on Tyndall Air Force Base would stop. This delays the return of base operations, impacts flight operations throughout the Air Force, and forces our airmen to work in degraded facilities.

Mr. Speaker, May 1 has come, and I stand before you today because we have failed to deliver funding, and now our military readiness is suffering. We only have until May 15 to provide funding to the Air Force before they start cutting airplane repairs.

I urge the leadership of the House and the Senate to pass a clean disaster supplemental immediately. It is necessary, and it is the right thing to do.

BUILDING BUFFALO'S WATERFRONT

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, a \$50 million Federal investment to create a parkway opened access to Buffalo's outer harbor waterfront 10 years ago. That parkway was the catalyst for new development that started with Gallagher Beach; a new State park, Wilkeson Pointe; and new parkland on the former NFTA property from terminal A and B to the Seaway Pier and beyond.

This Thursday, the Canal Corporation will announce more than \$100 million in new investments to open up 180 acres and improve access to the outer harbor lakefront of Buffalo. More Buffalo waterfront development is coming, development to move Buffalo forward with a new, exciting waterfront of possibilities.

MICROSOFT TECHSPARK

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

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with some great news for the residents of my district, the Fifth District of Virginia.

Southern Virginia was selected as Microsoft's newest TechSpark community. The goal of the TechSpark program is to accelerate economic growth through expanding broadband connectivity, career pathways in digital transformation.

This \$5 million investment has a potential to be a game changer for southern Virginia, and this project partners perfectly with the work I have been doing in Congress providing rural broadband and increasing economic opportunities in Southside Virginia.

Private investment is always encouraged and preferred, but we also need to use private-public partnerships to expand access to broadband.

Communities in my district are in desperate need of broadband access, and this investment in South Boston will be an example of how we can encourage innovation and spur economic growth that will help families around this country.

MUELLER REPORT

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

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, in the last 24 hours, we have discovered that Special Counsel Robert Mueller wrote a letter to Attorney General Bill Barr saying that the Attorney General mischaracterized the Mueller report. That is an extraordinary letter.

I am now going to read into the House CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the relevant portions of that letter, which is dated March 27, 2019, from Robert Mueller to Bill Barr.

He writes: "The summary letter the Department sent to Congress and re-

leased to the public late in the afternoon of March 24 did not fully capture the context, nature, and substance of this Office's work and conclusions. We communicated that concern to the Department on the morning of March 25. There is now public confusion about critical aspects of the results of our investigation. This threatens to undermine a central purpose for which the Department appointed the Special Counsel: to assure full public confidence in the outcome of the investigations."

Bill Barr is supposed to be the attorney for all Americans. He is supposed to be the people's attorney, not Donald Trump's personal attorney. He does not understand that. He needs to resign.

MINORITY HEALTH MONTH

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise as we mark National Minority Health Month, and I urge my colleagues to stand with one voice as we demand universal healthcare coverage for every American, not as a privilege, but as a human right.

Your healthcare should not depend on your ZIP Code. But for far too many Americans, healthcare disparities mean higher rates of chronic illness, less access to quality care, and shorter life spans.

In the U.S. in 2019, African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans still suffer from much higher rates of diabetes, cancer, heart disease, stroke, substance abuse, infant mortality, low birth weight, HIV, and AIDS.

These deadly disparities are rooted in economic injustice, racism, and our failure, as a nation, to value and protect the health and well-being of every American equally.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support full funding for lifesaving research, federally qualified health centers, and public health programs that promote prevention and healthy lifestyles.

□ 1215

REACH EVERY VETERAN IN CRISIS

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because our Nation is facing a crisis. Each day, 20 veterans take their own lives. That is over 7,000 veterans a year, more than the number of U.S. soldiers we lost in the entire Iraq war.

We have a moral responsibility to do more to protect those who have so courageously put their lives on the line to defend our country.

Recently, it was revealed that the Veterans Administration spent only \$1.5 million of its \$6.2 million budget toward suicide prevention media outreach in fiscal year 2018.

That is why I have introduced legislation called the Reach Every Veteran in Crisis Act, to ensure those resources are used effectively and efficiently to provide veterans with the support services they need and so richly deserve.

It is my hope that this legislation will help our veterans during their time of need and, hopefully, save the lives of our Nation's heroes.

I encourage any veteran who is facing crisis or anyone who is concerned about a loved one to call the Veterans Crisis Line: 1-800-273-8255.

PLIGHT OF PUERTO RICO

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, at a hearing examining Puerto Rico's Financial Oversight Board, I plan to stand strong with the Puerto Rican families I represent and demand to hear the board's plan for reversing Puerto Rico's plight.

At a time that families are leaving the island, schools are closing, and homes and communities destroyed by Hurricane Maria still have not been rebuilt, the fiscal board is forcing Puerto Ricans to sacrifice pensions, wages, and crucial government services.

People are hungry, using plastic tarps as roofs, and living without electricity or heat.

I toured the devastated areas earlier this year and met with families in my district whose relatives are still suffering last week.

Well over a year after Maria, less than 20 percent of the aid that the fiscal board anticipated has been delivered.

How can Puerto Rico recover while its oversight board continues to squeeze the island and President Trump continues to block disaster aid and food stamps?

Tomorrow, I will stand with our brothers and sisters in Puerto Rico and demand answers to these questions.

FOUR PILLARS FOR AN INFRASTRUCTURE DEAL

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, House Democrats have an opportunity to create substantive, innovative, and cost-effective legislation that will bring jobs and economic growth to America through an infrastructure bill.

As co-chair of the New Democratic Coalition's Infrastructure Task Force, we are actively drafting policy priorities to be considered for a House infrastructure bill. It is important to have Americans of all sectors' voices as we do this, and last week the infrastructure listening sessions were hosted by Representatives COLIN ALLRED and MARC VEASEY in Dallas and JOE CUNNINGHAM in Charleston.

New Democrats are intensely focused on receiving and implementing forward-looking and practical ideas to help everyday Americans use infrastructure that supports job creation and advancement, multiple forms of transportation, policy proposals to mitigate climate change, and streamline bureaucracy.

It is my hope that the President and Republicans will join us as we focus on four pillars for an infrastructure deal: modernize America's infrastructure and seek new revenue, create an infrastructure bank to finance the project, create incentives for communities most in need to finance those projects through grant programs, and encourage innovation and reform through responsible regulatory streamlining and the utilization of public-private partnerships that work.

Building and renovating roads, bridges, ports, greener schools and hospitals, and broadband all need the support of Congress to advance the flow of America's goods and services. It is what we need to do to keep our dominance in the economy.

CLIMATE CHANGE IS OUR PRESENT

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

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Speaker, climate change isn't a question of if or even when. Climate change is not our future. It is our present.

Kids with asthma are finding it harder and harder to breathe on their walks to school or to the playground. Raging fires have reduced whole communities to ash in my home State of California. Rising seas threaten to swallow family homes on the coast. Extreme weather has devastated our country from the coast of Puerto Rico to the coast of Orange County.

So, it bears asking: What will it take for politicians to see what the American people already know to be true?

Americans are already suffering from climate change, and the threat to humankind grows every day.

In 2015, almost every country in the world recognized the climate crisis and signed the Paris Agreement. The United States led the way.

In 2017, this administration abdicated the throne of American global leadership and joined Russia, Turkey, and Iran in the cheap seats.

This administration failed to lower carbon emissions and protect the lungs, homes, and wallets of the American people.

The Climate Action Now Act demands accountability from this White House. It is an up-and-down vote on whether the Members of this body support a livable future for humankind.

PAWNS

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the workers of the United States of America are tired of being pawns in this big corporate game.

President Trump came to my community and said: Don't sell your house. Don't sell your house. We are going to get these house prices back up.

And, since that time, we lost the second shift at our General Motors plant; and General Motors, on that same day that the workers were walking out, announced they are building a new factory in Mexico.

President Trump said: Don't sell your house.

A few months later, General Motors lays off the first shift. They tell the workers 2 days after Thanksgiving.

And, just a couple of days ago, a trucking company, Falcon Transport, just outside of Youngstown, Ohio, their workers get a text message—600 workers get a text message at 8:00 on a Saturday night: You lost your job.

We got bailout money for every bank that wants one. Every savings and loan, every corporation gets a tax cut to the tune of \$2.3 trillion, and no one gives a damn about the workers.

If we can bail out the corporations that have done everything wrong, we can start helping the workers who have done everything right.

CLIMATE CHANGE IS REAL

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, there is no denying it, climate change is real, and Congress has a moral obligation to act.

The communities that I represent in Washington State are already experiencing the impacts. Coastal Tribes are in the process of trying to move to higher ground. Changing ocean chemistry is impacting our marine life and the industries that depend on it.

The Department of Defense has called it a threat multiplier that makes our world less safe.

And, today, Congress will take an important, tangible step toward addressing climate change by passing the Climate Action Now Act, a bill that reaffirms America's commitment to the Paris climate agreement and directs the administration to develop a comprehensive plan to meet the significant emission reductions that we as a Nation, and nearly every Nation in the world, committed to back in 2015.

We know that making progress is not only about protecting our environment, but also about protecting our economic interests and our national security.

The American people are not just demanding action, but leadership, to counter the impacts of climate change.

This legislation is an important first step toward meeting our long-term carbon emission goals, and I am proud to cosponsor it and vote in favor of it.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 30, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 30, 2019, at 4:33 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1222.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 9, CLIMATE ACTION NOW
ACT

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 329 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 329

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 9) to direct the President to develop a plan for the United States to meet its nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement, 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 90 minutes, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TED LIEU of California). The gentleman

from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. 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. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which 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. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 329. It provides for the consideration of H.R. 9 under a structured rule that makes 30 amendments in order.

It also provides for 90 minutes of general debate, with the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs controlling 60 minutes, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce controlling 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the measure we are considering today makes clear that under this Democratic majority science is once again respected here in the House of Representatives, that facts matter, and that the word of the fossil fuel lobby is not going to rule the day, because there is no debate on our side about something as basic as climate change.

The evidence is overwhelming. It is happening, Mr. Speaker, and human beings are playing a defining role.

Now, you don't have to take my word for it. You can ask virtually any scientist working in the field today, because 97 percent of all climate scientists agree that it is happening—97 percent.

There is a United Nations body charged with looking at the science here called the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Do you know what it has found? That the evidence is unequivocal.

The facts are as clear as day.

But you don't even need to read the report to know that something is happening here. Just look out your window. Once-in-a-generation hurricanes are becoming commonplace; record-breaking storms are becoming the norm; and drastic temperature swings are now just the way it is.

My district is home to more than 1,800 farms, and I visit with farmers often. Climate change isn't just an issue on their minds; it is sometimes the top issue on their minds when they are asked about the challenges that they face.

These farmers have told me about how heat waves disrupt what was once a reliable growing season and how unexpected frosts have completely wiped

out their crops. Rainfall that once ran like clockwork has given way to droughts that could wipe out their entire profits.

They don't question what is going on. They are not debating the science of whether climate change is real. They know. They know.

□ 1230

They can see it, seemingly every day as it impacts their livelihoods. I wish the Republicans took climate change as seriously. But instead of treating it as a threat, they treat it as a punch line.

A Republican Senator once brought a snowball onto the Senate floor, trying to prove that climate change isn't real because it still snows sometimes. You can't make this stuff up.

Just the other day, President Trump mocked clean energy by suggesting that windmills cause cancer. Are you kidding me? That is the President of the United States.

I won't pretend to know what goes on in the President's head, but I know this: His announcement in June 2017 that he would be pulling the United States out of the Paris climate agreement was indefensible.

This agreement set an ambitious goal of keeping warming below 2 degrees Celsius and established binding commitments for countries to meet to reduce emissions. It recognized climate change is a global problem that requires a global solution.

If the President gets his way and actually withdraws the United States, we would stand alone as one of the only nations in the world not to be part of it. Even Syria, a nation embroiled in war, announced that it would sign on.

Thankfully, we are not out of it yet, but we could be starting as early as 2020.

H.R. 9 would ensure the President wouldn't get his way by requiring him to develop a plan to meet our commitments under the Paris Agreement.

It is called the Climate Action Now Act because we can't wait, Mr. Speaker. Climate change isn't some far-off threat. It is not a problem for our great-grandchildren or even our grandchildren to solve. It is our problem. It is here today, impacting our Nation and our future.

It is not just about the weather. Climate change also negatively impacts public health and our national security. Experts have even developed a new term to describe those displaced by its destructive impacts, "American climate refugees."

This is not the time for handwringing or indecisiveness and not the time to let the fossil fuel industry that funds some campaigns outweigh the facts. It is certainly not the time for more stunts or snowballs on the floor.

This is the time to act boldly, to listen to what the scientists are telling us, and to protect our planet for future generations. That is what H.R. 9 is all about.

I ask my colleagues to let the facts rule the day once again in the people's House of Representatives. Let's support this rule and the underlying legislation and send an undeniable message that, under this majority, we value science and recognize the urgent need to act on climate change.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves on the floor, yet again, to consider a rule for a piece of legislation that is nothing more than another messaging bill against the President of the United States.

This new Democratic majority has spent nearly 20 percent—20 percent—of the time debating bills on the floor that are nonbinding messaging pieces of legislation. H.R. 9 is just another example of this majority's intent on messaging against the President and the lack of any true agenda for the American people.

The reality is that we all want clean air, clean water, and a healthy environment. Who doesn't? However, this bill isn't the solution.

Addressing environmental policy should not include extreme policies like the Green New Deal, nor should it involve binding ourselves to international agreements that put the United States at a disadvantage to its main security and economic competitors in the world, and with no regard to cost for American consumers and ratepayers.

Republicans have a better approach. We can protect our environment by promoting policies favoring clean energy, like nuclear, hydropower, natural gas, wind, solar, and carbon capture, and removing barriers to the deployment of new technologies and innovation.

The United States is already leading the world in reducing greenhouse gas emissions through innovation and technological development. Between 2000 and 2014, in fact, the U.S. reduced emissions more than 18 percent.

We should be focused on continuing to reduce emissions, developing and exporting clean energy technologies, and making our communities more resilient, all while ensuring affordable and reliable energy prices and prioritizing the consumer and American security and prosperity.

We have serious questions concerning costs, effectiveness, and the feasibility of the U.S. commitments made by the Obama administration under the Paris Agreement 4 years ago. Even then-Secretary of State Kerry noted during the Paris negotiations that if the United States cut its CO₂ emissions to zero, it would still not offset the emissions coming from the rest of the world.

The Obama administration's commitments in Paris were made without a clear plan to meet those promises,

without a full view of the costs to American consumers, and, certainly, without a strategy that had broad bipartisan support of Congress.

If H.R. 9 were enacted into law, it would put the United States into a position where it could not enforce any other country's action and would put us at a disadvantage.

I have heard from some of my Democratic colleagues that their energy policies are good for consumers, that it creates many jobs and benefits the economy. When they argue this, they point to States like California, with their renewable energy mandates.

However, California finds itself in the precarious situation where it actually pays Arizona to take their energy. This is not good energy or economic policy.

If Democrats were serious about solving big problems for the American people, they would partner and work across the aisle to find bipartisan solutions that they knew would have a chance to pass in the U.S. Senate and be signed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Before I yield to the gentleman from Texas, let me make a couple of points.

First of all, just so the RECORD is clear, under President Trump's policies, which are now taking effect and are now reversing some of the advances that we made under previous administrations, basically, these policies have consequences. In 2018, our emissions rose by 3.4 percent. We are going in the wrong direction.

When the gentlewoman talks about all these other alternative energy sources that are clean and green that my Republican friends support, she neglects to point out that this President hasn't seen a fossil fuel that he hasn't wanted to embrace. In fact, he wants to go back and invest more in coal, which is hard to believe, given all the scientific evidence that exists about the dangers of coal for our atmosphere.

There is no question where this President is coming from. He doesn't believe in climate change, and that is what is so shocking, that the whole world, the scientific community all over the world, has warned us time and time again that this is a real problem, and we have a President who doesn't believe it. It is stunning. It is stunning, but that is what we are dealing with.

Basically, this is an attempt to try to get us back on the right track, to take this problem, which is already having significant negative consequences in our country, and do something about it.

It is time to come together and tell the President, who doesn't believe in science, that science is real, that it is something we ought to take seriously, and that we ought to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, climate change is already wreaking economic and security havoc: deep freezes; an incredible 5 feet of water dumped on Houston, Texas, by a hurricane; in other areas, droughts, amazing wildfires, and extensive disease.

What we need is alternative energy, not Trump "alternative facts," and decisions that are based on science, not on mythology. President Trump's rejection of sound climate change facts only makes Chinese clean energy great again.

We need to lead on the road to clean green energy, not get run over. Fighting climate change is an existential challenge, but it is also an amazing economic opportunity. We can create green jobs right here with technology that is exported to the world, instead of letting our international competitors prevail.

Recommitting to the Paris climate agreement is more than bipartisan. It is joining 2,000 American businesses. It is joining 23 States. It is joining cities across America, like San Antonio and Austin, that have already pledged that they want climate action, not more nonsense and climate denying.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. It is joining 21 senior Defense officials who identify climate change action as a way to address a major national security challenge.

President Trump continues to block meaningful environmental action by clogging the corridors of power with fossil fuel industry cheerleaders. A Green New Deal is an alternative to the same old dirty deal threatening our planet with dark money, where the only thing green is that money clogging and polluting our democracy.

Climate action does bear some costs, but inaction has even greater costs. Let's embrace the simple truth that preserving the Earth is worth it. Let's embrace an America that is leading on a green economic revolution.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), my good friend and the Republican whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arizona for yielding and for leading on this issue for the economy of the United States of America and for hardworking families.

If you look at what getting back in the Paris accord would do, Mr. Speaker, it would wreck our economy in many different ways.

The people hardest hit by the United States getting back in the Paris accord are the very people who don't need to be hit the most, those with the lowest income in our country, because it would increase energy costs. By outside estimates, this bill, complying with the unachievable requirements that they have in this bill, would cost up to 2.7 million American jobs.

Those jobs wouldn't just evaporate, Mr. Speaker. Those jobs, ironically, if we were to get back into the Paris accord, would go to China and India because China and India, according to the accord, are exempt until 2030. They don't even have to comply.

By the way, why don't we look at the countries that are begging us to get back into the Paris accord? Not one of the countries in the entire European Union is in compliance with the unachievable targets set in the Paris accord. In fact, France, which Paris is in, is not even in compliance with the target.

Then they tell us: Hey, America, why don't you come into this thing, this disaster of an agreement that none of the countries in Europe are in compliance with?

Then you look at what it would do, again, to wreck America's economy.

Let's talk about carbon emissions. If this is really about carbon emissions, like the Green New Deal and other crazy ideas that would wreck the American economy, get rid of fossil fuels. You don't have to fly around on planes anymore. You don't have to worry about missing a flight because there wouldn't be any flights. That is how ludicrous their ideas are, yet they believe in them.

They all do this under the guise of carbon emissions. As they say on the other side, climate action does have some cost. Let's talk about that cost: \$250 billion in higher taxes, as well as lower wages for American families.

You wonder why they are rioting in the streets of France. In Paris, where the accord was signed, they are having riots over this radical idea. By the way, again, they are not even in compliance with it.

Then you look at where these jobs would go. The jobs would go to China and India, which are not only exempt, Mr. Speaker, but those countries actually emit four or five times more carbon than we do here because we have good environmental standards in America.

□ 1245

We have been decreasing our carbon emissions in America. In fact, we have decreased our carbon emissions down to the level that they were at in the year 2000.

We are doing it not by signing some radical job-killing accord; we are doing it through American ingenuity, something we have always celebrated in this country, something that we are the world leader at.

Why would we want to give that advantage away? And not just giving it away in the name of saving the planet, giving it away to countries like China and India, who are increasing carbon emissions dramatically higher than us.

This is a disaster for our economy. We need to reject this bad deal.

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

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the words from our distinguished minority whip, but I would point out that the cost of climate inaction will far outweigh the cost associated with acting now.

According to the Fourth National Climate Assessment, by 2090, lost wages will reach \$155 billion, mortality from extreme temperatures will surpass \$140 billion, and coastal property damage will approach \$120 billion. All told, the U.S. economy could lose more than 10 percent of its GDP under the worst-case scenario.

So people can deny that this is a problem all they want, but they do so at great economic risk for our country and for other economies around the world.

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

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

Washington's First District is home to some of our Nation's most beautiful parks, mountains, and waterways, and we are already seeing the consequences of climate change:

Snowpack in the north Cascades is currently 20 to 40 percent below normal amounts;

Last year, wildfires ravaged the West Coast, resulting in poor air quality and public health issues;

Washington State just had the second driest March on record, and there is a greater likelihood of more fires through the summer.

This is why Congress must take action and pass H.R. 9. We need to be moving forward, not backward.

President Trump's statement of intent to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement is a grave mistake that would have lasting effects on our planet and our economy.

H.R. 9 is an important step forward, ensuring the United States upholds our commitments under the agreement and leads in the green economy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend and the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I thank my very good friend, Mrs. LESKO, for yielding.

Well, we are here again, Madam Speaker, on yet another bill that isn't going to pass the Senate, isn't going to become law, and doesn't really do anything.

As they have done over and over again over the past few months, my Democratic friends seem content to bring up virtue-signaling messaging bills as a substitute for passing real bipartisan legislation to solve problems facing the American people.

Today's bill purports to force the President to return the United States

to the Paris Agreement on climate change, never mind that he hasn't actually pulled the United States from that agreement yet, nor can he until the day after the next Presidential election in 2020. But on that day, to be fair, I think he will.

Ineffective though it may be, the bill does nothing to address the serious fundamental flaws in the Paris Agreement, nor does it offer any substantial legislation to consider the problem of our own changing climate.

Instead, like many other bills the majority has offered in Congress, today's legislation is all talk, no action. It is simply another messaging bill to allow the majority to go on record in opposition to President Trump. That is not legislating.

Madam Speaker, it didn't have to be this way. We had an opportunity to improve this bill both at the committees of jurisdiction and again at the Rules Committee this week, and we could have made the bill better if we had made more amendments from both sides of the aisle in order for consideration on the floor. Legislating is better and more effective when all Members can have their ideas considered before final passage.

Making more amendments in order is a pledge that we have heard time and time again from my good friend and my good chairman, Mr. MCGOVERN, so it is unfortunate that this rule misses a perfect opportunity to have robust debate on ideas from both sides of the aisle.

At the Rules Committee Monday night, 91 amendments were proposed and considered. Of those, 45 were proposed by Democrats, 44 by Republicans, and 2 were bipartisan. Of the 44 Republican amendments, 35 had no points of order against them or any parliamentary issues, yet when the final rule was proposed and passed out of committee, it made in order 30 amendments: 1 bipartisan amendment, 26 Democratic amendments, and just 3 Republican amendments.

Is that really how the majority wants to operate going forward, 58 percent of the Democratic amendments allowed to come to the floor, but just 6 percent of the Republican amendments and just 8 percent without points of order? That is an abysmal result.

For example, my good friend RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois proposed an amendment that simply would have noted that the 2018 farm bill is relevant to achieving the goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and would have required the President to add the Committee on Agriculture to any reports he sends on this topic to the Foreign Affairs and Energy and Commerce Committees. This is a commonsense amendment that takes into account the role agriculture can play in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, yet the amendment was blocked from consideration on the floor.

What is the harm, I ask, in debating that amendment here on the floor and

bringing our Nation's farmers into the discussion?

Dr. BURGESS, my fellow member of the Rules Committee and a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, submitted two amendments that required the President to consider how carbon emission-free nuclear power and other forms of renewable energy with zero emissions, like hydropower, could contribute to meeting the United States' obligation under the Paris Agreement.

It seems logical to me that, when you are seeking to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, using energy sources that are emission-free makes sense, yet the majority didn't even want to discuss that on the floor and blocked both of Dr. BURGESS' amendments. What harm was there in discussing them?

I could go on and on, but the reality is that the majority has used its power at the Rules Committee to block consideration of dozens of amendments that could have and should have been discussed on the floor.

When the Democrats took majority control in the House, they promised a more inclusive process with more minority voices heard, more Republican amendments considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CASTOR of Florida). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me additional time.

When the Democrats took majority control of the House, they promised a more inclusive process, more minority voices heard, more Republican amendments considered. If today's action is any indication, we have a long way to go in making that promise a reality. Instead, we are moving forward with a deeply flawed bill that could and should have been improved through the amendment process.

I have been a member of the Rules Committee for a long time, including many years in the majority. It is fair to ask: How did we do when we were in the majority? Let's look at the record.

In the 115th Congress, under Republican control of the Rules Committee, 45 percent of the amendments made in order were Democratic, 38 percent were Republican, 17 percent were bipartisan. The statistics for today's rule is a far cry from the fairness of that record.

If the majority truly wants to address the environment and wants to legislate, then we can all certainly do better than the bill before us today, and we can do better than the process we saw with this bill. All Members should have an opportunity to be heard, and we should all have an opportunity to make the bill better today.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Madam Speaker, let me just say to my ranking member, whom I have great respect for, that I think we all ways need to figure out a way to do better and to be more accommodating, and I will continue to work with him to try to do that. But I will point out for the record that the committee has made in order 30 amendments, a total of 31 pages of amendments on a 6-page bill.

I think we have a long way to go to achieve the record of closed rules that the previous Congress had, well over 100 closed rules. That broke, I think, every closed rule record in history. We certainly don't want to get there, but we need to continue to figure out ways we can be more accommodating, and he has my word that I will do that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for his good work and for yielding me the time.

Greenhouse gas emissions did not happen in isolation. They have widespread impact and will not be curbed without global coordination. The Obama administration understood that fact, and that is why they entered America into an international compact to curb emissions on a global scale.

When the Trump administration retreated from the Paris accord last year, it meant the effects of climate change would only get worse in my home State of Maine. In Maine, climate change isn't an abstraction, it is not a silly floor debate that has no meaning. It is a very real threat to our economy and to our way of life.

I recently met with farmers in my State who told me climate change is here now and we need real solutions to adapt and to mitigate.

I met with climate scientists from the University of Maine who told me invasive species are threatening the livelihoods of our foresters.

I also met with shellfish growers and harvesters who are grappling with the effects of ocean acidification, of extreme weather events, and of the very real fact that the Gulf of Maine is warming faster than 95 percent of the Earth's other waters.

This is real, and I don't want my grandchildren looking back and saying: "Why didn't Congress fix the problem when they could?"

H.R. 9 is the first piece of positive climate change legislation to receive a vote in the House in years. The bill will reaffirm America's commitment to fighting climate change and will put this Congress on a course to take on the climate crisis before it is too late.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my good friend.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule that is before us today. As

Democrats in the House bring forward legislation in the name of supporting the environment and climate, I would like to talk a little bit about the process.

My good friend Chairman MCGOVERN and the Democratic majority of the House Rules Committee received a total of 91 amendments submitted for consideration on the legislation that we have before us, and as you just heard from Mr. COLE, of the 45 Democratic amendments, more than half were made in order, 26 of those; but of the 44 Republican amendments submitted for consideration, only 3—let me repeat that—3 of those were made in order.

Myself, I offered 2 of those 44 amendments. They were noncontroversial. They were ruled germane to the legislation before us by the House Parliamentarian, and all they did, simply, was recognize the clean, renewable benefits of hydropower and the clean emissions-free benefits of nuclear power, but Chairman MCGOVERN and his committee refused to allow this recognition.

So we have got to ask ourselves, Madam Speaker:

Why? Why, if we are supposedly here to debate policy affecting our environment and our climate, why would they not want to discuss the clean energy that comes from hydroelectric dams like those in my district along the Columbia and Snake Rivers?

Why would they not want to discuss the emissions-free energy produced by nuclear power plants like the Columbia Generating Station in my district in central Washington.

It is because the efforts put forward by Democrats in the House, be it the flawed Paris agreement legislation that is before us or the radical Green New Deal proposal—which, I might add, has no mention of hydropower and actually calls for the end of nuclear power in our Nation—have nothing to do with science and everything to do with politics.

The majority party, the Democrats, with these proposals, is more focused on pushing a mandated top-down system that will inevitably do nothing to help our environment.

What we should be doing, and what my Republican colleagues continue to advocate for, is focusing on the free market approach spurred by collaboration and innovation between our national laboratories, research universities, Federal partners, and the private sector.

Madam Speaker, I would say to my friend Mr. MCGOVERN that, when Republicans were in the majority, we made a conscientious effort on the Rules Committee to provide equitable treatment of amendments offered to legislation. With the process before us today, it is disappointing to see the chairman not following in that good faith effort, and I would urge a "no" vote.

□ 1300

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

Madam Speaker, oh my God, just listening to the gentleman from Washington State give his remarks. He was on the Rules Committee when the Republicans were in charge last time and voted for a record number of 103 closed rules. That meant that not a single amendment, Republican or Democrat, could be made in order. Never once, never once, did I hear him express reservation about the historic closed process that the Republicans embraced.

And as far as his amendment goes, as the gentleman knows, the Paris climate agreement operates under the theory that parties should be able to satisfy their compliance plans any way they choose. There are neither preferred nor prohibited ways to reduce emissions.

Since the Paris Agreement is fuel and technology neutral, we think this bill should be too. But I just find it hard to sit here and to listen with any level of seriousness to the gentleman's complaints. When he was on the Rules Committee, they broke every record in the history of Congress being the most closed Congress in the history of our country. Can we do better? Yes, we can, and we should do better.

But I will remind the gentleman, again, that there were 30 pages of amendments made in order on a 6-page bill, by the way, that the gentleman, Mrs. LESKO, said is not a serious bill anyway. So, I am not quite sure what the messaging is here: that it is not serious or that it is serious enough where we need to have more amendments. I can't quite figure their logic out here.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his important work on this urgent bill.

It is too late to overstate the urgency of the climate crisis. It has already assumed emergency status in parts of the world, including parts of States like Florida.

The threatened withdrawal of the U.S. from the Paris climate accord should be considered an international crime. The United States is the only nation to threaten to withdraw from the agreement, but others, such as Brazil, seem willing to follow our lead.

I am encouraged, though, that in our country, even though we have record polarization today, Americans overwhelmingly want the United States to remain in the agreement. The absurdity of sealing our own fate by faking blindness to the climate catastrophe is not lost on the American people we represent. This is the most serious issue faced by the Congress of the United States in our history. We must vote for the life, not the end of the planet.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), my good friend.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 9.

Madam Speaker, if we are really going to speak about what makes sense, what doesn't make sense, or what does have a relevance, let's not forget about who bears the brunt of the cost of what we are talking about. It is hardworking Americans.

I find it interesting that we talk about: Well, do you know what, you guys did stuff the last time that prevented us from getting amendments in, so we are following along with the same thing. I have great respect for the chairman of the Rules Committee, but I have to say that if the whole purpose of this is what I think it is, then I would like to go back to the actual beginning where this should have been treated as a treaty and it should have gotten the advice and consent of the Senate. Why did President Obama not do that? Obviously, he did it because he couldn't get the advice and consent of the Senate, so he decided to do it this way.

If our whole job in coming to the people's House is to defend the American people, then we need to take a real long look at what it is that we are trying to defend. This bill today is a messaging bill, there is no question about it.

If you look at the damage that could be done to the American people—I am talking about the American people now, not a philosophy that is out there, not an agenda that is out there, but I am talking about hardworking Americans: a loss of nearly 400,000 jobs—this is according to the Heritage Foundation—an average manufacturing loss of over 200,000 jobs, a total income loss of more than \$20,000 per family, a GDP loss of over \$2.5 trillion, and increases in household electricity expenditures between 13 percent and 20 percent. The biggest offenders in the world are China and India, and they aren't part of this so-called agreement.

If we are really concerned about protecting the people who sent us here to be their voice, then we ought to look at what their voice is and who bears the burden of a philosophy, a failed philosophy, that has no chance of working itself into law. We know that, and yet today we will come here, and we will rail against something that isn't really on the list of what the American people have the greatest concerns over.

The people who I represent back in Pennsylvania, they thank me every day for the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act because it has reduced their utility bills.

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

Madam Speaker, let me just remind my colleagues that the impact on our economy is astronomical if we do nothing.

We are already seeing the negative impacts on our economy because of climate change. It is hard to believe that we are having a debate on the floor of the House of Representatives where people are denying that climate change is a real threat or that our constituents somehow don't care about this issue, which they do.

And just one other thing. I want to make sure that the RECORD is clear on process. This bill went through two committee hearings—Foreign Affairs and Energy and Commerce—and two markups before it went to the Rules Committee where we granted a structured rule and we are having a debate here on the floor. That is called regular order. I know some of my Republican friends don't know what regular order is, because when they were in charge bills routinely came to the Rules Committee that bypassed committees of jurisdiction and then were closed up and sent to the floor with no amendments at all.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the distinguished chairwoman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill.

Climate change is the greatest, the greatest, and most urgent challenge of our time and this government should never put corporate profits and those kinds of concerns ahead of the health and safety of our children and our future.

Climate change isn't just a Democratic or a Republican issue. It is an existential issue for our species on this planet.

I am hearing so many mischaracterizations of what the Paris accord is. These standards that are applied to the United States are not from the outside, not coming from across the pond. We agree to reduce carbon emissions on our own terms. Every country develops its own plan and its own program.

This issue about jobs is just ridiculous. Everyone understands that our future is not in the fossil fuel industry. The future is in the green technologies that are being developed by entrepreneurs. Young people get it. The 21st century jobs of the future are clean technologies that make sure our planet is good and that entrepreneurs can actually succeed.

The costs of not doing this right now are so enormous. We are seeing, practically every year, what are called 500-year floods. They are only supposed to happen once every 500 years, and now we are seeing State after State, in my own Midwest, under water, and it happens all the time.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. What is the cost that we are bearing in all of our States and at the Federal level to mitigate the problems that are caused by climate change? And I want to just say to my colleagues: These words are on the RECORD. You might want to consider not embarrassing your children and your grandchildren and future generations of yours with making the kinds of statements you are.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), my good friend.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose the rule and the underlying legislation that is both ill-advised and misguided.

The environment in the United States isn't getting dramatically worse as those on the other side claim. We are using more while actually reducing air pollutants.

The total emissions of the six major air pollutants has dropped by 68 percent since 1970. This is a feat no other country has accomplished.

How did we do this? These milestones have been reached due to free-market innovation and technological advances only possible in a capitalistic society.

This is how to solve problems, not through disastrous plans like the Paris climate accord that imposes burdensome and costly regulations not approved by Congress. Remember that: not approved by Congress.

The accord, which was negotiated unilaterally by the Obama administration with little congressional oversight, was flawed in both process and substance. The Obama administration skipped the ratification process in the Senate and tied the American people's hands through executive power.

In fact, I offered an amendment in committee to delay this legislation until the Senate performed their constitutional duty, but the other side would rather send billions of taxpayer dollars to other countries without congressional approval. If the American people are forced to put aside their personal needs in order to help the global good, the Constitution should be followed, and the Senate should perform their proper role.

The substance of the Paris climate accord was equally flawed and would have significantly damaged the American economy. It is estimated that the Paris climate accord would result in a loss of 400,000 jobs, a total income loss of \$20,000 or more per family of four, and an aggregate gross domestic product loss of over \$2.5 trillion.

While causing harm to the U.S. economy, the accord does nothing to hold the biggest offenders of the emissions accountable, nations like Russia and China. Again, an amendment was offered in committee to hold these nations—Russia and China—to the same standards the United States would be held to and it was shot down by the other side.

We can't have effective climate policy that puts the United States at a disadvantage to its main security and economic competitors in the world. This is not an America First agenda. This legislation is more of a redistribution of wealth scheme than actual sound environmental policy.

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

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

Mr. DUNCAN. I think it is telling when former U.N. climate official Ottmar Edenhofer said regarding international climate policy, "We redistribute de facto the world's wealth by climate policy."

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and defeat the underlying legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Washington Post article entitled "Trump on climate change: 'People like myself, we have very high levels of intelligence but we're not necessarily such believers.'"

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 27, 2018]

TRUMP ON CLIMATE CHANGE: 'PEOPLE LIKE MYSELF, WE HAVE VERY HIGH LEVELS OF INTELLIGENCE BUT WE'RE NOT NECESSARILY SUCH BELIEVERS'

(By Josh Dawsey, Philip Rucker, Brady Dennis and Chris Mooney)

President Trump on Nov. 26 reacted to a major report issued Nov. 23 that said climate change will challenge the economy, environment, and human health. (The Washington Post)

President Trump on Tuesday dismissed a landmark report compiled by 13 federal agencies detailing how damage from global warming is intensifying throughout the country, saying he is not among the "believers" who see climate change as a pressing problem.

The comments were the president's most extensive yet on why he disagrees with his own government's analysis, which found that climate change poses a severe threat to the health of Americans, as well as to the country's infrastructure, economy and natural resources. The findings—unequivocal, urgent and alarming—are at odds with the Trump administration's rollback of environmental regulations and absence of any climate action policy.

"One of the problems that a lot of people like myself, we have very high levels of intelligence but we're not necessarily such believers," Trump said during a freewheeling 20-minute Oval Office interview with The Washington Post in which he was asked why he was skeptical of the dire National Climate Assessment his administration released Friday.

"As to whether or not it's man-made and whether or not the effects that you're talking about are there, I don't see it," he added.

Trump did not address the fundamental cause of climate change. The president ruffed on pollution in other parts of the world. He talked about trash in the oceans. He opined on forest management practices. But he said little about what scientists say is actually driving the warming of the planet—emissions of carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels.

"You look at our air and our water and it's right now at a record clean. But when you look at China and you look at parts of Asia

and you look at South America, and when you look at many other places in this world, including Russia, including many other places, the air is incredibly dirty, and when you're talking about an atmosphere, oceans are very small," Trump said in an apparent reference to pollution around the globe. "And it blows over and it sails over. I mean we take thousands of tons of garbage off our beaches all the time that comes over from Asia. It just flows right down the Pacific. It flows and we say, 'Where does this come from?' And it takes many people, to start off with."

Katharine Hayhoe, a climate scientist at Texas Tech University, said in an email Tuesday that the president's comments risk leaving the nation vulnerable to the ever-growing impacts of a warming planet. "Facts aren't something we need to believe to make them true—we treat them as optional at our peril," Hayhoe said. "And if we're the president of the United States, we do so at the peril of not just ourselves but the hundreds of millions of people we're responsible for."

Andrew Dessler, a professor of atmospheric sciences at Texas A&M University, struggled to find a response to the president's comments. "How can one possibly respond to this?" Dessler said when reached by email, calling the president's comments "idiotic" and saying Trump's main motivation seemed to be attacking the environmental policies of the Obama administration and criticizing political adversaries.

In his comments, Trump also seemed to invoke a theme that is common in the world of climate-change skepticism—the idea that not so long ago, scientists feared global cooling, rather than the warming that is underway today.

"If you go back and if you look at articles, they talk about global freezing," Trump said. "They talk about at some point, the planet is going to freeze to death, then it's going to die of heat exhaustion."

This may refer to an oft-cited 1975 Newsweek article titled "The Cooling World" or a 1974 Time magazine story titled "Another Ice Age?" But researchers who have reviewed this period have found that while such ideas were indeed afoot at the time, there was "no scientific consensus in the 1970s" about a global cooling trend or risk, as there is today about human-caused climate change.

In other words, scientists' understanding of where the planet is headed, and the consequences, is far more developed now than it was in the 1970s.

At present, Earth has warmed roughly one degree Celsius (1.8 degrees Fahrenheit) above late-19th-century, preindustrial levels. Multiple analyses have shown that without rapid emissions cuts—well beyond what the world is undertaking—the warming will continue and could blow past key thresholds that scientists say could lead to irrevocable climate-related catastrophes, such as more-extreme weather, the death of coral reefs and losses of major parts of planetary ice sheets.

On Tuesday, a U.N. report underscored again how the world is far off course on its promises to cut greenhouse-gas emissions. The report found that, with global emissions still increasing as of 2017, it is unlikely they will peak by 2020. Scientists have said carbon emissions must fall sharply in coming years if the world is to have a chance of avoiding the worst consequences of climate change.

Trump also made reference to recent devastating wildfires in California, which scientists say have been made more intense and deadly by climate change. But the president instead focused on how the forests that burned have been managed. Previously, he has praised Finland for spending "a lot of time on raking and cleaning" its forest floors—a notion that left the Finnish president flummoxed.

“The fire in California, where I was, if you looked at the floor, the floor of the fire, they have trees that were fallen,” Trump said. “They did no forest management, no forest maintenance, and you can light—you can take a match like this and light a tree trunk when that thing is laying there for more than 14 or 15 months. And it’s a massive problem in California.”

“You go to other places where they have denser trees, it’s more dense, where the trees are more flammable, they don’t have forest fires like this because they maintain,” he said. “And it was very interesting I was watching the firemen, and they were raking brush. . . . It’s on fire. They’re raking it, working so hard. If that was raked in the beginning, there would be nothing to catch on fire.”

Trump wasn’t the only administration official on Tuesday to shrug off the federal government’s latest climate warnings. In a television appearance in California, Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke acknowledged that fire seasons have grown longer in the state but added, “Climate change or not, it doesn’t relieve you of responsibility to manage the forest.”

Meanwhile, asked Tuesday about the findings of the nearly 1,700-page climate report the administration released on Black Friday, White House spokeswoman Sarah Sanders echoed her boss.

“We think that this is the most extreme version and it’s not based on facts,” Sanders said of the National Climate Assessment. “It’s not data-driven. We’d like to see something that is more data-driven. It’s based on modeling, which is extremely hard to do when you’re talking about the climate. Again, our focus is on making sure we have the safest, cleanest air and water.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I do that because I want the RECORD to reflect this President’s ignorance on an issue that is not only of national concern but of international concern.

In the past three annual worldwide threat assessments, the U.S. intelligence communities have cited climate change as a national security threat and a multiplier of threats that create instability, food and water shortages, refugee and population migration, and economic disruption. This is a matter that we can’t ignore anymore. We need to pass this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, climate change is a crisis that demands our immediate attention. Its effects are ongoing. It will impact all of us eventually, whether through worse storms, bigger wildfires, less food and water, or conflicts over resources.

The good news is, we still have the time and ability to halt the worst effects. That is what the Paris climate agreement achieved. This landmark agreement was the first ever to unite 195 countries around the common goal of protecting our planet from the worst impacts of our own actions. That is why we must pass H.R. 9, to keep the President from pulling us out of this deal and require the administration to develop concrete plans to meet our emissions reduction targets.

Under the Paris Agreement, each country agreed to meet our own goals

to keep global temperatures from raising more than 2 degrees Celsius. Despite Trump’s step backwards, I am proud that my State of California shows change can be made with commonsense steps.

Investments in important technologies like renewable energy, clean cars, and green buildings mean that California is on track to drop our emissions to 80 percent of 1990 levels by 2050. Now the Federal Government must follow.

The urgency of fighting climate change cannot be in question. Neither can our commitment to the Paris Agreement. I urge passage of this bill.

□ 1315

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how many minutes I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Arizona has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 11 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, it has been nearly 2 years since President Trump recklessly announced the United States’ withdrawal from the Paris climate accord. We are now the only country in the world not firmly behind this agreement.

There are times where we must stand alone. This is not one of them. Climate change and its impacts are an existential threat, and American leadership has an important role to play, but under the Trump administration, we are retreating from our responsibility and giving up our seat at the table.

Two years ago, more than 180 Representatives joined my resolution condemning President Trump’s withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, but the Republican leadership refused to let this body vote its will. Today, that changes. That is because this House is finally reflecting the will of the American people, which, by a 5-to-1 margin, support staying in the agreement.

We need to work with the rest of the world, and the nations of the world are looking to us to lead. Staying in the Paris Agreement and developing a plan to meet emission reduction targets agreed to would be an important first step.

As this House takes action to pass H.R. 9, I hope the Senate will follow our lead and promptly take up the legislation, and I hope today’s vote—this vote—represents just the first of many efforts to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and prevent a global climate disaster.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

Climate change is here, and it is worth highlighting some of the impacts that are underway.

This year, we have seen record flooding in the Midwest, unprecedented wildfires in the West, and record temperatures across the country.

In Vermont—and talk about economic impacts—the ski season is getting shorter. In one study, it has noted that, even under the most optimistic climate change models, all the ski areas in southern New England will no longer be economically viable by 2040. That would be thousands of jobs melting away as a result of climate change.

We have had 16 disasters in 2017 with damage exceeding \$1 billion, spending \$306 billion on weather-related disasters that year.

Climate change is a priority for young people and local officials. It now must become a priority for Congress.

The Climate Action Now Act takes an important step in this direction by keeping us—or getting us back into the Paris climate agreement and not taken out by the action of a single person. This bill is just the start of fulfilling our obligations and our opportunity to slow climate change.

Now, some folks are fearful about the economic consequences of addressing climate change, but a confident nation faces its problems; it doesn’t deny them. It is in facing these problems that we are actually going to create jobs, not lose jobs.

So, Madam Speaker, I commend Representative CASTOR for her leadership on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill as the beginning of undertaking the opportunity that we have economically to build a stronger and safer environment.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY).

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, climate change is an existential threat that requires the entire international community to solve. The Paris Agreement was a monumental achievement, rightly praised across the world and in Congress. The President’s impulsive decision to pull out of the agreement was one of the most dangerous acts of his Presidency.

My district, Ventura County, knows all too well the devastating economic and human toll of climate change, which has increased the frequency and severity of deadly wildfires in our community.

Climate change is also a threat to our national security and military readiness.

I am the proud Representative of Naval Base Ventura County, and I know that climate change will increase problems with coastal corrosion at our Navy base and other U.S. military installations worldwide. In Ventura

County, the Army Corps of Engineers must replenish sand regularly or we will lose land for military exercises, and buildings on the base could literally fall into the sea.

As sea levels rise and the severity of coastal storms increase, these problems will only grow more acute. Fortunately, House Democrats have recognized these threats, and we have developed plans to address them through the creation of the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, on which I proudly serve.

The Climate Action Now Act is our pledge to the world that many in the United States Congress want our Nation to be a global leader in solving this crisis. I urge my Republican colleagues to vote to protect our children's and our grandchildren's future and our national security. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and on the bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from leading public health advocates in support of H.R. 9, as well as a letter signed by many of the leading environmental organizations in support of this legislation.

APRIL 29, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned public health and medical organizations urge you to support H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. The bill would help ensure that the United States adheres to the science-based targets in the Paris Agreement and develops a plan to meet them, both essential steps to protecting public health from the impacts of climate change.

Climate change is a public health emergency. The science clearly shows that communities across the nation are experiencing the health impacts of climate change, including enhanced conditions for ozone and particulate air pollution, which cause asthma attacks, cardiovascular disease and premature death; increased instances of extreme heat, severe storms and other destabilizing weather patterns that disrupt people's access to essential healthcare; increased spread of vector-borne diseases; and longer and more intense allergy seasons. These threats are no longer hypothetical, and Americans across the country have experienced them firsthand.

Every American's health is at risk due to climate change, but some populations are at greater risk, including infants, children, seniors, pregnant women, low-income communities, some communities of color, people with disabilities and many people with chronic diseases. Evidence and experience shows that these populations will disproportionately bear the health impacts of climate change without concerted action to both mitigate and adapt to climate change.

The science is also clear that limiting increase in global temperatures to no more than 1.5 degrees Celsius is essential. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found dramatic differences in health impacts between 1.5 and 2 degrees, including in heat-related morbidity and mortality, ozone-related mortality, and vector-borne diseases. The Paris Agreement's goals are to keep the world well under 2 degrees Celsius and to pursue efforts to further stay below 1.5 degrees.

H.R. 9 is an important step toward what must become a comprehensive set of policies

protect public health from the worst impacts of climate change. The nation urgently needs to implement strong, science-based measures to reduce the emissions that cause climate change. The U.S. must also invest in health adaptation strategies to help communities address the varied health impacts they are already facing.

On behalf of the patients and communities we serve, we urge you to vote YES on H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

Sincerely,

Allergy & Asthma Network, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments, American Lung Association, American Public Health Association, Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health, Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America, Children's Environmental Health Network, Climate for Health, Health Care Climate Council, Health Care Without Harm, National Association of County and City Health Officials, National Environmental Health Association, National Medical Association, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Public Health Institute.

APRIL 29, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters across the country, we urge you to support H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, to ensure the U.S. meets its commitments under the Paris Agreement and to reinforce our national resolve to address climate change.

The Paris Agreement is a global response to the greatest environmental challenge of our time. It includes, for the first time, specific commitments from all major countries and a pathway for each country to strengthen its own domestic climate actions in the years ahead. United States leadership and participation was crucial in bringing the world together to act. But now, by threatening to exit the agreement, the Trump administration risks isolating itself, undermining global climate action, and weakening America's international influence on a broad array of critical foreign policy issues.

Americans are experiencing climate change here and now in a rising tide of extreme weather disasters, from hurricanes in the southeast, to wildfires in the west, to flooding right now in the country's heartland. It's no surprise that polls consistently show that concern over the climate crisis is rising across generational, geographic, and partisan lines.

Americans' personal experience is underscored by a raft of new scientific reports. Last fall the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) confirmed that climate change is already happening, and ambitious action to curb carbon pollution is needed starting now to stave off steadily worsening impacts in the U.S. and across the globe. The last four years have been the hottest on record since global measurements began in 1880, according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. And the National Climate Assessment—prepared by 13 federal agencies and released by the Trump Administration last year—lays out the stark reality of current climate impacts in all regions of the nation and projects how much worse they could get.

Without significant global action, the National Climate Assessment concludes: "rising temperatures, sea level rise, and changes in extreme events are expected to increasingly disrupt and damage critical infrastructure and property, labor productivity, and the vitality of our communities." "[C]oastal economies and property are already at risk," especially communities disproportionately comprised of low-income and minority Americans. In short, climate change is already here in America and it's already harming Americans' lives.

Despite these dire forecasts, we can still stave off the worst effects of climate change. Congressional leadership is more important than ever, and the Climate Action Now Act will go a long way to ensure that the United States fulfills our commitments under the Paris Agreement and stays on the path to serious action on climate change.

This legislation demonstrates leadership and vision needed to tackle the climate crisis. We urge you to support the Climate Action Now Act to help make the future climate safe for our children and grandchildren and honor America's commitments to help confront this global challenge.

Signed,

Alaska Wilderness Action, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments, Arizona Parks and Recreation Association, Blue Future, Bold Alliance, Chispa, Chispa Arizona, Citizens' Climate Lobby, Clean Water Action, Climate Hawks Vote, Climate Law & Policy Project, Climate Reality Project, Colorado Farm and Food Alliance, Conservation Colorado, Defend Our Future, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Earthworks, Eastern PA Coalition for Abandoned Mine Reclamation, Elders Climate Action.

Endangered Species Coalition, Environment America, Environment Colorado, Environment North Carolina, Environmental Defense Fund, Environmental Justice Center of Chestnut Hill United Church, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Friends of Ironwood Forest, Gasp, Green The Church, GreenLatinos, Hispanic Access Foundation, Hispanic Federation, Interfaith Power & Light, Kids Climate Action Network, League of Conservation Voters, League of Women Voters of the United States, National Hispanic Medical Association, National Parks Conservation Association, National Wildlife Federation.

Natural Resources Defense Council, NC League of Conservation Voters, Oxfam America, Partnership for Policy Integrity, Physicians for Social Responsibility Pennsylvania, Public Citizen, Sierra Club, The Healthy Environment Alliance of Utah (HEAL Utah), The Trust for Public Land, The Wilderness Society, Union of Concerned Scientists, Voices for Progress, World Wildlife Fund.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

The simple fact of the matter is that climate change is real, and it is creating enormous consequences for the United States. It is a threat to coastlines and property values, to public health, and to our economy.

But it is also affecting our military readiness, our national security, and it is changing the strategic environment in which our country and our troops operate. That is why I added language to the fiscal year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act making it clear that Congress acknowledges climate change is a threat to our national security.

My amendment also requires the Department of Defense to assess the military bases most threatened by climate change, including an analysis of future costs of how to deal with and mitigate

those challenges. Only through sober and rigorous analysis can we recognize the true cost of climate change to American strength and capabilities.

Madam Speaker, it is absolutely imperative that we address the impacts of climate change now, and we have more work to do. This year, on the Armed Services Committee, we will continue to require the Pentagon to better assess and report on the climate threat.

Madam Speaker, the Climate Action Now Act is about honoring our global commitments. As Americans, we rise to meet our challenges; we do not hide from them. We solve problems. We develop new technologies, and we innovate to create a more sustainable world. That is our Nation's proud heritage, and that is the spirit that we should bring toward engaging this climate threat.

The Paris Agreement was crafted through the work of American negotiators with other countries around the world. It was signed by an overwhelming 174 countries, plus the European Union. This agreement represents a clear consensus to get serious and combat climate change.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill. The threat is real. Time is of the essence. The time to act is now.

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

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to provide additional consideration of H. Res. 109, the notorious Green New Deal.

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, it is about time that the American people know where Members of Congress stand on this radical proposal of the Green New Deal, which will change nearly every aspect of Americans' lives. Even the sponsor of this legislation has requested hearings on this proposal since the Speaker and the Democratic leadership refuse to give the Green New Deal any legislative hearings. I would like to lay out some of it here.

Estimations show energy bills under the Green New Deal would spike by as much as \$3,800 per year, per family.

The resolution calls for upgrading all—all—existing buildings in the United States and constructing new buildings to achieve maximal energy efficiency, which could range between \$1.6 trillion, with a t, and \$4.2 trillion in cost.

What is the estimated total price tag for the Green New Deal? Up to \$93 trillion. That is with a t, trillion dollars.

So where is this money going to come from? The Green New Deal could

cost nearly \$65,000 per year, per household, much higher than the average family income.

We have seen the Democratic majority bring messaging bill after messaging bill to the floor. Why not this one? Why not the Green New Deal? Why not truly let the American people know where the Democrats stand on what I believe is a radical proposal that will hurt our Nation and kill jobs?

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE), my good friend.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mrs. LESKO, for yielding some time.

H.R. 9 is an attempt simply to force the President to reenter an ineffectual international agreement, one that pushes the United States to adopt burdensome, painful measures and hold us to a standard that no other country that is a part of the agreement has bothered to meet themselves, all to do something that we are already doing, and that is lowering greenhouse gas emissions.

But H.R. 9 is not the real agenda of our Democratic colleagues. To understand what the real Democratic Party wants to do, one need look no further than H. Res. 109, better known as the Green New Deal.

Look, people in my district are not asking where I stand or what I think about the Paris climate agreement, but they are asking, eagerly, where I stand on the Green New Deal. Everywhere I go, people are asking about it.

Last night, on a telephone townhall, several questions were asking where I stood on this. They are concerned that their Representative might support a proposal that would drastically increase their energy bills.

And businesses I talk to want to know whether or not I would support what amounts to a torrent of heavy-handed regulations.

I assure you, as I did them, that I do not. I strongly oppose the Green New Deal, but I cannot say the same for my colleagues across the aisle.

Madam Speaker, 92 Democrats have cosponsored the Green New Deal, and nearly every Democrat running for President has endorsed it. It seems clear that this really is the new policy platform for the Democratic Party.

I know that many of my Democratic colleagues disagree with me. They believe strongly in the policies of the Green New Deal, and I am sure some of their constituents would agree as well.

But I am also positive that their constituents, Democratic constituents, want to know where their Representative stands on this issue just as much as mine want to know where I stand. So let's have a vote.

But let's be frank with each other. The Speaker would not allow a recorded vote. Speaker PELOSI knows very likely that to have a vote on the Green New Deal could cost the Democrats the majority.

So, look, here is the deal. We Republicans are more than happy to go on

record with our opposition to the Green New Deal, and we are more than happy to help our Democratic colleagues go on record with their support for the Green New Deal. So help us defeat the previous question.

As my friend, Mrs. LESKO, has said, if we defeat the previous question, then we will amend the rule and enable a vote on the Green New Deal, and I hope to have support in that regard.

But I understand it may be difficult for some of my colleagues across the aisle to do so, and if they are unable to help support us on this previous question, then I have another opportunity.

□ 1330

If we do not defeat the previous question immediately following this vote series, I am going to file a discharge petition to ensure a vote on the Green New Deal. I encourage all Members here to vote against the previous question, vote against the rule, and sign the discharge petition. Let's have a vote on the Green New Deal.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time.

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

Madam Speaker, in closing, we all want to protect the environment, both Republicans and Democrats, and ensure that we are leaving a better world for our children, grandchildren, and future generations.

Unfortunately, H.R. 9 is not, in my opinion, a legitimate solution. H.R. 9 is little more than a messaging bill that is intended to undermine the President and message to the Democratic base.

We do have an opportunity to get things done here, but it takes a willingness from those in power to work with us in a bipartisan fashion for a solution.

Republicans want to focus on clean and affordable energy solutions that will create stability for consumers at affordable rates. We should be working together on these solutions and on real pieces of legislation that have the ability to pass the U.S. Senate and be signed by the President.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and a "no" vote 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 4½ minutes remaining.

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

This is like the theater of the absurd, when I listen to my Republican colleagues. We have a bill, H.R. 9, that says that the United States should not remove itself from the Paris climate accord. I have one colleague saying that it is a messaging bill that means nothing. I have other Republican colleagues saying that if we pass this, it is the end of the world because it is going to have all these implications.

Then we get lectured to by my Republican colleagues for almost an hour

now that 30 amendments are not enough on a 6-page bill, that we need more and more amendments in order. Then, the gentleman from Georgia comes to the floor and says: I want to offer the Green New Deal, and I want to offer it under a closed rule where nobody can amend it.

I mean, you can't make this stuff up. The Republicans are saying: We don't want hearings, and we don't want markups. We want nothing. We just want to bring it to the floor under a closed rule so that nobody, Democrats or Republicans, can amend it.

I support the Green New Deal. I have some ideas to make it a little bit better. I would like to have some amendments made in order. But my Republican friends say no amendments, closed rule, shut it all down. Old habits die hard.

When the Republicans were in charge, they presided over the most closed Congress in the history of our country, and they just can't break that old habit.

Well, you know what? We want to move on a Green New Deal, but we want to do it right. We want to do hearings, and you can have some of your friends and allies who are climate-change deniers come to testify against it if you want. We will bring experts and scientists because we believe in science. We will have them come to talk about why it is important and how we can improve it.

We look forward to that, but not under a closed rule with no hearings and no markups. This is embarrassing.

Madam Speaker, the United States has a unique role to play in fighting climate change, not just because we should be leading the way on innovation or because we have the largest economy anywhere but because we played a major role in furthering this crisis.

Between 1970 and 2013, the U.S. ranked number one in total carbon emissions. We released more carbon into the atmosphere than China, Japan, or any of the other 40 global nations. That is according to the Emissions Database for Global Atmospheric Research. I don't think we should be turning our back on a problem that we helped create.

It isn't a radical or partisan idea. Experts consider 1988 to be the year that the science behind climate change became widely known and accepted, and that is the year when a Republican Presidential nominee, George H.W. Bush, pledged that he would fight the greenhouse effect with the "White House effect."

We have come a long way since then, Madam Speaker, and I don't mean positively. There was a time when Republicans cared about the environment, when they understood that issues like the climate crisis were something that we needed to work on in a bipartisan way. Now they have become the party of climate change deniers.

This is the challenge of our generation. It is more important than petty partisanship.

President Trump seems obsessed with dismantling anything that Barack Obama has ever done. That doesn't mean that Congress should sit idly by when it comes at the expense of the future of our planet.

With climate change, public health is at risk and our national security is endangered. The President may be unwilling to rise to the challenge, but this Democratic majority is not. Congress shouldn't let another one of his temper tantrums ruin our planet.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question, and I urge a "yes" vote on this rule and the underlying resolution.

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

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 329

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 109) recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 109.

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 yeas 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, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 191, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—228

Aguilar	Boyle, Brendan	Chu, Judy
Allred	F.	Cicilline
Axne	Brindisi	Cisneros
Barragán	Brown (MD)	Clark (MA)
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Clarke (NY)
Beatty	Bustos	Clay
Bera	Butterfield	Cleaver
Beyer	Carbajal	Clyburn
Bishop (GA)	Cardenas	Cohen
Blumenauer	Case	Connolly
Blunt	Casten (IL)	Cooper
Rochester	Castor (FL)	Correa
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Costa

Courtney	Kennedy	Pocan
Cox (CA)	Khanma	Porter
Craig	Kildee	Pressley
Crist	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Crow	Kim	Quigley
Cuellar	Kind	Raskin
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)
Cunningham	Krishnamoorthi	Richmond
Davids (KS)	Kuster (NH)	Rose (NY)
Davis (CA)	Lamb	Rouda
Davis, Danny K.	Langevin	Ruiz
Dean	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Lawrence	Rush
DeLauro	Lawson (FL)	Ryan
DelBene	Lee (CA)	Sánchez
Delgado	Lee (NV)	Sarbanes
Demings	Levin (CA)	Scanlon
DeSaulnier	Levin (MI)	Schakowsky
Deutch	Lewis	Schiff
Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Schneider
Doggett	Lipinski	Schrader
Doyle, Michael	Loeb sack	Schrier
F.	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Engel	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Escobar	Lowey	Serrano
Eshoo	Luján	Sewell (AL)
Espallat	Luria	Shalala
Evans	Lynch	Sherman
Finkenauer	Malinowski	Sherrill
Fletcher	Maloney,	Sires
Foster	Carolyn B.	Slotkin
Frankel	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)
Fudge	Matsui	Soto
Gabbard	McAdams	Spanberger
Gallego	McBath	Speier
Garamendi	McCollum	Stanton
Garcia (IL)	McEachin	Stevens
Garcia (TX)	McGovern	Suozi
Golden	McNerney	Swailwell (CA)
Gomez	Meeks	Takano
Gonzalez (TX)	Meng	Thompson (CA)
Gottheimer	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Green (TX)	Morelle	Tlaib
Grijalva	Moulton	Tonko
Haaland	Mucarsel-Powell	Torres (CA)
Harder (CA)	Murphy	Torres Small
Hayes	Nadler	(NM)
Heck	Napolitano	Trahan
Higgins (NY)	Neal	Trone
Hill (CA)	Neguse	Underwood
Himes	Norcross	Van Drew
Horn, Kendra S.	O'Halleran	Veasey
Horsford	Ocasio-Cortez	Vela
Houlihan	Omar	Velázquez
Hoyer	Pallone	Viscosky
Huffman	Panetta	Wasserman
Jackson Lee	Pappas	Schultz
Jayapal	Pascrell	Waters
Jeffries	Payne	Watson Coleman
Johnson (GA)	Perlmutter	Welch
Johnson (TX)	Peters	Wexton
Kaptur	Peterson	Wild
Keating	Phillips	Wilson (FL)
Kelly (IL)	Pingree	Yarmuth

NAYS—191

Aderholt	Cline	Gonzalez (OH)
Allen	Cloud	Gooden
Amash	Cole	Gosar
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Granger
Armstrong	Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)
Arrington	Comer	Graves (LA)
Babin	Conaway	Graves (MO)
Bacon	Cook	Green (TN)
Baird	Crawford	Griffith
Balderson	Crenshaw	Grothman
Banks	Curtis	Guest
Barr	Davidson (OH)	Guthrie
Bergman	Davis, Rodney	Hagedorn
Biggs	DesJarlais	Hartzler
Billirakis	Diaz-Balart	Hern, Kevin
Bishop (UT)	Duffy	Herrera Beutler
Bost	Duncan	Hice (GA)
Brady	Dunn	Higgins (LA)
Brooks (AL)	Emmer	Hill (AR)
Brooks (IN)	Estes	Holding
Buchanan	Ferguson	Hollingsworth
Buck	Fitzpatrick	Hudson
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Huizenga
Budd	Flores	Hunter
Burchett	Fortenberry	Hurd (TX)
Burgess	Foxx (NC)	Johnson (LA)
Byrne	Fulcher	Johnson (OH)
Calvert	Gaetz	Johnson (SD)
Carter (GA)	Gallagher	Jordan
Carter (TX)	Gianforte	Joyce (OH)
Chabot	Gibbs	Joyce (PA)
Cheney	Gohmert	Katko

Kelly (MS) Nunes Stefanik
 Kelly (PA) Olson Steil
 King (IA) Palazzo Steube
 King (NY) Palmer Stewart
 Kinzinger Pence Stivers
 Kustoff (TN) Posey Taylor
 LaHood Ratcliffe Thompson (PA)
 LaMalfa Reed Thornberry
 Lamborn Reschenthaler Timmons
 Latta Rice (SC) Tipton
 Lesko Riggleman Turner
 Long Roby Upton
 Loudermilk Rodgers (WA) Wagner
 Lucas Roe, David P. Walberg
 Luetkemeyer Rogers (AL) Walden
 Marchant Rogers (KY) Walker
 Marshall Rose, John W. Walorski
 Massie Rouzer Waltz
 Mast Roy Watkins
 McCarthy Rutherford Weber (TX)
 McCaul Scalise Webster (FL)
 McClintock Schweikert
 McHenry Scott, Austin Wenstrup
 McKinley Sensenbrenner Westerman
 Meadows Shimkus Williams
 Meuser Simpson Wilson (SC)
 Miller Smith (MO) Wittman
 Mitchell Smith (NE) Womack
 Moolenaar Smith (NJ) Wright
 Mooney (WV) Smucker Yoho
 Mullin Spano Young
 Newhouse Stauber Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Abraham Harris Rooney (FL)
 Adams Hastings Titus
 Carson (IN) Norman Vargas
 Cartwright Perry Woodall

□ 1401

Mr. STEUBE, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Messrs. CURTIS, STEWART, GROTHMAN and ROGERS of Alabama changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. ESPAILLAT changed their 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 226, nays 188, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—226

Aguilar Cicilline DeGette
 Allred Cisneros DeLauro
 Axne Clark (MA) DeBene
 Barragán Clarke (NY) Delgado
 Bass Clay Demings
 Beatty Cleaver DeSaulnier
 Bera Clyburn Deutch
 Beyer Cohen Dingell
 Bishop (GA) Connolly Doggett
 Blunt Rochester Cooper
 Bonamici Correa Doyle, Michael
 Boyle, Brendan F. Engel
 F. Courtney Escobar
 Brindisi Cox (CA) Eshoo
 Brown (MD) Craig Espallat
 Brownley (CA) Crist Evans
 Bustos Crow Finkenauer
 Butterfield Cuellar Fletcher
 Carbajal Cummings Foster
 Cárdenas Cunningham Frankel
 Case Fudge Davids (KS)
 Casten (IL) Davis (CA) Gabbard
 Castor (FL) Davis, Danny K. Gallego
 Castro (TX) Dean Garamendi
 Chu, Judy DeFazio García (IL)

Garcia (TX) Luján
 Golden Luria
 Gomez Lynch
 Gonzalez (TX) Malinowski
 Gottheimer Maloney,
 Green (TX) Carolyn B.
 Grijalva Maloney, Sean
 Haaland Matsui
 Haaland Harder (CA) McAdams
 Hayes McBeth
 Heck McCollum
 Higgins (NY) McEachin
 Hill (CA) McGovern
 Horn, Kendra S. McNeerney
 Horsford Meeks
 Houlihan Meng
 Hoyer Moore
 Huffman Morelle
 Jackson Lee Moulton
 Jayapal Mucarsel-Powell
 Jeffries Murphy
 Johnson (GA) Nadler
 Johnson (TX) Napolitano
 Kaptur Neal
 Keating Neguse
 Kelly (IL) Norcross
 Kennedy O'Halleran
 Khanna Ocasio-Cortez
 Kildee Omar
 Kilmer Pallone
 Kim Panetta
 Kind Pappas
 Kirkpatrick Pascrell
 Krishnamoorthi Payne
 Kuster (NH) Perlmutter
 Lamb Peters
 Langevin Peterson
 Larsen (WA) Phillips
 Larson (CT) Pingree
 Lawrence Pocan
 Lawson (FL) Porter
 Lee (CA) Pressley
 Lee (NV) Price (NC)
 Levin (CA) Quigley
 Levin (MI) Raskin
 Lewis Rice (NY)
 Lieu, Ted Richmond
 Lipinski Rose (NY)
 Loeb sack Rouda
 Lofgren Roybal-Allard
 Lowenthal Ruiz
 Lowey Ruppertsberger

NAYS—188

Aderholt DesJarlais Johnson (SD)
 Allen Diaz-Balart Jordan
 Amash Duffy Joyce (OH)
 Amodei Duncan Joyce (PA)
 Armstrong Dunn Katko
 Arrington Emmer Kelly (MS)
 Babin Estes Kelly (PA)
 Bacon Ferguson King (IA)
 Baird Fitzpatrick King (NY)
 Balderson Fleischmann Kinzinger
 Banks Flores Kustoff (TN)
 Barr Fortenberry LaHood
 Bergman Foxx (NC) LaMalfa
 Biggs Fulcher Lamborn
 Bilirakis Gaetz Latta
 Bishop (UT) Gallagher Lesko
 Bost Gianforte Long
 Brady Gibbs Loudermilk
 Brooks (AL) Gohmert Lucas
 Brooks (IN) Gonzalez (OH) Luetkemeyer
 Buchanan Gooden Marshall
 Buck Gosar Massie
 Budd Granger Mast
 Bucshon Graves (GA) McCarthy
 Graves (LA) McCaul
 Burgess Graves (MO) McClintock
 Byrne Green (TN) McHenry
 Calvert Griffith McKinley
 Carter (GA) Griffith Meadows
 Carter (TX) Grothman Meuser
 Chabot Guest Miller
 Cheney Guthrie Mitchell
 Cline Hagedorn Moolenaar
 Cloud Hern, Kevin Mooney (WV)
 Cole Herrera Beutler Mullin
 Collins (GA) Hice (GA) Newhouse
 Collins (NY) Hill (AR) Nunes
 Comer Holding Olson
 Conaway Hollingsworth Palazzo
 Cook Hudson Palmer
 Crawford Huizenga Pence
 Crenshaw Hunter Posey
 Curtis Hurd (TX) Ratcliffe
 Davidson (OH) Johnson (LA) Reed
 Davis, Rodney Johnson (OH) Reschenthaler

Rice (SC) Smith (NJ)
 Riggleman Smucker
 Roby Spano
 Rodgers (WA) Stauber
 Roe, David P. Stefanik
 Rogers (AL) Steil
 Rogers (KY) Steube
 Rose, John W. Stewart
 Rouzer Stivers
 Roy Taylor
 Rutherford Thompson (PA)
 Schweikert Thornberry
 Scott, Austin Timmons
 Sensenbrenner Tipton
 Shimkus Turner
 Simpson Upton
 Smith (MO) Wagner
 Smith (NE) Walberg

NOT VOTING—17

Abraham Hastings Rooney (FL)
 Adams Higgins (LA) Scalise
 Blumenauer Himes Titus
 Carson (IN) Marchant Vargas
 Cartwright Norman Woodall
 Harris Perry

□ 1410

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 173.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise to offer a question of the privileges of the House previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:
 H. RES. 304

Whereas Michael Cohen testified under oath as a witness before the House Committee on Oversight and Reform on February 27, 2019;

Whereas Michael Cohen falsely testified under oath, “I have never asked for, nor would I accept, a pardon from President Trump”;

Whereas in truth and fact, attorney for Michael Cohen, Lanny Davis, admitted on March 6, 2019, that Cohen “directed his attorney to explore possibilities of a pardon at one point with Donald J. Trump lawyer Rudy Giuliani as well as other lawyers advising President Trump”;

Whereas in truth and fact, attorney for Michael Cohen, Michael Monico, admitted in a March 12, 2019, letter that Cohen’s testimony was inaccurate;

Whereas in truth and fact, the ex post representation by Cohen’s attorney does not annul Cohen’s intentionally false and misleading testimony;

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen’s testimony under oath was delivered in the context of apologizing for all his criminal activities;

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen’s denial of ever seeking a pardon contained no qualifiers about the context of his statement;

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen’s denial of ever seeking a pardon, as uttered under oath in his testimony, was absolute and unequivocal;

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen testified under oath that he and his lawyers spent hours editing his written statement submitted to the Committee on Oversight and

Reform preceding his testimony, which included the written assertion, “I have never asked for, nor would I accept, a pardon from President Trump”;

Whereas in truth and fact, Cohen’s denial in his written statement of never asking for a Presidential pardon was an unqualified assertion;

Whereas Michael Cohen falsely testified under oath that he “did not want to go to the White House” and he “did not want a role or title in the administration”;

Whereas in truth and fact the United States Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of New York submitted to Federal court a sentencing memorandum expressing Michael Cohen’s desire to work in the White House, explaining: “during and after the campaign, Cohen privately told friends and colleagues, including in seized text messages, that he expected to be given a prominent role and title in the new administration. When that did not materialize, Cohen found a way to monetize his relationship with and access to the President”;

Whereas Michael Cohen falsely testified under oath on other factual matters of material significance;

Whereas Michael Cohen’s intentionally false testimony was aimed at obscuring the truth and ameliorating the extent of his own personal embarrassment;

Whereas intentionally false testimony to a committee of the House of Representatives harms the integrity of the proceedings of the House;

Whereas it is a Federal crime to provide false information to Congress and the failure to enforce this crime further undermines the integrity of the House; and

Whereas it is the judgment of the House of Representatives that providing a copy of the official transcript of the hearing of the Committee on Oversight and Reform on February 27, 2019, to the Department of Justice would aid the Attorney General’s consideration of investigation and potential prosecution of Michael Cohen’s criminal conduct: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the House of Representatives directs the chair of the Oversight and Reform Committee to submit to the Attorney General an official copy of the transcript of the hearing during which Michael Cohen testified under oath on February 27, 2019.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOYER moves that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. 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 226, noes 183, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

AYES—226

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

NOES—183

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

NOT VOTING—22

Abraham	Harris	Rooney (FL)
Adams	Hastings	Scalise
Armstrong	Hern, Kevin	Titus
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Vargas
Cartwright	King (IA)	Woodall
Cloud	Norman	Young
Davis (CA)	Perry	
DeGette	Riggleman	

□ 1426

Mr. VAN DREW changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 174.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 174.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I spoke at the memorial service for Indiana’s former Senator Birch Byah and missed roll call votes 172 to 174. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes:

Roll Call 172, on the Previous Question on the Rule, H. Res. 329, vote YEA.

Roll Call 173, on H. Res. 329, vote YEA.

Roll Call 174, The Motion to Table the Green of Tennessee Privileged Resolution, H. Res. 304, vote YEA.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and could not get to the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 172, “nay” on rollcall No. 173, and “nay” on rollcall No. 174.

**MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING
THE LIFE OF CONGRESSWOMAN
ELLEN TAUSCHER**

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great sadness to mark the passing of a leader of exceptional courage and firm principles, our colleague and dear friend, Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher.

The presence of so many members from our California delegation is a beautiful tribute to her beautiful life. Thank you all for being here.

Ellen's passing is a great official loss to the people of California and to the Nation and a deep personal loss for all of us who are blessed to call her friend.

Our hearts break for her daughter, Katherine. Personally, it was a joy for many of us to see her expect Katherine. Katherine came. Katherine is growing up. She took such delight in being Katherine's mother.

Ellen was an extraordinary force for progress who made a difference. Her smart, strategic leadership strengthened our democratic institutions and kept America safe, and her relentless commitment to nuclear nonproliferation beautifully honored the oath we take to support and defend the Constitution and protect the American people.

Ellen was a pioneer who made history when she became the youngest ever and one of the very earliest women members of the New York Stock Exchange, where she was a powerful voice for technology, science, and innovation.

Ellen's friendship was a gift, and her legacy was one of outstanding leadership marked by deep patriotism and tireless commitment to progress.

May it be a comfort to Ellen's beloved daughter, Katherine, and her many, many loved ones that so many share their loss and pray for them at this sad time.

Mr. Speaker, I now ask that Members and guests in the gallery rise to observe a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWALWELL of California). All present will rise to observe a moment of silence.

**REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962,
BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SUR-
VIVORS PROTECTION ACT**

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been

cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

CLIMATE ACTION NOW ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 9.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 329 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 9.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1432

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9) to direct the President to develop a plan for the United States to meet its nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement, and for other purposes, with Mr. BLUMENAUER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the House the bill is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 90 minutes, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

I shouldn't need to persuade anyone in this Chamber that we desperately need to take serious action on climate change. Just look at the news. We are already seeing the consequences of our inaction: natural disasters, famines, instability, human suffering.

The time for action to avoid the worst effects of climate change is rapidly closing. We must demonstrate to the rest of the world and to future generations that we are still committed to taking on this fight.

Climate change is a national security threat that transcends borders and requires international coordination. That is why it is so critical that we work shoulder to shoulder with our friends and partners around the world.

The negotiation of the Paris Agreement was a defining moment for the future of our planet. For the first time, the countries of the world came together to face this global crisis.

At challenging times like these, the international community usually looks to the United States for leadership. So when President Trump announced his intention to withdraw from this landmark agreement, it sent an unmistakable message that America is on the retreat. It is really just shameful.

Every nation in the world has now signed on to the Paris Agreement. If we withdraw, we will be the only country unwilling to step up to this challenge.

We can—we must—do better.

The Climate Action Now Act keeps the United States in the Paris climate accord, renewing our country's pledge to address climate change head-on.

The Paris Agreement allows every country to determine its own pollution reduction targets and to develop a public plan for how to meet those targets. This bill follows that same model. It gives the executive branch total flexibility to decide what approach we need to follow and what kind of technology we need to use to reach our national targets.

H.R. 9 gives us all an opportunity to show Americans that we hear them, that we take their concerns seriously, and that we are addressing this danger that is hurting their health and safety.

Mr. Chair, it is time for Congress to put our country back on the right path to address the climate change crisis facing the world. I strongly support passage of H.R. 9, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we can all agree that the climate is changing and we need to take positive steps to address it. However, I oppose H.R. 9 because it is just a messaging bill that is dead on arrival in the Senate and that the President will veto.

I oppose H.R. 9 because, among other problems, it attempts to codify President Obama's unrealistic and unilaterally determined greenhouse gas reduction pledge under the Paris Agreement. This pledge was submitted on behalf of the United States without any notification, consultation, or role for Congress.

At a recent hearing, when we asked whether any of the witnesses agreed that President Obama should have submitted the Paris Agreement to the

Senate for ratification, all four witnesses, including the three Democrat witnesses, agreed it should have been submitted to the Senate.

In addition to not involving Congress, the Obama administration also did not seek meaningful input from private-sector stakeholders, such as energy companies.

Not only that, the administration provided no cost-benefit analysis or economic justification to rationalize its pledge—its arbitrary pledge—to cut greenhouse gases by 26 to 28 percent below 2005 levels by 2025.

A recent study by the Chamber of Commerce estimates it could cost U.S. GDP \$250 billion and 2.7 million jobs by 2025. By 2040, it could cost the United States economy \$3 trillion and 6.5 million industrial sector jobs.

But the good news is that, even before the United States entered the Paris Agreement, the United States started making progress to significantly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. According to the EPA, from 1990 to 2014, U.S. greenhouse gas emissions per GDP declined by 40 percent, and we are at the lowest emissions levels since 2000.

In addition, over the last decade, U.S. greenhouse gas emissions have decreased by 14 percent, Mr. Chairman, while China's emissions doubled. Sadly, China, the world's largest greenhouse gas emitter, under this agreement, will continue to increase its emissions through 2030 under its unenforceable Paris Agreement pledge.

Other major greenhouse gas emitters, like Russia, have signed the Paris Agreement but have not ratified it.

Instead of doubling down on a pledge that Congress had no role in setting that will have a potentially catastrophic impact on the United States economy and which will do nothing, Mr. Chairman, to address China and other countries' growing emissions, we should work on bipartisan legislation to boost research, advance technologies, promote innovation, and develop real solutions.

That is why I offered an amendment calling for bipartisan solutions to address this challenge, providing a meaningful role for Congress regarding the Paris Agreement, and requiring our greenhouse gas reduction commitments to undergo a rigorous cost-benefit analysis. Sadly, this amendment failed by a party-line vote in the committee and the Rules Committee, denying it from even being debated on this House floor.

So for that, Mr. Chairman, and many other reasons, I oppose H.R. 9, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my friend on the other side of the aisle just said that all four witnesses at our April 2 hearing in the Foreign Affairs Committee expressed agreement that President Obama should have submitted the

Paris accord to the Senate for ratification. I was there and chaired the hearing. I didn't hear that.

Let me tell you that, first of all, we were proud to welcome a distinguished panel of national security leaders, including former military officials. They offered detailed descriptions of the risks that climate change poses to our national security.

They talked about how climate change acts as a threat multiplier and a source of international conflict, how it makes individuals more vulnerable to recruitment by violent extremist organizations, how it is increasing great power competition and tensions in places like the Arctic, and how it is the driver of extreme weather and natural disasters that require dangerous and expensive military responses.

More to my point, there was a fleeting question about whether any witness disagreed with the statement that President Obama should have submitted the Paris Agreement to the Senate for ratification. The only response, I believe, came from one retired admiral, who simply said, "military, not political," meaning he is not the right guy to ask, nor were any of the other witnesses, so they all sat in silence.

As my colleague should know, silence is not an assent, whether it is at a congressional hearing or at a deposition or even in the exit row of an overcrowded commercial airplane. A person must give a verbal "yes" or "no" for their answer to be accepted and relied upon.

So I just want to clear the record, because what really happened is one of my colleagues posed a question to the wrong person and got no answer.

So when it comes to arguing that the Paris Agreement needed to be submitted to the Senate for ratification, my colleagues are incorrect as a matter of international law and incorrect as a matter of U.S. law. The previous President had the authority to enter into the Paris Agreement, derived from the Constitution, the Senate-approved United Nations Framework on Climate Change, and domestic law.

We all know that the vast majority of international agreements entered into by the U.S. are not approved by the Senate, and the Paris Agreement is no different.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the author of this bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman ENGEL of the Foreign Affairs Committee for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise humbly as a Representative of my home State of Florida and as a patriotic American but, especially today, as a mother of two daughters and future generations because I feel the weight of our moral responsibility to address climate change.

This is a historic day here in the House of Representatives. This is the first time in 10 years that major cli-

mate legislation is being heard in the people's House.

□ 1445

H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, is where we will start by honoring America's commitment to address the climate crisis, and it is a crisis. The last time global monthly temperatures were below average was in February of 1985. That means everyone who is 34 years of age or younger has grown up in a world that has been forever altered by the change in climate.

How severe the impacts of climate change will be to us personally over time depends on the actions that we take now.

Based on the latest science from the administration's own National Climate Assessment, we have reason to worry. Seas are rising. America's heartland and farms have suffered unprecedented floods. Snowpack is shrinking, and that is bad for clean water supplies. Droughts are getting worse. Hot, humid heat waves are becoming more intense, with more days where people cannot safely work or play outside. Higher temperatures mean that pollutants, like ground-level ozone from car exhaust, will become more damaging to our health.

One-and-a-half years ago, I had to pack up my home, board up the windows and doors, pack up my most cherished belongings, and flee as Hurricane Irma, that monster hurricane, threatened the State of Florida. We were scared of a huge storm surge coming up from the Gulf of Mexico and into Tampa Bay. We were petrified.

Fortunately, we had time to get out of the way, but that isn't true for so many Americans who have suffered floods, fires, and more. They haven't been as lucky. And the risks and costs going forward are likely to be more severe.

What is necessary to combat the climate crisis is to stop carbon pollution from accumulating in the atmosphere. That requires action, urgent action, ambitious action.

Fortunately, we have made some progress in recent years in cutting carbon pollution. Thousands of businesses, houses of worship, States, and communities are taking action. Now they are demanding that we do the same.

A few years ago, there was also good news. After years of finger-pointing, the United States, China, India, Europe, and other countries, all of the countries around the world, came together and agreed to cut carbon pollution. With America's leadership and engagement, the U.S. led other nations in committing to take climate action in an international agreement called the Paris climate accord. The agreement was a breakthrough.

After years of playing the blame game, nearly every other country said, here is our plan, and each country developed its own individual plan, and America has done just that. That plan has incredible upsides.

We are creating millions of clean energy jobs right now, and they are good-paying jobs. We are saving billions of dollars on home energy bills, and businesses are saving huge amounts of money through energy efficiency. We can finally address climate injustice.

And despite what the Trump administration says, America is still in the international agreement. We have not formally withdrawn. If this bill becomes law, we never will, because America does not cut and run, America keeps its commitments, and we will recommit to doing so when we pass this bill.

My Climate Action Now bill is straightforward. It would block the administration from spending any money on withdrawal, and it would require the Trump administration to release its plan to cut carbon pollution.

Americans overwhelmingly support U.S. leadership on the climate crisis because they understand that when America leads, we win. Ask the 23 States, 300 cities, and more than 2,000 businesses who have pledged to honor the Paris goals. Now they will be joined by the House of Representatives.

Some of the fastest growing jobs in America are clean energy, engineering, green building, solar installers, and wind turbine technicians. This is just the beginning, but we have to stay on course.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. In addition to sending an important signal to clean energy, job-creating businesses, this will send an important signal to our allies across the world. We expect ambitious action from them.

I have heard my friends on the other side of the aisle say, but China. Well, if the President forces a retreat here, other countries will retreat, as well. A vote against H.R. 9 is a vote to let China off the hook. This is a patriotic vote. Vote for America, vote for our future, and keep us in the climate Paris Agreement. I thank the hundreds of my colleagues who have joined this, and I thank the brave Republicans who will join us in this patriotic vote for Climate Action Now.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, not because we don't want clean water or clean air or deny a world-changing climate. H.R. 9 is a direct attack on this administration for withdrawing from the flawed agreement and is a purely political move by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

The Paris Agreement requires each signatory country to determine, plan,

and regularly report on the contributions that it undertakes to mitigate global warming with no regard for American consumers; it places burdensome regulations on American businesses that are already employing environmentally friendly practices; and it places the cost of the Paris Agreement to supplement other nations on the backs of the moms, dads, and citizens of America.

In August 2016, President Obama unilaterally accepted the Paris Agreement under the United Nations climate change treaty. Rather than bringing it to this body, where it could be ratified with the advice and consent of the Senate, this was a blatant power grab by the executive branch encumbering America and future generations.

I had been opposed to President Obama's decision to circumvent congressional approval of the Paris Agreement from the beginning. It was a clear violation of the Constitution to leave Congress out of the approval process of an agreement that will have far-reaching implications on our economy and our citizens.

During the 114th Congress, I even introduced H.R. 544, expressing the sense of the House that the President should submit any binding international agreement on climate change to the Senate as a treaty. By accepting the Paris Agreement without congressional approval, the Obama administration made promises that are too expensive and too difficult and not science-based as far as the results. In fact, in a current hearing, it was stated that if the U.S. were to cut emissions to zero, it would not change global warming.

A report prepared by NERA Economic Consulting in 2017, found that meeting the commitments President Obama made could cost the U.S. economy \$3 trillion and 6.5 million industrial-sector jobs by 2040. There are serious concerns surrounding costs, effectiveness, and feasibility of U.S. commitments made under the Paris Agreement.

Greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S. fell by 14 percent from 2005 to 2017, our manufacturing output increased 4 percent, and our energy consumption went down 2 percent. That is American leadership done by the private sector, not by government mandates or encumbering agreements.

The United States is already leading around the world in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. This agreement does not address the world's largest carbon emission offenders, as you have heard—China and India. These countries are not held to any enforcement standards besides being required to provide a report to the United Nations every 5 years.

Again, the Paris Agreement ties the hands of the American consumers to pay for countries, like China and India, whose total commitment is, "We will try to reduce greenhouse gas emissions"—not do it, but we will try—while they continue to increase our

carbon footprints around the world, again at the cost of nearly \$3 trillion to the American consumer.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. China is building or planning to build over 700 coal-fired power plants around the world with one-fifth of these plants located in countries outside of China, making it virtually impossible for them to meet goals set in the Paris Agreement.

Additionally, of the 195 signatories, 13 countries have still not ratified the agreement, including Russia, Turkey, Yemen, Iraq, and Iran. Russia accounts for nearly 5 percent of the global greenhouse gas.

While I do believe that climate change should be addressed, I do not agree that forcing the President to remain in an agreement that had no oversight, cost-benefit analysis or stakeholder input is the right way to go.

As we continue to have discussions about how to address climate change, we should focus on solutions for the world body.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman ENGEL for yielding, and I congratulate Representative CASTOR for her great leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it is odd listening to the very same argument that we can't go forward with this because there is nothing to hold China or India to account because there are no requirements, and, at the same time, the very same document puts a huge burden on America by putting enforced requirements on us. It doesn't make any sense.

Mr. Chairman, for decades, the scientific community has understood the need to fundamentally transition everything about how we live, work, and move about this planet to protect life on Earth as we know it. We have known this for decades. And yet, knowing how destructive climate change is to our health, our safety, and our national security, President Trump decided to withdraw from the Paris Agreement and neglect, not just the fundamental responsibility to protect Americans, but an enormous economic opportunity.

I feel like I am listening to arguments from lobbyists from the horse and carriage industry against railroads, or for the buggy whip industry against paving roads because cars are such a threat.

President Trump made a huge mistake by backing away from the commitment we made in Paris. We are here today to correct that mistake and to steer our country back in the right direction.

We have a chance to propel economic growth with investments in zero net-energy buildings, electric vehicle charging infrastructure, expanded solar, wind, geothermal, solar thermal, and more. We can lead the world in creating good-paying, sustainable jobs.

There is no way that we can move fast enough or comprehensively enough to address climate change, but this is about more than that. This is about unleashing American innovation, creating American jobs, and restoring American leadership on the world stage.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. We must pass this bill and we must do it now, both for the sake of the climate, for our kids, and for our economy.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, which would prevent the President from rightfully withdrawing the United States from the Paris Agreement and codify President Obama's misguided and, frankly, over-the-top emissions reduction commitments.

There are two principles, I believe, that should guide our international agreements.

First, they should be fair and beneficial to the American people.

Second, they should not put the United States at a disadvantage vis-à-vis other nations of the world.

The Paris Agreement fails on both counts.

As already noted, if we implement the commitments made by the Obama administration as part of this agreement, it could cost the U.S. gross domestic product \$250 billion and eliminate 2.7 million jobs. That is hardly fair and beneficial to the American people.

As it is, the Paris Agreement allows countries to determine their own commitments, without regard to their emissions. Should this remain the case, the United States will forever be at a disadvantage to self-interested countries, like China and Russia, whose emissions continue to grow. Meanwhile, our emissions were the lowest in 2017 since 1992. Despite this, our commitments far outweigh those made by the worst greenhouse gas offenders.

I submitted an amendment that would have, at the very least, addressed the disadvantage of this agreement. My amendment would have changed the enacted date of H.R. 9 to whenever the Secretary of State could certify that Russia and China were making commitments equivalent to ours.

I regret that it was not made in order and that my colleagues across the aisle

denied us the opportunity to do right by the American people. H.R. 9 is an outrage, Mr. Chairman, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

□ 1500

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I want to remind my colleagues that the United States was once a global leader in pushing for climate action, but the current administration has largely abandoned our efforts to mitigate the effects of a warming world. As a result, our progress in reducing pollution has dwindled and is now reversing itself.

The Environmental Protection Agency's latest data shows that reductions in greenhouse gas pollution fell to just half a percent in 2017, and, according to the International Energy Agency, U.S. carbon dioxide pollution actually rose by 3.1 percent in 2018.

Think about that for a minute. At a time when the world desperately needs to decrease emissions, ours increased. In a year, where more dirty coal plants closed than almost any other year in history, our emissions increased. So this bill is absolutely important.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER), a valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

Back in 2003, 16 years ago, the Pentagon commissioned a report on how climate change would impact our ability to keep our country safe. Its conclusion? That we should move beyond scientific debate and treat ongoing ecological damage as a serious national security threat.

Our military and intelligence communities agree that climate change exacerbates conflict and instability. It weakens fragile governments, contributes to food and water insecurity, and perpetuates poverty.

These are threat multipliers, and they present real risk to U.S. interests around the globe, especially in areas vulnerable to extreme weather, such as the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa.

As a former CIA officer, I recognize that combating climate change is a national security imperative, and the first step in this fight is to keep our word to cooperate with our allies and partners in this battle. By staying in the Paris Agreement, we demonstrate that the United States takes our planet's fate seriously, keeps its word, and can be a steady partner in future agreements. Going forward, we must use our country's tremendous diplomatic, military, and economic strength as assets in this global fight.

Today, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation because our country cannot afford to abdicate its role of leadership.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, we are here today because the previous administration wanted to score political points before leaving office by saving the world for America's leadership on greenhouse gas emissions.

The former administration's chasing glory on foreign soils signed the Paris climate agreement, or, as folks back home call it, "the kill America's economy agreement so China can take my jobs."

The Constitution, Article II, Section 2, paragraph 2, sentence 1, says very clearly: "He shall have the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

The Paris Agreement looks, smells, and feels like a treaty.

The worst offender for climate change in the world, China, had their legislature approve the Paris Agreement. President Obama never sent that to the Senate for approval, and since the Paris Agreement was never approved, it has the same power as this blank piece of paper.

Here are some numbers, some facts:

From 2000 to 2014, America's global leadership has reduced our emissions by 18 percent.

From a study by the EIA, despite having an increase of 3.1 percent of CO₂ in 2017, we are down 14 percent from 1990 levels for CO₂.

Former Secretary of State John Kerry noted through negotiations from Paris that if America and all of the developed countries of the world cut their gas CO₂ emissions to zero, emissions for the world would take over, and we would still be in the same position.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chair, in conclusion, America does not need the Paris Agreement.

Russia needs the Paris Agreement; China needs the Paris agreement; India needs the Paris Agreement; the European Union needs the Paris Agreement.

We don't have to take this. We have proven to the world with technology and the free market, we can make this Earth cleaner.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the families, vote for the local jobs—vote against H.R. 9.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me say, the whole world—not just the United States and not just China—needs to do more if we are to be spared from the worst damage of climate change.

Under Paris, China committed to leveling off its carbon emissions no later than 2030 and reducing its carbon intensity by 60 to 65 percent from 2005 levels by 2030. And that is a big step towards sustainability.

Meanwhile, global action on climate change has already spared public and

private-sector investments and green innovation. China has created the world's largest carbon market, pumped approximately three times as much money into renewables as we have, and surpassed the United States in terms of both the number of electric vehicles on the road and the number of publicly available charging stations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the distinguished chairwoman.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding, for his tremendous leadership on this and so many issues.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. This piece of legislation is an extremely important first step in protecting our environment—major first step—and we have to move forward and do even more.

H.R. 9 ensures that the United States remains in the Paris Agreement and prohibits Federal funding to exit the agreement. It is critical that the United States takes the lead on addressing climate change on the world's stage.

Let me be clear. The Trump Administration is plugging their ears and pretending that climate change doesn't exist.

America was once a global leader in fighting climate change. It was our leadership that led so many nations to commit to climate action. Yet this administration has abandoned plans to address climate change and, instead, has weakened our leadership in the world. It is really shameful, and this needs to stop.

Climate change is an urgent matter. It creates more flooding and superstorms, threatening the safety of millions of Americans and people around the world.

People around our country and throughout the world are breathing in polluted and unhealthy air. Here in our own country, communities of color and low-income communities also, disproportionately, are impacted by the effects of climate change and have a lack of access to adequate healthcare services on top of that.

We owe it to our children and future generations to do more for the environment. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 9 and "yes" on fighting climate change.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

America has long been the standard of leadership, freedom, and innovation. We do not allow other countries to take advantage of us.

While H.R. 9 has many issues, my opposition is founded in its attempt to strip our President of his constitutional executive authority and force us

to remain locked in an agreement that hurts American taxpayers.

After the Obama administration's international apology tour, it is a refreshing change to have a strong hand at the wheel. I am glad to see President Trump defending our exceptionalism instead of sacrificing our economy for the sake of other countries.

My colleagues across the aisle would have us believe that we are headed for doom within a decade, that Americans are behind the curve. In reality, we lead the world in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, while other countries are growing emissions; yet America is paying the lion's share in the Paris Climate Accord.

American innovation and technological advancements are second to none. These are the same qualities of American excellence that made us the greatest country on this planet. We should not lower our standards and allow other nations to take advantage of us.

This poorly negotiated deal will do nothing to address the growing emissions from China and other industrial countries. It only hurts American jobs, especially the energy industry that employs hundreds of thousands of people in Oklahoma and brings high-paying jobs to my district. These are people who are hurt by the continuation of the Paris Climate accord.

I applaud President Trump's leadership on this issue and support his authority to remove us from the Paris climate accord.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of misinformation out there about the Paris Agreement, including the idea that it will hurt the U.S. economy. The Paris Agreement will cost little or nothing, and allowing climate change to proceed would certainly be very expensive indeed.

A raft of studies from environmental organizations, Citibank, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development all argue that a failure to mitigate the effects of climate change could cost the U.S. economy trillions of dollars. Citi found that investing in low-carbon energy to address climate change would save the world \$1.8 trillion through 2040, but not acting will cost an additional \$44 trillion by 2060.

Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today because I know climate change is real, and its impacts are already here. In New Jersey, we know those impacts all too well.

Superstorm Sandy sent an unprecedented storm surge up the Hudson and the Hackensack Rivers that destroyed homes, businesses, police departments,

and critical infrastructure that our neighbors are still digging out of this day.

These once-in-a-generation storms have a human toll. In 2017, the destruction and failed response to Hurricane Maria by the Trump Administration led to over 3,000 Americans dying—3,000.

The time for waiting is over. We need to act right now. Climate scientists are in universal agreement. Our planet is warming, and it will continue to inflict catastrophic devastation.

Military and intelligence experts have warned it is a national security threat. You are no longer going to educate Americans to hide their head in the sand.

We need to work together, one nation, as an international community.

The goals some have set above have been called overly ambitious. You bet they are ambitious. These are big problems, and Americans tackle big problems with big solutions.

Supporting H.R. 9 would do just that. It shows the world the United States is committed to the Paris Agreement, that we are serious about setting targets for carbon emissions reductions.

This agreement is the bare minimum we can do to prevent against the impacts of climate change.

We need to be serious about getting this right, that we are serious about preserving the world for our people, for our children, like my grandchildren and their grandchildren, Mr. Chairman, because that is who this is about.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, let me first say to my good friend from New Jersey that there are many of us on this side of the aisle who agree the climate is changing, and I think it is a question of how we get there and the solutions and innovation and technology.

I hope that—it will not move forward; it will be, obviously, vetoed—maybe we can work together in a bipartisan way on something that can reduce emissions using innovation technology. I personally think nuclear power should be examined as well.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

□ 1515

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. MCCAUL for his statements, and I agree with everything that was just stated. I have great respect for Chairman ENGEL and the bill's sponsor, Ms. CASTOR, and for their intentions and their advocacy. I look forward to working with them on this issue and many others because this is a very important issue for us to be working on, on both sides of the aisle in both the House and the Senate.

We all have constituents who want access to clean air and clean water. It is something that, whether you are representing a district in Flint, Michigan, or you are in Tampa, Florida, or the east end of Long Island, we all

want to advocate for that for our constituents.

I was concerned with the negotiation of the Paris climate deal, that there wasn't more discussion. There wasn't any discussion in Congress. There weren't hearings and votes. There wasn't enough of an analysis done of the impact on the economy.

There is a debate now over numbers. I wish it was fleshed out. What will be the impact on GDP? What will be the impact on jobs? What will be the impact on energy costs for my constituents? There are a lot of numbers that are going around that are very concerning to my constituents.

Other countries were having debates, and they were having votes publicly. In this case, this was not submitted to the United States Senate for ratification, and there was some discussion earlier about what happened at the House Foreign Affairs Committee meeting on this topic.

What I asked of the witnesses was: "Do any of the witnesses disagree with the statement that President Obama should have submitted it to the Senate for ratification?" That was the exact wording of my question.

If you look at the video of the response, no one disagreed. I asked: "Does anyone disagree?" No one disagreed. There was one person, Admiral McGinn, who specified that his role was military, not political.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

He said his role was military, not political, but nobody disagreed with that statement.

I believe it should have been submitted.

I also think it is outrageous that China and India are not doing more. They are emitters. China, in fact, won't even comply to reduce its carbon emissions until 2030. Many other countries that made commitments aren't fulfilling their commitments.

We needed a better deal for the world and other countries to step up and do more, more transparency and debates, and a vote here in Congress. That is in the best interests of all our constituents.

Hopefully, we can agree on the numbers and a process going forward, and we can work together on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, climate change is one of the greatest existential threats of our time. I am honored to serve on the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis with the leadership of the author of this bill, Representative CASTOR.

In Oregon, smoke from raging wildfires makes the air unhealthy to

breathe. Acidic oceans are threatening our fishing industries. Droughts and extreme weather patterns jeopardize the livelihoods of our farmers. Warmer water in the Columbia River is further threatening endangered salmon.

My home State of Oregon is one of the many States committed to meeting the Paris climate agreement targets, but climate change is a global crisis, which is why more than 175 countries have signed on to the agreement.

The Climate Action Now Act is a clear signal to our international allies and to the world that the United States, at least the United States House of Representatives, supports upholding our Nation's commitments to the planet. This is about U.S. leadership.

The cost of inaction on climate change is too high to wait any longer. We can protect the planet, unleash innovation, and create good jobs. This bill is an important first step.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chair ENGEL, Chair MCGOVERN, and Chair CASTOR for their leadership. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important bill.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member McCAUL for yielding.

Mr. Chair, in my district in Pennsylvania, we are conservationists. But with this bill, H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, more appropriately known as the U.S. energy disadvantage act, the American people are being told yet again that Big Government is the solution to all of the people's problems. The American people know better than that, and they expect solutions, not more government.

The latest data is revealing. The U.S. is actually a global leader in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

In 2017, while global CO₂ emissions increased by 1.6 percent, the United States reduced its CO₂ emissions by more than 42 million tons, an annual reduction of 0.5 percent, the largest reduction of any country in the world.

The data also underscores that we have not seen this type of progress from other countries that are still part of the Paris Agreement. American leadership is ongoing while countries like Spain, Canada, India, South Korea, and China and the EU are all increasing their CO₂ emissions by 100 million tons and more.

If the U.S. stayed party to this agreement, it would be a huge and unnecessary drag on our economy that would be passed on to the American taxpayer. Moreover, it would not improve the situation, as most of the world is moving in the wrong direction.

The U.S. is reducing our emissions without the heavy hand of this Congress. This will continue, and it will be factual, as it will be measured.

We need to harness American talent and energies, not squander them with

bogus plans like the Green New Deal or ineffective climate agreements.

We need access to affordable, reliable, and clean energy sources, including natural gas, nuclear, oil, and clean coal. We need to empower our private sector to continue to innovate and develop new technologies. What we need is a true all-of-the-above and all-of-the-below energy plan.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to consider this and vote against this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST).

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairwoman ENGEL for yielding me the time.

I rise in strong support of the Climate Action Now Act written by my dear friend and the chairwoman of the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, KATHY CASTOR. We are both blessed to represent the Tampa Bay region of Florida, which is the most economically vulnerable to climate change in the world.

For the people back home, this isn't a partisan issue. It is real. It is happening. It threatens our environment, our quality of life, and our economy.

I know there are friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle struggling with this issue, and I want to offer encouragement: Do not wait for the next 1,000-year flood to hit your district or the next freak Category 5 hurricane that explodes over warming seas right before landfall. Do not wait for the next drought-fueled firestorm to destroy one of your towns or for rising sea levels to flood the streets when it rains during high tide, as it does in parts of my district.

The time to act is yesterday. Please vote "yes."

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 9, more appropriately named the U.S. energy disadvantage act.

The bill attempts to lock us into a bad deal. While the United States is continuing to lower its emissions and to lead the world through technological innovation, other countries around the world are not meeting even their targets. Some aren't making targets. Those countries came up with targets on their own, and they still aren't living up to them.

Staying in the Paris Agreement would raise energy prices and slow economic growth without curbing emissions in a meaningful, global fashion.

Mr. Chair, we are not the ones who are polluting the air and the water. We are cleaning it up. We are doing it as a result of doing the right thing. Yet, Mr. Chair, today, the ones that are polluting greatest are doing nothing other than just being told to think up something by 2030.

Mr. Chair, our President did the right thing. We should do the same. We need

to get to work on legislating, not political messaging.

The American people sent us here to work on solutions to healthcare, infrastructure, education, the economy, and much more. Let's get to work on that, and let's encourage the nations of the world to do the right thing and get involved in doing what the United States has done already and, by the way, will continue to do.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this bill. We all should.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When President Trump announced plans to withdraw the U.S. from the Paris climate agreement in 2017, hundreds of businesses from all over the country immediately responded that it was a mistake and that they would redouble their own efforts to cut emissions.

In a separate declaration a few days later, a group called We Are Still In said that, despite Trump, they continue to support climate action. They argued that compliance with the Paris Agreement would open markets and generate jobs.

Today, We Are Still In is comprised of over 3,500 leaders, including Governors, mayors, universities, and over 1,800 companies working together to uphold America's promise to meet the goals of the Paris Agreement.

Included in the coalition are some of the country's most successful companies, and I think you will recognize the names: Adobe, Amazon, Apple, Belkin, Ben & Jerry's, Campbell's, Chobani, Citi, DuPont, eBay, Gap, Google, The Hartford, Hewlett-Packard, Intel, Johnson & Johnson, Levi Strauss, Lyft, Mars, McDonald's, MGM Resorts International, Microsoft, and I can go on and on.

The Paris Agreement will not on its own solve our global warming problems, but it does present business and investors with a historic opportunity by signaling a new global consensus that the transition to a clean energy economy is underway.

The argument that the Paris Agreement is somehow antibusiness or will hurt our economy just doesn't hold water. So I encourage my friends on the other side of the aisle to listen to American businesses and treat climate change as both the threat and opportunity that it is.

Mr. Chair, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our majority leader.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, the overwhelming majority of scientists in the world, not just in the United States, believe that climate change is one of the major crises confronting the global community.

We went to Paris, and the world community got together and adopted an agreement that was voluntary in its implementation. No sovereignty was

given up by any nation. They said that scientists say we have a crisis and that we need to respond to it.

My friend from Michigan who spoke earlier, Mr. WALBERG, said that we ought to be focused on education, housing, healthcare, and job creation. He is right, but to ignore this problem is dangerous and unacceptable.

Climate change is perhaps one of the greatest threats we face as a nation and as a planet. Those who deny it do so at great peril to the health, security, and economic prosperity of our country.

H.R. 9 will not solve climate change. The first step in any journey does not get you there. But without it, you get nowhere.

House Democrats are laying down a marker today that we are committed to tackling this challenge with the seriousness it deserves.

Recognizing and combating climate change must be a global effort. This legislation prohibits the Trump administration from using any funds to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement.

I tell my friends in the House that I believe the overwhelming majority of Americans support that proposition, as do the citizens of the world.

□ 1530

We have been the leader of the free world. Withdrawing from an agreement that was voluntarily entered into by over 170 nations shrugs off the mantle of leadership, moral and intellectual. If the United States withdraws, then we will be the only nation in the world not to be part of this historic agreement which embraces the goals previously set by our country—joined by the contribution of other nations—to reduce carbon pollution, promote technological innovation, and help avoid the most catastrophic consequences of climate change.

If we ignore the challenges of climate change, then we will also close ourselves off to opportunities to take the lead in the race to develop and deploy cleaner and more efficient technologies, which would create jobs and grow businesses and be a boon to our economy.

So I would suggest to my colleagues that those who argue against this bill argue not for economic progress, not for the creation of jobs, but exactly the opposite, and they deny the future: the future of the economy, the future of our health, the future of our environment, and the future of our children.

America, if it is to be great, must not sit on the sidelines and shrug like Atlas in confronting the rest of the world. We must act on climate change.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my dear friend, the chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ENGEL, for his leadership and his strong voice on behalf of what is an international issue. It is an issue for us, but it is an international issue.

I want to thank, as well, my dear friend, Representative KATHY CASTOR,

for her leadership as chair of the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis and for introducing H.R. 9.

I also want to thank Chairman PALLONE and the Energy and Commerce Committee for their leadership.

There have been over 30 hearings on this issue. All concluded we must have a concerted effort to address climate change, and House Democrats will continue to do our part. But this ought to be a bipartisan vote. Every citizen—Republican, Democrat, Independent, and nonaffiliated—are going to be affected if we do not deal with climate change, and their children as well.

I look forward to bringing to the floor future legislation from our committees which seeks to tackle the climate crisis with substantive proposals, but I urge my colleagues: Let's take this first step. Let's say that we are not going to withdraw from the rest of the world. Let's say we are going to continue to lead on an issue that there is a global consensus on that we must deal with climate change. Take this step. Assert America's leadership.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished leader for his statement.

I, too, wish this were a bipartisan bill. I do. I wish it were a bipartisan bill. Unfortunately, as the ranking member of the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, I found out about this from the press, not from the chairman of the committee. I found out from the press about this bill. That is not how you pursue bipartisan legislation. If there were a true attempt and a true desire to do bipartisan legislation, certainly this would have been handled differently.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chairman, I fully agree that the climate is changing. I agree that humans are contributing to that change. I agree that there is something that we need to do about this, and we need to be aggressive.

As we heard from scientists just yesterday in the House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis, they have confirmed to us that the United States can eliminate all emissions, and we are still going to see warming. We are not going to see changes in the temperature if we eliminate all of our emissions.

Mr. Chairman, China, right now, is the top emitter. They are emitting 80 percent more than the United States. As a matter of fact, Greenpeace found last year they are actually increasing their emissions. Here we are, the United States, for about the last 20 years, the largest absolute reduction in emissions of any country in the world.

The Paris accord is fundamentally flawed. It is not the solution. We can eliminate all of our emissions, Mr. Chairman, and you are going to have countries like China that are allowed, under the Paris accords, to come in and more than replace all of our emissions

reductions. That doesn't make sense, and it is not fair. This coming from a country that has already stolen trillions of dollars in intellectual property and cost this country millions of jobs.

Let me say it again: Climate change is real, and we need to take action.

This agreement is fundamentally flawed. It benefits China.

Of course other countries agree. It is on the back of the United States, the nation that spends more money on climate change science and more money on climate change technology than any other country in the world.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is fundamentally flawed. This whole agreement is fundamentally flawed. China has an entirely different metric to measure their emissions reduction than the United States, and they don't even have to reduce a single degree of emissions until after 2030.

Mr. Chairman, this is a flawed bill, and I urge rejection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a proud original cosponsor of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, which preserves our Nation's commitment to the Paris Agreement and keeps our promise to the American people to take meaningful action on climate change.

The Paris Agreement paved the way for our Nation to develop a robust plan for cutting emissions which both threaten public health and contribute to global climate change. Part of this plan was to clean up the transportation sector, now the largest single source of emissions in the country.

My home State of California was critical in the effort to establish more stringent vehicle emissions standards. When the administration irresponsibly chose to abandon part of this plan by rolling back Obama-era vehicle emissions standards, I introduced legislation that would protect these standards and the benefits that they ultimately bring to our communities.

I am pleased to see so many of my congressional colleagues join me in proposing meaningful solutions to combat climate change, but we must do more. We must act together as a nation to lead the way.

Our Nation cannot afford to cede its international leadership. By not participating in the Paris Agreement, we risk irreversible damage to our planet and endanger the American people.

I think about my grandchildren, Anna and Robby. It is their future I am thinking about. They will be greatly impacted if we don't do something now.

Tackling climate change is and always has been my top priority. We must act now to mitigate the effects of climate change before it is too late. I have spent the last decade helping lead on this effort, and I am immensely pleased to be able to support the Climate Action Now Act on the floor today.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, let's be clear. We must have a global approach to the climate crisis, but giving a pass to countries like China and India subverts that process. Look at their record. Since 2001, there has been a 290 percent increase in emissions; India, 235. We have got a negative 16. We are reducing that.

So because of their miserable record of curtailing greenhouse gases, we still, in America, across the country, in rural areas, are going to face droughts, wildfires, and sea level rise. Because of India and China, experts are saying that Miami, Florida, and Baltimore are still going to flood.

So let's be honest. The Paris accord is really nothing more about political theater than actually addressing climate change.

Instead, we should have an agreement that is enforceable with legally binding targets and specific financial support that provides for liability or compensation for damages that could be caused and an understanding that global communities are still fossil fuel driven.

America should not unilaterally transform our energy policies while gambling that other nations will voluntarily—and I underscore that, voluntarily—reduce their emissions. History and past agreements indicate other nations are not following the lead of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” on H.R. 9.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to start off by saying that I respect the chairman. I respect his point of view, and I respect the arguments that have been made on this floor. I believe they are genuine. I believe that most Members of this Chamber agree that climate change is real and that climate change presents a risk.

I sat down with a scientist from NASA, which is in my home State. We talked about the data. He said: I am not a policymaker. Here is the data. Here is what is going to happen if we do nothing.

But I think, as the majority leader said, H.R. 9 does not solve this problem.

You have heard from my side of the aisle very genuine arguments about the cost to the economy, the fact that we have reduced our emissions but countries like China and India have doubled theirs. We want to get something done to solve this crisis, and I admit it is a crisis.

This bill is a messaging bill. It is a feel-good bill. It won't get through the Senate. It will be vetoed by the White House. I submit to all those listening to this debate that when that happens,

we work on something real, that is bipartisan.

We heard the ranking member from the new House Select Committee on the Climate Crisis say that he found out about this bill in the press. That is no way to lead a bipartisan effort in the Congress.

So when this fails, and it will, I submit we go back to the drawing board and do things that we know do work, and that is let's work on innovation, clean energy technologies, and, yes, nuclear power.

We are showing we are being a leader reducing our emissions while other countries are not. Let's lead by example. Let's come back with some real legislation that is going to make a difference, reduce emissions, and get us out of this crisis.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me say that I am very glad that the Foreign Affairs Committee has jurisdiction over this bill.

I would also like to note for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that we have three additional Members who intended to cosponsor H.R. 9, Congresswoman KAPTUR, Congresswoman GABBARD, and Congresswoman UNDERWOOD.

Let me also say that I include in the RECORD 9 letters in support of H.R. 9. Specifically, I have letters from a group of four dozen environmental organizations led by Oxfam; the Sierra Club; the Union of Concerned Scientists and others; the League of Conservation Voters; The Wilderness Society; EDF Action, which is an advocacy partner of the Environmental Defense Fund; BlueGreen Alliance, which is a coalition of the Nation's largest labor unions and environmental groups; the United Steelworkers; E2, which is a nonpartisan group of environmental entrepreneurs from across the country; Ceres and its BICEP Network, which is the Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy; the We Are Still In coalition, which is made up of over 3,750 U.S. businesses, cities, States, Tribes, colleges, universities, investors, faith groups, cultural institutions, and healthcare organizations; the NAACP; leading public health and medical organizations, including the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, and the Allergy & Asthma Network; and the American College of Physicians.

APRIL 29, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters across the country, we urge you to support H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, to ensure the U.S. meets its commitments under the Paris Agreement and to reinforce our national resolve to address climate change.

The Paris Agreement is a global response to the greatest environmental challenge of our time. It includes, for the first time, specific commitments from all major countries and a pathway for each country to strengthen its own domestic climate actions in the years ahead. United States leadership and

participation was crucial in bringing the world together to act. But now, by threatening to exit the agreement, the Trump administration risks isolating itself, undermining global climate action, and weakening America's international influence on a broad array of critical foreign policy issues.

Americans are experiencing climate change here and now in a rising tide of extreme weather disasters, from hurricanes in the southeast, to wildfires in the west, to flooding right now in the country's heartland. It's no surprise that polls consistently show that concern over the climate crisis is rising across generational, geographic, and partisan lines.

Americans' personal experience is underscored by a raft of new scientific reports. Last fall the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) confirmed that climate change is already happening, and ambitious action to curb carbon pollution is needed starting now to stave off steadily worsening impacts in the U.S. and across the globe. The last four years have been the hottest on record since global measurements began in 1880, according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. And the National Climate Assessment—prepared by 13 federal agencies and released by the Trump Administration last year—lays out the stark reality of current climate impacts in all regions of the nation and projects how much worse they could get.

Without significant global action, the National Climate Assessment concludes: "rising temperatures, sea level rise, and changes in extreme events are expected to increasingly disrupt and damage critical infrastructure and property, labor productivity, and the vitality of our communities." "[C]oastal economies and property are already at risk," especially communities disproportionately comprised of low-income and minority Americans. In short, climate change is already here in America and it's already harming Americans' lives.

Despite these dire forecasts, we can still stave off the worst effects of climate change. Congressional leadership is more important than ever, and the Climate Action Now Act will go a long way to ensure that the United States fulfills our commitments under the Paris Agreement and stays on the path to serious action on climate change.

This legislation demonstrates leadership and vision needed to tackle the climate crisis. We urge you to support the Climate Action Now Act to help make the future climate safe for our children and grandchildren and honor America's commitments to help confront this global challenge.

Signed,

Alaska Wilderness Action, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments, Arizona Parks and Recreation Association, Blue Future, Bold Alliance, Chispa, Chispa Arizona, Citizens' Climate Lobby, Clean Water Action, Climate Hawks Vote, Climate Law & Policy Project.

Climate Reality Project, Colorado Farm and Food Alliance, Conservation Colorado, Defend Our Future, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Earthworks, Eastern PA Coalition for Abandoned Mine Reclamation, Elders Climate Action, Endangered Species Coalition, Environment America.

Environment Colorado, Environment North Carolina, Environmental Defense Fund, Environmental Justice Center of Chestnut Hill United Church, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Friends of Ironwood Forest, Gasp, Green The Church, GreenLatinos, Hispanic Access Foundation, Hispanic Federation.

Interfaith Power & Light, Kids Climate Action Network, League of Conservation Voters,

League of Women Voters of the United States, National Hispanic Medical Association, National Parks Conservation Association, National Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Defense Council, NC League of Conservation Voters, Oxfam America.

Partnership for Policy Integrity, Physicians for Social Responsibility Pennsylvania, Public Citizen, Sierra Club, The Healthy Environment Alliance of Utah (HEAL Utah), The Trust for Public Land, The Wilderness Society, Union of Concerned Scientists, Voices for Progress, World Wildlife Fund.

LCV,

April 26, 2019.

Re Support H.R. 9, Climate Action Now Act.
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The League of Conservation Voters (LCV) works to turn environmental values into national priorities. Each year, LCV publishes the National Environmental Scorecard, which details the voting records of members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide, and the media.

We write in strong support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. This important legislation honors America's commitments to the Paris Climate Agreement, recognizes the urgency of tackling climate change, and lays the groundwork for further action.

Climate change is already having devastating impacts on communities across the country and the world. More extreme storms, record-breaking floods, and raging wildfires are hurting our families and even taking people's lives. It is unacceptable that these impacts and the burden of toxic pollution hit lower income, communities of color, and Indigenous peoples first and worst. Poll after poll shows that an overwhelming majority of voters—across ideological lines—want strong action on clean energy and climate solutions.

H.R. 9 is a strong rebuke of the Trump Administration's denial of the climate crisis, efforts to undermine progress, and ill-conceived decision to become the only country in the world to reject the landmark Paris Climate Agreement. In response to this utter failure of leadership, governors, mayors, universities, businesses, faith leaders, and investors are stepping up to support climate action to meet this agreement.

This momentum is only growing. Just this year, six new governors have joined the U.S. Climate Alliance, bringing the total to 23 states and territories committed to meeting the Paris Climate Agreement's goals. New Mexico Governor Lujan Grisham signed into law legislation that moves the state's electricity to 100% carbon free by 2045. Governors Walz (MN), Evers (WI), and Mills (ME) have all announced plans to move their state to 100% clean energy. After passing both chambers unanimously, Nevada Governor Sisolak signed into law legislation moving the state to 50% renewable energy by 2030. The Washington state legislature just passed a 100% clean energy bill, the Maryland legislature passed a 50% clean energy bill by 2030, and a comprehensive 100% clean energy package has been introduced in Illinois.

After eight years of the Republican leadership in the U.S. House taking us backwards in the fight against climate change, we are thrilled to see this important first step in the right direction and LCV urges you to SUPPORT H.R. 9. We will strongly consider including votes on this bill in the 2019 Scorecard. If you need more information, please

call my office and ask to speak with a member of our government relations team.

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,
President.

THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY,
April 2, 2019.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,
Chair, House Committee on Energy & Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Energy & Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PALLONE, RANKING MEMBER WALDEN, AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY & COMMERCE: On behalf of The Wilderness Society's over one million members and supporters, I write in support of H.R. 9, The Climate Action Now Act. This legislation would take a necessary and welcome step to reestablish the United States as a global leader and to tackle climate change at the scale required to avert the worst impacts of this crisis. The Wilderness Society urges you to vote for H.R. 9 when it is marked up in committee later this week.

Climate change represents the greatest threat facing our public lands and the communities that depend on them, from America's thawing Arctic to regions devastated by extreme drought and wildfire. President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement on climate change was a misguided step back from the kind of leadership the world expects of America. By deliberately undermining the global agreement and reversing policies to address U.S. emissions, President Trump has moved the United States and the world in the wrong direction at precisely the moment we need accelerated progress. H.R. 9 represents a much-needed step to confront the climate crisis by taking steps to prevent formal withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and requiring the Administration to develop a plan to meet national greenhouse gas targets.

The Wilderness Society believes that our 640 million acres of public lands can and must play a prominent role in addressing climate change in a comprehensive, sustainable and equitable way. We have a significant opportunity to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from fossil fuel energy development on public lands, which currently accounts for more than 20% of all U.S. emissions, and support responsibly-sited renewable energy projects. We must also protect large, connected landscapes, including our forests, deserts and other wild places that can help species adapt, store carbon, and provide natural infrastructure to safeguard communities from intensifying storms and extreme weather events. H.R. 9 takes an important first step in establishing a framework that allows for our public lands to be part of the climate solution, and no longer a significant contributor to the United States' carbon footprint.

The Wilderness Society looks forward to seeing passage of this bill, without amendment, as a first step in solving the climate crisis, and we welcome the opportunity to work with Congress to make public lands part of our national solution to climate change.

Sincerely,

DREW MCCONVILLE,
Senior Managing Director of Government Relations, The Wilderness Society.

[From EDF Action]

H.R. 9: THE CLIMATE ACTION NOW ACT

The Climate Action Now Act is a much-needed step toward reasserting American global leadership in the fight to solve climate change.

This bill gives Congress the opportunity to take common sense action against one of our country's most dangerous threats.

We need immediate action to reduce climate pollution and move our country toward 100% clean energy across the economy by 2050.

Taking action on climate change is necessary to:

Protect our health and our kids' future,

Strengthen the U.S. economy through innovation and investment,

Protect against trillions of dollars in damages,

Allow America to lead the next technological and energy revolution.

WHAT IS THE PARIS AGREEMENT?

In 2015 in a historic breakthrough, virtually every country in the world came together and committed to addressing climate change by reducing emissions. The announcement, known as Paris Agreement, allows each country to make its own plan to fight pollution.

A recommitment to the goals of the Paris Agreement would show the world that America takes its promise to cut pollution seriously, encourage other nations to honor their climate pledges as well, and give America a stronger voice in ongoing climate negotiations.

AMERICANS SUPPORT CLIMATE ACTION

The Trump administration has surrendered American leadership in the fight against climate change, isolating our country, and ignoring two-thirds of Americans who support climate action.

Recommitting to the Paris Agreement goals follows the lead of the over 3,500 elected officials, and tribal, university, businesses, and faith leaders, representing millions of Americans, who have pledged to continue to support climate action.

BLUEGREEN ALLIANCE,

April 30, 2019.

Re BlueGreen Alliance Supports H.R. 9, Climate Action Now Act.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As a coalition of the nation's largest labor unions and environmental groups, collectively representing millions of members and supporters, we write to express the BlueGreen Alliance's support for H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

The United States' adoption of the Paris Agreement was an historic step to lead in the fight against global climate change. The Trump Administration's stated intention to withdraw from this agreement is a mistake with dire consequences for the United States and the rest of the world. The effects of climate change are already being felt in communities across the country in the form of more frequent and severe extreme weather events, wildfires, droughts, and rising sea levels.

Removing the United States from the Agreement would be an abdication of our nation's responsibility to the world and to future generations to lead in the fight against climate change. Our country can and should lead the world in driving the significant economic growth and job creation that can result from clean energy technologies and infrastructure required to reduce climate change-driving pollution. The Paris Agreement holds all countries accountable for

their emissions, and is a critical tool at our disposal to create a level playing field for U.S.-based manufacturing in the race against our global economic competitors to build the clean technologies of the future.

America is currently meeting the challenge of making our energy, transportation, and other systems cleaner and more efficient. We have already begun putting millions of people to work in jobs designing, manufacturing, and installing the clean energy technology and infrastructure needed to reduce the pollution that is driving climate change. At the same time, we must ensure that the jobs we're building in new clean technologies are quality, family-sustaining jobs. Additionally, we must address the challenges of this transition to ensure that no communities or workers are left behind by making available the tools and resources for workers to transition to new, good jobs and for communities to diversify their local and regional economies and create new opportunities.

Ultimately, we have everything we need to meet our commitment made in the Paris Agreement. American innovation has the potential to lead the world in solving our environmental problems while creating good jobs for workers.

The Climate Action Now Act recognizes this reality and would block President Trump's dangerous threat to remove the United States from the Paris Agreement and require the Administration to create a plan that demonstrates how the U.S. will go about meeting our commitments for climate change mitigation. By addressing climate change the right way—with investments in infrastructure and job training, and developing technologies of the future—our country can lead the world in driving the significant economic growth and job creation that comes from the design, manufacturing, and installation of the clean energy economy. For these reasons, BlueGreen Alliance urges Congress to swiftly pass this legislation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL WILLIAMS,
Interim Co-Executive Director,
BlueGreen Alliance.

UNITED STEELWORKERS,

April 2, 2019.

Re United Steelworkers support H.R. 9, Climate Action Now Act.

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 850,000 members of the United Steelworkers (USW), we urge you to support the Climate Action Now Act (H.R. 9). This simple and straightforward legislation prevents the Trump Administration from withdrawing from the Paris Agreement and requires a plan for the United States to meet its emissions targets.

In our union's 1990 report titled *Our Children's World*, we stated that, "[Climate change] may be the single greatest problem we face." The situation has become more urgent, and for many years the United States has been a leader in innovation and technology to combat this crisis.

The Paris Agreement is an ambitious, non-binding, and transparent achievement in the global fight against climate change. The President's 2017 announcement of his intent to withdraw was reckless and opposed by labor, environmental, and business leaders. Withdrawal would be an inexcusable blow to the U.S. economy, as the diplomatic and trade impacts would be felt for years.

We applaud the House Democratic Leadership for introducing H.R. 9 to reverse this Administration's decision. We urge all mem-

bers to support the Climate Action Now Act (H.R. 9).

Sincerely,

LEO W. GERARD,
International President.

APRIL 2019.

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

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: We are members of the Leaders Circle of the largest coalition ever assembled for climate action in the United States, and are among the over 3,750 U.S. businesses, cities, states, tribes, colleges and universities, investors, faith groups, cultural institutions, and health care organizations who declared "We Are Still In" the Paris Agreement and the fight against climate change.

Since We Are Still In launched two years ago, more and more American leaders have stepped forward to declare their support for the global solution to climate change. Our 3,750 signatories come from all fifty states, represent half of the U.S. population and over half of the U.S. economy.

In that time, the science around climate change has only become increasingly clear. Last year, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change detailed the dire global consequences of allowing global temperature increases to exceed 2.7° F/1.5° C. Similarly, the National Climate Assessment detailed that the impacts of climate change are already impacting every place and walk of life in the United States. Our future is at stake.

For these reasons, we endorse H.R. 9: Climate Action Now Act, which advances our commitment to address climate change and support the Paris Agreement, and hope that leaders from both sides will choose to stand behind the legislation. It is in America's best interest to improve our global leadership and reputation on this issue by honoring our contribution to the Paris Agreement.

For our part, we will continue our commitment to tackling climate change by reducing our emissions and working together for a broad transformation of the U.S. economy. We look forward to welcoming strong, smart, national policies to address the climate challenge while unleashing substantial economic and public health benefits.

Sincerely,

Bishop Marc Andrus, The Episcopal Church; Richard Beam, Chief Environmental Officer, Providence St Joseph Health; Mayor Jim Brainard, City of Cannel, Indiana; Alison Brown, President and CEO, Science Museum of Minnesota; President Michael Crow, Arizona State University; President David Finegold, Chatham University; President Dianne Harrison, California State University—Northridge; Mayor Keith A James, City of West Palm Beach, Florida; President Mark Mitsui, Portland Community College; President Fawn Sharp, Quinault Indian Nation.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,

Washington, DC, April 26, 2019.

Re NAACP Strong support for H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the NAACP, our nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized grassroots-based civil rights organization, I strongly urge you to support and vote in favor of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. The earth's climate is now changing faster than at any point in

the history of modern civilization, primarily as a result of human activities, and as the effects of climate change intensify, so too will the stark differences in consequences experienced by the privileged and the disadvantaged. Low-income populations and in America people of color will suffer more dire repercussions because of climate change.

From Hurricane Katrina in 2005, to the more recent flooding in Houston due to Hurricane Harvey in 2017, as well as numerous other weather-related catastrophes including heat waves, hurricanes, cyclones, and floods we have witnessed the inconceivable loss of life and property that can be caused by more dangerous weather systems. The increased ferocity of these storms is but one result of climate change, yet it perhaps offers us the best insight into its disparate impact. Low income Americans and racial and ethnic minorities have fewer resources with which they can prepare for, defend against, or use to clean up after a disaster.

While H.R. 9 does not offer the resources which are necessary to defend against a crisis situation, it does make it less likely that we will be faced with catastrophes on the scale to which we are growing sadly increasingly accustomed. Specifically, H.R. 9 would require that the United States remain a partner in and part of the 2016 Paris agreement on climate change. The United States was once a global leader in pushing for climate action, but we have recently lost our way. As a result, our progress and that of some other nations in reducing emissions has dwindled and is now reversing itself.

There is not time to waste: we need to take decisive action to address this increasing problem while we still can. It is not an understatement to say that our future depends upon it. Please support and vote for H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, and urge your colleagues in the other body, as well, as the President, to take the threat of climate change seriously. Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at my office.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
Director, NAACP Washington Bureau and
Senior Vice President for Policy and
Advocacy.

APRIL 29, 2019.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned public health and medical organizations urge you to support H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. The bill would help ensure that the United States adheres to the science-based targets in the Paris Agreement and develops a plan to meet them, both essential steps to protecting public health from the impacts of climate change.

Climate change is a public health emergency. The science clearly shows that communities across the nation are experiencing the health impacts of climate change, including enhanced conditions for ozone and particulate air pollution, which cause asthma attacks, cardiovascular disease and premature death; increased instances of extreme heat, severe storms and other destabilizing weather patterns that disrupt people's access to essential healthcare; increased spread of vector-borne diseases; and longer and more intense allergy seasons. These threats are no longer hypothetical, and Americans across the country have experienced them firsthand.

Every American's health is at risk due to climate change, but some populations are at greater risk, including infants, children, seniors, pregnant women, low-income communities, some communities of color, people with disabilities and many people with chronic diseases. Evidence and experience shows that these populations will disproportionately

bear the health impacts of climate change without concerted action to both mitigate and adapt to climate change.

The science is also clear that limiting increase in global temperatures to no more than 1.5 degrees Celsius is essential. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found dramatic differences in health impacts between 1.5 and 2 degrees, including in heat-related morbidity and mortality, ozone-related mortality, and vector-borne diseases. The Paris Agreement's goals are to keep the world well under 2 degrees Celsius and to pursue efforts to further stay below 1.5 degrees.

H.R. 9 is an important step toward what must become a comprehensive set of policies protect public health from the worst impacts of climate change. The nation urgently needs to implement strong, science-based measures to reduce the emissions that cause climate change. The U.S. must also invest in health adaptation strategies to help communities address the varied health impacts they are already facing.

On behalf of the patients and communities we serve, we urge you to vote YES on H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

Sincerely,

Allergy & Asthma Network, Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments, American Lung Association, American Public Health Association, Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health, Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America, Children's Environmental Health Network, Climate for Health, Health Care Climate Council, Health Care Without Harm.

National Association of County and City Health Officials, National Environmental Health Association, National Medical Association, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Public Health Institute.

□ 1545

Mr. ENGEL. I think that it is very clear to say that this is a broad-based bill, and I do hope that we will pass it. We have the ability to work together to do it.

I thank the ranking member for his offer to work together. We have a tradition of doing that on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and we will do it again.

But climate change, global warming, is a factor. We can put our heads in the sand like an ostrich and pretend it is not there, but it is there and it is big; and if we don't do something about it soon, we are all going to pay the price in the future.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote for this important bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

President Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement is unjustified and, I believe, dangerous. It abdicates U.S. leadership on climate action and puts the health and safety of our communities at great risk. It also jeopardizes our national and economic security.

We can't live in the past. China, the EU, and others are moving towards a low-carbon economy, building solar panels, wind turbines, and cornering the market on renewable industries.

We can and should be a leader in that transition so that our industries, our

workers, and our communities benefit from the new opportunities created.

The United States has always been at the forefront in the creation of new technologies and new jobs; but, rather than leading right now, President Trump and his administration are simply sticking their heads in the sand, acting like this is the 19th century.

We have to be future oriented, not live in the past, or we will simply be left behind.

The President is actually making the climate crisis worse. The Trump administration gutted regulations to control methane pollution from the oil and gas sector, rolled back stronger fuel efficiency standards for vehicles, and illegally blocked improved appliance efficiency standards.

These actions led to a rise in greenhouse gas emissions last year.

Now, back in my district, I want you to understand, this is not a partisan issue. Everyone sees the harm climate change is doing to our shoreline, our oceans, and the health and well-being of our residents.

States and local governments are taking action on climate change. They are concerned about the health of their constituents, asthmatics who are negatively impacted by dirty air, cancers that are aggravated by increased toxicity.

I have a lot of Republican mayors and county and State legislators, and I don't know one of those Republican mayors or elected officials who thinks that the Federal Government should withdraw from climate action.

It is the cost of inaction that is really painful. We have all seen them. In 2017, the United States experienced 16 natural disasters with costs totaling \$360 billion. Superstorm Sandy hit my district very hard.

But I want to say that we still have time to avoid a deeper climate crisis, while strengthening and modernizing our economy at the same time, and H.R. 9 is an important step in that regard.

So—please—I call on my colleagues, I beg my colleagues, let's take this opportunity to prevent the withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and, at the same time, call upon this administration to come up with ways of achieving the goal of the Paris Agreement.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, clearly, today is, unfortunately, more about the politics of climate change than actually rolling up our sleeves and getting to work on American solutions.

Climate change is real, but addressing climate change should not involve binding ourselves to international agreements that put United States workers and jobs at a disadvantage to our main competitors around the world and with no regard to the cost for American consumers and ratepayers.

We should have a serious, solutions-oriented discussion about how to address climate change risks through

American innovation, American conservation, and preparation.

But we all know that long-term, sustainable policy is best developed through a thoughtful, logical, and strong bipartisan process. That is the approach we have taken over the last several Congresses as Republicans and one I think we should continue in this Congress.

In fact, in the last Congress, Republicans worked with Democrats to remove regulatory barriers to new technological advances in power generation, from hydropower to small modular nuclear, from tax policies that actually encourage carbon capture and storage to reforms of the Nation's electric grid.

There are many bipartisan policies Congress could further pursue to accelerate innovation and to create industrial, electrical, and technological infrastructure that actually will enable cleaner energy systems for the future; such as, furthering advanced nuclear reactor technologies, easing the permitting of clean-energy infrastructure, and modernizing our electric grid.

We need to do all of those, Mr. Chairman.

We can also look to better management of our Federal forests to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfires, which choke the communities, like those in my home State of Oregon, with smoke and fill our atmosphere with untold pollutants.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change found that sustainably managing our Federal forests—in fact, all forests—will create the longest sustained carbon mitigation benefit. Those are the findings of the U.N. IPCC.

But H.R. 9, it just does not represent that kind of bipartisan policy that we should be considering today. This bill is being considered, frankly, without the benefit of regular order in any committee of jurisdiction. It has no companion in the United States Senate.

H.R. 9 represents the Democrats' reflexive response to the President's June 1, 2017, announcement that the U.S. would withdraw from the Paris Agreement.

Now, the Obama administration's commitments in Paris were made without a clear plan to even meet those provisions, without a full view of the costs to American consumers, and certainly without a strategy that had broad bipartisan support from Congress.

Further, H.R. 9's unquestioning focus on U.S. domestic action ignores the evidence that the bulk of the future global emissions growth will be in China, it will be in India and the rest of the developing world.

If implemented, it would lock in the United States to expensive commitments that will harm consumers; our communities; and, frankly, our economic security.

Republicans offered a number of amendments to debate these matters,

but, unfortunately, most of those amendments were rejected by Democrats.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are serious about reducing emissions and addressing other climate change risks, and doing so quickly, they would acknowledge the reality of global energy needs. They would acknowledge that the United States is reducing greenhouse gas emissions through innovation and through technological development, frankly, better than any country on the planet.

That is what we are doing as Americans. That is what we do. We innovate. We lead. And we are doing that in emissions reduction; we are doing that with new energy technologies; and that is where we should be focused as a Congress to incentivize those going forward.

Now, instead of spending a week of precious legislative time talking about a bill that, frankly, has little teeth, will never move in the Senate, would get vetoed by the President if it ever got to his desk, we could be legislating on how to ease the overly burdensome hydropower licensing process.

The Northwest is a great place for hydroelectricity. We know a lot about it, and it has zero carbon emissions.

Or we could be passing bills that support nuclear energy. You look at the small modular nuclear technologies that are on the cusp of an energy future for baseload power, and you understand just what that could be, with no emissions.

We could either do that through licensing reform or through these advanced technologies.

Let's focus on the new technology necessary for future energy systems, for future transportation systems, for advances in manufacturing and industry to emit fewer greenhouse gases. That is what we should be doing.

Let's work together on the bills that are going to lead to ribbon-cutting ceremonies for new energy infrastructure or to an American getting a new, well-paid job in the energy industry.

That infrastructure could be a wind farm. It could be a natural gas pipeline. That new job could be as a solar installer, or it could be a nuclear engineer.

I am not talking about picking winners and losers here when it comes to energy, the environment, or the climate. I am talking about unleashing American innovators to do what they do best, and that is develop new and better technologies that benefit consumers, benefit the environment, and benefit the good, old United States of America.

So we should reject H.R. 9 and focus on realistic solutions to prepare for the future and on policies that work for the American public.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee,

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for allowing me 2 minutes.

We are here today to talk about a global problem that demands a global solution. Since the Industrial Revolution, a significant amount of carbon has been building up in the atmosphere; and, until just recently, the United States was the number one emitter of carbon pollution.

As China ramped up its emissions, we lost that dubious title, but we are still dumping massive amounts of carbon into the atmosphere.

This carbon in the atmosphere has caused energy to accumulate in the oceans and the skies, and that is now causing changes in our environment. And these changes will continue to grow.

The global solution we need is one that the United States actually had a hand in crafting. We led the efforts in the development and adoption of the Paris climate accord; but now, because of this administration's decision, we are telling the world to do as we say, not as we do.

The Paris climate accord is one of the most comprehensive deals to date and is a worldwide agreement to begin reducing carbon emissions. It is the important first step in the battle to stop the dangerous spiral of climate change.

If we retreat from the Paris accord, we are condemning future generations to a world filled with catastrophic climate change and conflict.

H.R. 9 will help heal this rift by putting us in alignment with the rest of the global community and holding us to standards that we helped put in place.

My Republican colleagues say they believe in climate change but have always refused action.

The Paris climate agreement is action. Let's get with the program.

The United States has led by example, so, today, I inform my colleagues: Adopt H.R. 9. Don't make us the past villain for future generations.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), a very important member of our committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, put simply, this legislation forces President Trump's hand to carry out the goals of his predecessor, but this administration was elected to tackle our energy issues differently, our environmental issues differently.

Americans asked for this change in direction. And we got that last Congress, where Republicans worked with this administration to find creative ways to streamline the development and use of all of our energy sources and technologies.

We examined grid modification issues, looked at ways to encourage the creation and adoption of advanced nuclear energy, along with creative ways to encourage new coal and natural gas technologies.

We looked at how market forces are driving new energy technologies and

how the Federal Government can play a supportive role in that advancement, not pick winners and losers.

I worry that today's legislation could bring us back to a prescriptive approach to our Federal energy policy. It could cause significant ratepayer hikes on families and small businesses in eastern and southeastern Ohio who simply cannot absorb higher electric bills.

H.R. 9 was rushed through our committees. The Energy and Commerce Committee held no hearings on it, but simply a full committee markup. Members had no time to debate it—only vote.

E&C Democrat leadership even expressed frustration over the expedited pace of this bill.

Because of these reasons and the issues raised by my colleagues, I urge a “no” vote on H.R. 9.

□ 1600

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), another member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, that is laid before this House now for final consideration.

“The Earth's climate is now changing faster than at any point in the history of modern civilization.” This is a direct quote from the Fourth National Climate Assessment issued by our top scientists from across 13 government agencies.

Sea levels are rising; average temperatures are warming; ice is disappearing; and extreme weather is intensifying and becoming more frequent. And we know that in this Chamber, because we are dealing with the consequences of the hurricanes, the fires, too often because of our constituents that are being hurt.

We know this is affecting the lives of growing numbers of Americans all across the country. And even as I stand here, right now, we have floods in my district.

Climate change is an urgent, existential threat we all face, and bold action is demanded at this moment. We have to act together, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans.

We don't change treaties. We don't change things because we have had a change in who has been elected President. We respect that office. The consequences of inaction are real, and not only are future generations put at risk each day if we do nothing, so are we.

This begins by ensuring America honors its commitment under the Paris Agreement. Withdrawing is not the answer.

The Climate Action Now Act would simply prevent the United States from using Federal dollars to withdraw from the Paris Agreement; and calls on the President to develop and make public a plan for how the United States will

meet its nationally-determined contributions submitted to the world in 2015.

The bill is technology-neutral, so the President has the flexibility to set climate policies and marshal renewable forms of energy. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, President Trump has made clear what climate action he doesn't like. He doesn't like the Paris Agreement, which contemplated that every nation in the world would set a target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

He doesn't like the Clean Power Plan, which encouraged each State to create its own strategy to lower greenhouse gas emissions. And he doesn't like the CAFE standards that required automakers to lower emissions from cars and trucks.

Now, last month, the President's own EPA administrator came to the Energy and Commerce Committee, and he testified, and he agreed that climate change is happening, and that it is driven largely by human activity.

So the question is, what climate action does President Trump support? And that is the point of the Climate Action Now Act, which simply invites the President to tell us his strategy.

Now, there are many options, many bipartisan options, many mentioned by my colleague from Oregon, Mr. WALDEN. These are increasing research into energy storage technologies, pricing carbon, incentivizing more renewable energy, requiring or incentivizing energy efficiency, easing regulation for developing renewables, developing carbon capture and negative emissions technology, or investing in resiliency and more.

And we don't even need the President to draft new ideas. We have got existing bills from the last Congress and from this Congress we have assembled into The Climate Playbook, which you can find right on my Congressional website.

Mr. President, we get that you don't like President Obama's climate action ideas. Now tell us your climate action plans.

I encourage each of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to join me in making that request to President Trump by supporting and passing H.R. 9. Congress has a Climate Playbook.

Mr. President, tell us yours.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SABLAN). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) to speak on this matter.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I am probably going to be a little different than some of the folks you are

going to have come speak from our side. I actually, though, like the goal that we agreed to, or the President agreed to in 2015.

I believe it is an abdication, though, of our responsibility to actually build what the plan is—we will call it the smorgasbord of options out there—because, if you think about it, once again, it is Congress passing the buck saying, well, here's the goal; let someone else take the blows of it.

So if we are going to have an honest conversation, let's say I am a State that uses heating oil. Heating oil is functionally filthy. Okay. Are you willing to encourage that community, that State, to allow more natural gas extraction, more pipelines so we can actually hit the numbers? Or is it easier passing it on to the White House to let them take the slings and arrows of what it takes policy-wise?

If you actually look at the reality, 2015, the year that President Obama agreed to this, that year, every functioning benefit from all of the solar that was adopted in 2015 was removed because of the amount of nuclear that went offline that year. Are we ready here to step up and say, hey, if we want baseload, clean, non-CO₂, non-greenhouse emitting, we are going to step up and get this nuclear back online, because it is a type—just that 1 year of the number of nuclear facilities that closed equaled every solar panel in the country that was added.

Are we willing to continue to do as we did in Ways and Means last year, moving forward with carbon sequestration tax credits?

Turns out there is some new amazing technology of mining CO₂ right out of the air. There is a utility scale, industrial scale facility going up in Canada now that has broken the Holy Grail on the code on how to do it. These are pro-growth policies that we, as this body, should be adopting, not passing it off to the bureaucracy and the administration to make the hard choices.

Understand, we did some math a couple of years ago that, if we would do a pipeline loop in West Texas to capture methane flare-off, capture that gas and make it—utilize it, it had a huge effect in getting us, like right now, that last 13 points of gap that we have to get in the next 7 years.

How many of my brothers and sisters on the other side are ready to stand up and promote more natural gas, more pipelines, more tax credit mechanisms for carbon sequestration? Those are policy decisions. That is our job here in the House.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), who is the chairman of our Environment and Climate Change Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership as chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Certainly, as chair of the Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change, I understand the prioritization that we need to make as a House with climate change. We are doing it with this caucus, with the Democratic Caucus. We have languished without a policy or hearings in the committee for quite some time and, finally, the Democrats are showing their forcefulness.

Global problems require global cooperation, and we accept this as a given when it comes to countless security, health, and economic challenges. And climate change will impact all of these areas, and more.

But global climate action will not succeed without America at the table, leading by example. Other nations understand this, as do thousands of United States cities, businesses, universities, and nonprofit organizations.

That is why the “We Are Still In” campaign was formed, and why its many members support this bill. The contributions of subnational actors can achieve two-thirds of our 2025 national commitment, but we need Federal action to fill the gap.

President Trump has made it clear that he does not appreciate the previous administration’s policies to achieve America’s Paris target. Therefore, Mr. President, we have a very fair question of you. What is your plan?

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have taken the opposite approach, throwing up their hands and saying this bill is a waste of time because the President would veto it.

I could not disagree more. This vote will show the American people and the international community who in Washington understands and acknowledges the threat of climate change; who recognizes the importance of building global cooperation to address it; and who will work to enact the policies that will result in a safer, healthier planet, a planet that will be safer for future generations.

Based on the President’s statements, the answer is clearly, not him. And the clock is ticking.

I hope next time we are on the floor, we will be debating concrete solutions that will lead to meaningful emissions reductions and accelerate the clean energy transition. We can start that process today by stating in clear and resounding fashion: We Are Still in. Support this bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, at the heart of America’s economic prosperity and unrivaled security is an abundant, affordable and reliable supply of domestic energy.

The lion’s share of America’s energy supply, nearly 90 percent, comes from fossil energy resources, and the hard-working energy producers of West Texas are leading the way. This is thanks to the great American work ethic, entrepreneurial spirit, and drive for innovation.

In the Permian Basin in West Texas, we went from producing a million barrels of oil a day in 2012 to four million today, and we are on a path to producing 8 million barrels a day within just a few years.

The blessings of these natural resources have allowed us to become the most powerful and prosperous nation on the face of the planet. It has allowed us to build the largest middle class in the world; helped us to produce the new technologies and innovations that have improved the quality of life and given us the highest standard of living in the world.

It has been the lifeblood of this land of opportunity, where we now have more jobs than we actually have people to fill them.

Having an abundant supply of energy doesn’t just fuel this economy. It also is an overwhelming advantage in terms of national security. Energy independence gives us choices that many nations would be envious of. It allows us to export that same freedom to our allies and to democracies around the world.

Forcing our President to stay in this terrible deal would undermine many of those advantages, and it would penalize the American people, and cost hundreds of billions of dollars. It would cost us millions of jobs.

At best, the Paris Agreement is a feel-good-do-nothing political window dressing, at best. At worst, it is a tax on the middle and working class. It is a millstone around the neck of our job creators. And it is a gift to our enemies, and we must oppose it.

It would punish the American people. It would punish our children and their future in this country.

Look, I want responsible stewardship of the environment, like everybody in this Chamber. And I want clean water and clean air for my kids. But I also want them to grow up in the safest, strongest, freest nation in the world.

The irony of this discussion is that the United States is leading this debate. We are leading in our actions.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALDEN. I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ARRINGTON. The irony is the innovations and technology that created the shale revolution have already resulted in significant reduction in carbon. Since 2000, the U.S. has led the way by cutting emissions by almost 20 percent.

We need policies that are not hostile to America’s main source of energy. Instead, we should put forth solutions that encourage the continued development of all energy resources, while setting high and responsible standards for environmental quality and human health. And we should carry out this mission in partnership, not in hostility, in partnership with States and industry.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire about how much time remains on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER).

□ 1615

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. I am a proud cosponsor of the bill and a longtime supporter of the Paris climate accord.

With the Northwest on catastrophic fire alert every year, everyone out west knows full well that climate change is a real and serious threat that needs addressing.

To that end, we cannot abdicate the United States’ very serious responsibility to lead the world in curbing the effects of climate change. That is why I have strongly opposed the President’s reckless decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement, which has seriously damaged U.S. credibility on the world stage.

The Paris Agreement stresses the dire importance of international cooperation in combating the climate crisis. We must work together with countries around the world if we are to achieve any sort of meaningful dent in greenhouse gas emissions.

I am proud that my State of Oregon remains committed to the goals of the Paris Agreement, but one State’s efforts cannot combat climate change alone. We need the Climate Action Now Act to keep the entire country committed to the Paris Agreement.

I urge support for the bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I don’t believe we have any other speakers on our side, so I will conclude my comments and then be happy to hear from the chairman of the committee.

I think we have had a good debate here, a thorough debate, and at the end of the day, it is important to remember America is actually leading, through new innovation and technology in the energy sector, the reduction in emissions. Again, we are leading as a country.

You look at other countries, competitors of ours like China, wouldn’t have to begin making reductions until 2030, so they can keep adding emissions-spewing power plants. They could do all kinds of things until 2030. Meanwhile, we are supposed to shut down our economy in a lot of ways if you go down certain paths.

We don’t think we should take that bargain. We don’t think we have to take that bargain. Instead, Republicans believe we should continue to rely on our great innovators in America to develop even new technologies to reduce emissions and produce power like we have done in the energy sector, as my friend from Texas described.

And like my friend from Arizona described, there are companies around

the world that are figuring out how to remove carbon from the atmosphere and use it for another purpose. Republicans led the effort on tax credits to say let's incent you to put carbon into other use or into the ground, and we will even give you a bigger incentive to put it in the ground.

We should be doing more in the area of advanced battery research, like is being done at Pacific Northwest National Laboratory across the river from Oregon, and get to where we can harness the renewable intermittent power sources to more firm power; and the same with streamlining hydro, with pump storage.

There is a lot we can do working together to make sure we have a safe, secure, reliable grid that is adequate to make all this seamlessly work together because, at the end of the day, we want to make sure we don't have riots in the streets because you have driven up costs too high, like they are having in France today. We want to make sure that we are creating the jobs and technology here, because if somebody is going to lead this effort internationally, it should be us.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is going nowhere after this vote today, and I would urge opposition.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, particularly the last two speakers, and it just seems that they are trying to invent something that doesn't exist.

They talk about jobs. They talk about innovation. They talk about the freedom to let people do what they want, but what is really happening here is the Trump administration is actually trying to force the old ways, saying, well, okay, maybe coal is not as competitive as it used to be, but we will find a way to make it competitive. We will find a way to say that fossil fuels have a future where they can be used even more so.

Government policy has to lead innovation. That is what it is all about. What we are seeing is that our competitors like China, for example, realize that renewables are the future. They realize that the fossil fuels and continued use of coal, for example, are actually polluting the environment, so they are taking the lead and they are creating innovative technologies, and they are creating the jobs that go along with it.

A few years ago, if I can use my home State of New Jersey, when Governor Christie was first elected, a Republican Governor in New Jersey, he started out by saying that he was going to have wind turbines built in New Jersey. He was going to have us manufacture solar panels. He was going to have us be the renewable center for the country. Then, very quickly after that, when he decided to run for President, he

dropped all that and actually pulled out of RGGI, our regional agreement.

And what happens? The other States or the other countries, they start developing these new technologies, and they then corner the market on things like wind turbines or solar panels. More and more of those are being manufactured in China and then shipped over here. So we lose the competitive edge that we would have had through innovation that is essentially driven by good government policy. Then what happens is we lose the jobs and our economy falls behind.

You know, the same thing is true with climate disasters. My district was more impacted by Superstorm Sandy than any other district in the country. What happens? You know, we lose jobs. Our tourism economy was destroyed in the summer because there was so much damage and destruction. People lost their jobs; they had to look elsewhere; their income was reduced.

So this notion that somehow if you do nothing or if you withdraw from international agreements because of your fear of the future, that this is going to help you, help your economy, help your jobs, it is not true. It is, in fact, just the opposite.

I don't want our country to fall behind. I don't want us to look towards 19th century solutions while other countries are looking towards 21st century innovations. We can't be like an ostrich where we just put our head in the sand and we assume that everything is going to be the same in the future. That is simply not the case.

I don't care whether it is the European Union. I don't care whether it is Japan, China, or India. They understand where the future is. They understand that these new technologies have to be fostered at the Federal level, the same way they are being fostered at the State and the local level.

So let us not kid ourselves and think that somehow actions in Washington don't make a difference. They do. One of the purposes of government is trying to find ways to innovate and create jobs for the future and not rely on the past, and that is all we are saying.

So we have to send a message with H.R. 9: Withdrawal from the Paris Agreement is not good for this country; it is not good for our jobs; it is not good for our economy.

Please support this bill. Let us be on the right path again.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, Congressman MOULTON of Massachusetts and Congresswoman HAYES of Connecticut, and express my appreciation to them for their assistance and support.

The Jackson Lee/Moulton/Hayes Amendment improves the bill by adding a finding which emphasizes the importance of international cooperation and multilateralism in responding to the global challenges facing the international community.

The Paris Climate Accord was an example of the international leadership, commitment,

and resolve that defeated fascism, created NATO, the European Union, the Marshall Plan, the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and most importantly, preserved peace and freedom for the last 75 years.

Collective international action is also needed to combat growing international challenges such as terrorism, human trafficking, and black-market sales of illegal weapons, drugs, and tobacco.

No one country can solve these problems on its own, and this amendment emphasizes the importance of collective international action.

The landmark Paris Climate Accord was established to combat climate change and to accelerate and intensify the actions and investments needed for a sustainable low carbon future.

This also brings all nations into a common cause to undertake ambitious efforts to combat climate change and adapt to its effects, with enhanced support to assist developing countries to do so.

And in these efforts, we promote the importance of continued international cooperation that has sustained the global community through epidemics, famines, and natural disasters.

A collective of rational actors acting in a selfless manner to achieve a rational result such as this requires leadership and systemic reasoning.

Without this type of collective action and selfless resolve, we leave ourselves vulnerable to a Tragedy of Commons.

When countries act solely in their best interests without regard to combatting international threats, everyone suffers.

That is why a great person and former Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, so eloquently said: "We are stronger together."

The Jackson Lee/Moulton/Hayes Amendment reflects this important insight.

I urge support of the Jackson Lee/Moulton/Hayes Amendment.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. The Paris Agreement codified what many across the world already knew must be done to meaningfully address our most serious environmental challenge: climate change. Four years ago, 190 countries came together to make a commitment. Now, however, the United States stands alone in its intent to withdraw from it.

Establishing a commitment to action, not for some, but for all countries, is the first step towards limiting the worst effects of a changing climate. Scientific reports like the Fourth National Climate Assessment and the IPCC's Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 Degrees, both released at the end of last year, summarized 50 years of scientific evidence. These reports concluded that every bit of warming matters, for our economies, for our families, and for public health.

I cosponsored H.R. 9 because it represents a simple, bold, and achievable goal. It lays out common-sense steps that will lead to a healthier environment, because acting on climate change is not only an environmental imperative, but a public health and economic one as well.

Without action, climate change will be costly. With the right signals from the federal government, however, addressing climate change can also lead to business opportunities. This

bill sends a signal to the private sector that a stable framework for action will be put in place, enabling private actors to invest, innovate, and inspire further action.

It promotes the transition to a clean economy. And perhaps, most importantly, it sends a strong and much needed signal to the rest of the world about the seriousness of the United States in addressing climate change. It restores meaningful international engagement.

The United States has been a leader in global initiatives on climate solutions before and should be again. This Congress my colleagues and I have worked to re-establish the U.S.'s climate leadership. On the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, we have held hearings examining the findings of major climate reports, discussing the warming, deoxygenation, and acidification of our oceans, and how our interconnected energy and water systems are stressed by a changing climate. The House Science Committee has marked up four bipartisan bills that address ocean acidification, as well as the Energy and Water Research Integration Act, which I reintroduced with my colleague and Ranking Member of the House Science Committee, Mr. LUCAS. It instructs the Department of Energy to incorporate the consideration of water use and treatment into all of its relevant research, development, and demonstration programs. We hope to continue the momentum of discussion and action on climate change, and urge my colleagues to support passage of this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the following letters of support for H.R. 9.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, Congress will soon vote on legislation that would compel the Trump administration to honor and plan for meeting the United States' commitment under the Paris Agreement. We, the undersigned members of E2 (Environmental Entrepreneurs), strongly urge you to vote in support of this bill to ensure that we continue to focus on actions to protect our climate and grow our economy.

E2 is a national, nonpartisan group of business leaders who advocate for smart policies that are good for the economy and good for the environment. Our members have founded or funded more than 2,500 companies, created more than 600,000 jobs, and manage more than \$100 billion in venture and private equity capital.

As business leaders, investors and professionals from every sector of the economy who live or do business in every state, we understand the enormous economic promise that can arise if the United States leads on this issue and stays a party to the Paris Agreement.

Thanks in part to federal leadership, more than 3 million Americans now work in clean energy and vehicles jobs. These are residents of every state who go to work every day installing solar panels on homes and commercial buildings, manufacturing wind turbines, and making our homes, schools, vehicles and offices more efficient. By honoring our obligations in the Paris Agreement, America can continue to drive demand for innovative technologies and industries that grow our economy and create jobs.

Studies show that delivering on the Paris Agreement would unlock at least \$19 trillion in economic growth globally. The international clean energy market is already worth an astounding \$1.4 trillion a year—and set to grow, with America's share pegged at \$200 billion annually. This economic activity could fuel an additional \$26 billion in GDP

growth in the United States alone by 2020, which would also provide greater opportunities for U.S. businesses to lead in emerging clean economy markets.

The Paris Agreement is good for American businesses and its workers. Ensuring that we maintain our obligations under this historic agreement is a chance to ensure America leads in clean energy, agriculture, transportation, infrastructure, technology and other sectors instead of falling behind our overseas competitors.

We urge you to vote in favor of legislation that keeps the United States in the Paris Agreement and creates a plan for meeting our nation's commitments.

Sincerely,

382 E2 BUSINESS MEMBERS AND SUPPORTERS

Dan Abrams (California), President/CEO, Wynkoop Properties; Clifford Adams (New York), Managing Director, Coady Diemart Partners; Hartwig Adan, Google; Milo Aguilar (Illinois), Consultant, Sumac Consulting; Shauna Alexander (Oregon), Vice President, Sustainability Stumptown Coffee Roasters; Annick Antcl (Michigan), Assistant Professor, Civil & Environmental Engineering, Michigan State University.

Trevor Anderson (California), Policy Manager, Climate Action Reserve; Emily Applegate (Colorado), Senior Manager, Business Funding & Incentives, Business Investments, OEDIT; Esteban Arenas; Gerald L. Armes, Principal Engineer, Aurastar; Anne Arquit Niederberger (California), VP, Market Development, Enevee; John Atherton (Pennsylvania); Michael Atkins (California), Communications and Impact Manager, Friends of the Los Angeles River; Betsy Aubrey (California); Marta Badon (Louisiana); Ravi Bajaj (California); Claire Baldwin (California); Jay Baldwin (California), Partner, Wind River Capital Partners, LLC.

Fred Bamber (California), Managing Director, Spartina LLC; Tom Bartley (California), Founder/VP Sales & Marketing, Proennis; Caroline Bauhaus (California), Education Consultant, Equity & Access; Mark Bauhaus (California), Partner, Just Business; Keir Beadling (California), CEO and Co-Founder, Mavericks Surf Ventures; Michael Bean (Ohio), Facility Manager, Third Federal Savings & Loan; Jacob Bean-Watson (Oregon); Natalie Bearbower (Illinois).

Josh Beck (Pennsylvania), General Manager, BCI Technology Investments; Karen Begin (California), Development Director, Environment, San Diego Habitat for Humanity; Thatcher Bell (New York), CoVentures; Dave Belote (Virginia), Managing Partner & CEO, DARE Strategies LLC; Jeff Bennett (Colorado), Founder, Big Kid Science; Lisa Bennett (Colorado); Karin Berardo (California), Founder, SIREs Advisors (Also Board Member, CleanPath); Seth Berkman (Massachusetts), Energy Market Analyst, SourceOne; Elliot Berman, CEO, Solar Energy Corp.

Eric Berman (Washington), President and Co-Chair, E8 Angels; Luann Berman (Washington); Aron Bernstein (Massachusetts), Professor of Physics, MIT; Marcella Bernstein (California); Stuart Bernstein (California), Founding Member, Sustainable Capital LLC; Doug Berry (Pennsylvania), President & CEO Solar Renewable Energy LLC; Phil Beyl, Co-Director, GBD Architects; Jan Birenbaum (California); Larry Birenbaum (California), Former SVP, Cisco Systems.

Mari Bishop (Illinois), CLEAResult; Maureen Blanc (California), Director, CHARGE ACROSS TOWN; Philip Blumenthal (North Carolina); Darren Booth (Colorado), Director, Renewable Energy Integration, GreenPowerU; Dara Bortman (Pennsylvania), Senior Vice President of Marketing and Sales, Exact Solar; Mark

Bortman (Pennsylvania), Owner, Exact Solar; David Bowen (California), Consultant; Bill Boyk (Oregon), CEO/Founder, GyroVolts by Ameristar Solar, LLC; Diane Boyk (Oregon); Mickle Bragg, Product Manager, Geotech Environmental Equipment, Inc.; George Brandt (California).

Alice Brown (Massachusetts), Director of Planning, Boston Harbor Now; Beth Brummitt (California), President, Brummitt Energy Associates, Inc.; Barbara Brenner Buder (California); Jim Bunch (California), Chairman, Green Chamber; Kyle Burkybile (Illinois), Administrative Lead, Franklin Energy; Adriane Busby (Colorado), Staff Attorney, Ryley Carlock Applegate; Richard Bush (California), Chairman, Identity Engines; Vince Calvano (Colorado), Attorney & Business Owner, Vincent P. Calvano, LLC; Paul Campbell (Illinois), Director, Sears Holding Corp.

Bill Capp (Florida), Founder, Grid Storage Consulting; Jacqueline Capp, DDS (Florida), Owner, JHC Studio; Patrick Carberry (Colorado); Jim Cassidy (Colorado); Shaandiin Cedar, Sales and Marketing Assistant, GreenBiz; Suzanne Charle, Journalist, Freelance; John Cleveland (New Hampshire), Executive Director, Green Ribbon Commission; Michelle Cleveland (New Hampshire); Carole Connell (Oregon), City Planner, Connell PC Associates Inc.; Martha Conway (California) Valerie Corbett (New York); President, Intelligreen Partners.

D. Rafael Coven (Pennsylvania), SVP Bus Dev, PaceControls; Jane Cuddehe (New York), Broker Associate, Coldwell Banker Devonshire; Michael Cuddehe (New York), Principal, Strategic Global Advisors, LLC; Greg Curhan (California), President and CEO, Merriman Curhan; Mary Ann Cusenza (California), Independent Consultant for high tech and cleantech companies; Joseph Dalum (Wisconsin), Odyne; Diane Dandeneau (Colorado), CEO, IPower Alliance; David Danielson, Managing Director, Breakthrough Energy Ventures.

Chris Davis, VP Smart Cities, Cimcon Lighting Inc.; Michael Davis, Vice President, Bergmeyer; Bart Deamer (California), Treasurer, ODC Dance; Patty Debenham (California), Managing Director, Ocean Enterprise, Environmental Defense Fund; Rick DeGolia (California), Executive Chairman, Cimbale, Inc; Michael Delapa (California), DeLapa Consulting; Sheila Dennis (Massachusetts), Director, Principal Gifts, Harvard Divinity School; Sally DeSipio (Oregon), Creative consultant and climate activist, Self-employed.

James Dice (Colorado), Vice President, Sitton Energy Solutions; Scott Dietzen (California), Chairman, Pure Storage; Christopher Dillion (Illinois), President, Campbell Coyle; Sean Donaghy (Massachusetts), Energy Management Analyst, Mass DOT; Mark Doughty (Massachusetts), President & CEO, Thoughtforms Corporation; James Doyle (North Carolina); Teresa Dupuis (Michigan), Patricia Durham (California); Robert Earley (New York), Principal, Armor Capital; Mike Eckhart, Managing Director, Citigroup, Inc.; Stanley Eilert (Colorado); Lloyd Elam, Auditor, Impact.

Ellington Ellis (Michigan), President, Ellington Management Group; Blake Enyart (Colorado), Lab Manager, University of Colorado; Bob Epstein (California), Co-Founder, Sybase, New Resource Bank, Environmental Entrepreneurs; Helen Fairman; Chris Farrington (Oregon), Co-Found, Voxity Video Productions; Jerry Feitelson (California), CEO, Agribody Technologies, Inc.; Anne Feldhusen (California), Consultant, Green Business, Technology Marketing; Boris Feldman (California), Base Energy; Brett Feldman; Jason Fike.

Barry Fitzgerald (California), Founder, Hidden Compass Consulting; Kevin

Fitzwilliam (Louisiana), Regional Account Manager, Joule Energy; Vanessa Flores (Illinois), Sustainability and Property Operations Manager, ACE Hardware; Suzanne Foster Porter; (Colorado), Principal, Kannah Consulting; Andrew Foy (Oregon), MBA Candidate, Lundquist College of Business.

Karen Francis (California), CEO, Academix Direct, Inc.; Richard Frankel (California), Co-Founder, Rocket Fuel; Corey Friedman (Illinois), Principal, CF Financial LLC; Micah Fuchs (Illinois), Business Development Director, Dynamic Energy; Linda Gerber (Oregon), Principal Consultant, Linda Gerber Consulting Services; Gerry Glaser (California); Barbara Glynn (California), Glynn Capital; John Glynn (California), CEO, Glynn Capital; Nancy Gail Goebner (California), Owner, Gardenpeach Place; Susan Goldhor (Massachusetts), Biologist, C.A.R.S.

Ken Goldsholl (California), CEO, x.o.ware, Inc.; Nancy Goldsholl (California); Wes Goldstein (California), Senior Partner, Hobbs & Towne, Inc. Keith Good (Pennsylvania) Belmont Solar; Alan Gordon; Todd Gossett (Virginia); Joan Green (California), Trustee, J.C. Krauskopf GCLA Trust; Connie Greenfield (Connecticut); Stewart Greenfield (Connecticut), Chairman, Alternative Investment Group; Michael Greis (Massachusetts), Principal, Riverbend Advisors; Kat Gridley (Colorado), Founder, Atolla Energy.

Lynn Griffith, Director of Operations, Building Performance Institute; Rachel Griffith (Washington); Abby Gritter; Barbara Gross (Oregon), Winegrower, Cooper Mountain Vineyards; Marianna Grossman (California), Founder and Managing Partner, Minerva Ventures; Isaac Hacker (Oregon), Key Account Manager, QOS Energy; Lauren Hafford (Colorado), Mechanical Eng; Reed Hamilton (California), Owner, Grass Valley Grains; Kate Hammarback (Oregon), Principal, Occam Advisors; Doug Hammer (California), Senior Counsel, Shartsis Friese LLP; Lisa Harding.

Berl Hartman (Massachusetts), E2 New England Chapter Director, Hartman Consulting; Hyman Hartman (Massachusetts), Research Scientist, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Carol Hazenfield (California), Communications Coach; Sheryl Heckmann (California); Ward Hendon (New York), Business Advisor, Independent Consultant; Karen Hennessey, Eastern Regional Director, Nexant; Tom Henry (Massachusetts).

Len Hering (California), I Love A Clean San Diego; Kathi Hess (Ohio); Renate Heurich; James Higgins (California), Partner, Lakeside Enterprises; Jill Tate Higgins (California), General Partner, Lakeside Enterprises; John Hopkins (District of Columbia), Vice President—Energy & Infrastructure, Astris Finance LLC; Reuben Howard Jr (Colorado); Robin Hruska (Washington); Paige Humecki (Illinois), Analyst, Smart Energy, AECOM; Ari Isaak (California), Founder and CEO, Evari GIS Consulting, Inc.; Erica Jackson (Pennsylvania), Community Outreach and Communications Specialist, FracTracker Alliance.

Ed Jaros (Massachusetts), Jarson Corporation; Corinna Jess (Illinois), Director, Consulting Services & Trade Missions, GACC Midwest; Lars Johansson (Washington), Manager, E8 Fund; Michael Johnson-Chase (New York), Blogger, Carbonstories.org; Charlene Kabcenell (California), Former Vice President, Oracle Corporation; Derry Kabcenell (California), Former Executive Vice President, Oracle Corporation; Jerome Kalur (Montana), Attorney at Law.

Christopher Kaneb (Massachusetts), Principal, Catamount Management Corporation; Nancy Kaplan, Manager of Workforce Development, BPI; Stephanie Katsaros (Illinois), Business Owner, Bright Beat; Steven Keleti (Massachusetts); Brett KenCairn (Colorado),

Senior Climate & Sustainability Coordinator, City of Boulder, CO; Gaviella Keyles (California), Manager, Stakeholder Engagement, Future 500; John Kibler; Peter Kirby (Massachusetts), Board Director, Governance Committee Chair, Plaxall, Inc.; David Kirkpatrick (North Carolina), Managing Director and Cofounder, SJF Ventures; Joseph Kiss (Pennsylvania), Owner, Kiss Electric.

Bill Kissinger (California), Bingham McCutchen LLP; Virginia Klausmeier (California), CEO, Sylvatex; Charly Kleissner (California), Co-Founder & Investor, KL Felicitas Foundation; Lisa Kleissner (California), Co-Founder, KL Felicitas Foundation; Charles Knowled (California), Executive Director, Wildlife Conservation Network; Stephanie Knowles (California); Christian Koch, Business Development Driver, Levin Energy Partners; Ari Kornelis (Michigan), Graduate Research Assistant, Michigan State University.

Chip Krauskopf (California), VP Business Development, Aditazz; Pete Krull (North Carolina), CEO and Director of Investments, Earth Equity Advisors, LLC; Brice Leconte (Virginia), Founder, iUnit; Stephanie Leconte (Virginia); Nicole Lederer (California), Chair and Co-Founder, Environmental Entrepreneurs; Grey Lee (Massachusetts); Andrew Legge (California), Havelock Wool; Regina Leung; Steve Lichtenberg (California); Mike Lingle (Illinois), CEO, Eta Vision; Pyramyth Liu (California), COO, Hanergy; Charles Lord (Massachusetts), Principal, RENEW Energy Partners.

Olivia Loria (Colorado); Tracy Lyons (California); Fred Maas (California), Pacific EcoCompanies, LLC; Henrik Mader (Michigan), Energy Planner, Southeast Michigan Municipal Energy Planning Project, Ecoworks; Cliff Majersik (District of Columbia), Institute for Market Transformation; Theron Makley; Theron Makley (Colorado), Marketing Director, Panasonic; Lori Malloy (New York); Timon Malloy (New York); Mayela Manasjan (California), Chief Environmental Optimist, The Manasjan Consultancy.

Jessie Mansperger (Massachusetts), Program Launch Manager, Engie Services US; Heather March Takle (Massachusetts), Principal, 2ndPath Energy; William Marshall (Virginia); Jim Martin-Schramm (Iowa), Professor, Luther College DG Projects; James Marvin (Massachusetts), Regional Manager, North America East & Canada, Expeditors International of Washington Inc.; Joanna Marvin (Massachusetts), Owner, Federal Consulting Solutions; Steve Masters (Pennsylvania), President, JustLaws.

Richard Mattocks (New York), Principal, Environomics LLC; Camilla McCalmont (California), Tom McCalmont (California), President, McCalmont Engineering; Michael McElroy (Massachusetts), Gilbert Butler Professor of Environmental Studies, Harvard University; Doug McGarrah, Partner, Foley Hoag; John McGarry (Washington), Investor; Dennis McGinn, Senior Advisor, Customer First Renewables; Patricia McGuigan (California), Senior Vice President, Cornish and Carey Commercial.

Milton McIntyre (Ohio), President, Peak Electric Inc.; David Mendels, (Massachusetts), Board Member, Resilient Coders; Mike Mercer (Oregon), Principal, M Mercer Consulting; Quinn Middleton Antus (Colorado), Head of Operations, Campfire Labs; David Miller (Massachusetts), Executive Managing Director, Clean Energy Venture Group; Karen Miller (Massachusetts), President, Belly Shmooze; Malcolm Miller (Michigan), Director of Business Development, Walker Miller Energy Services; John Montgomery (California), President, Lex Ultima.

Joseph Morinville (Pennsylvania), President, EIS Solar; Kevin Morse (Colorado), Vice

President, Lever Energy Finance; Sherry Morse (California), Principal Designer, Sherry Morse Interiors; Ning Mosberger-Tang (Colorado), President, Ovonn Ventures LLC; Sam Mumford (Oregon), MBA Candidate, Lundquist College of Business; Emilie Munger Ogden (California), Leonard Nagy, systems analyst, ARCADIS; Jim Nail (Massachusetts), Principal Analyst, Forrester Research.

Alison Nash (Massachusetts), Architect, DiMella Shaffer Associates, Inc.; Carl Nettleton (California), President, Nettleton Strategies LLC; Franklin Neubauer, Principal, Core Metrics; Armand Neukermans (California), Founder, Xros; Al Nierenberg (Massachusetts), President, Evergreen Consulting & Training; Tori Nourafchan (California); Julia Novy-Hildsey (Oregon); Graham Noyes (California); Managing Attorney, Noyes Law Corporation; Anne O'Grady (California); Standish O'Grady (California), Managing Director, Granite Ventures, LLC; Doug Ogden (California), CEO, North Ridge Investment Management; Barry Olafson (California), CEO, Protabit, LLC; Larry Orr (California), General Partner, Trinity Ventures; Michael Brian Orr (Washington), Senior Computer Scientist, Adobe Systems; Jack Oswald (California), CEO, SynGest Inc.

Julie Parish (California), The Parish Fund; Will Parish (California); Robin Park (California), Principal, RXP Energy, Inc.; Richard Parker (Illinois); Katherine Peretick (Michigan), Director of Engineering, NRStor, Inc; Linda Perrine (Oregon), Owner, Honor Earth Farm; Brandon Pieczynski (Illinois), Energy and Sustainability, Pangea Real Estate; Milton Pinsky (Illinois), Chairman, Banner Real Estate Group, LLC; Scott Piper (Illinois), Owner/Architect, SPM Architects; Brad Pnazeck (Michigan), Senior Development Manager, Trade Wind Energy; Michael D Ramage (Washington), President/CEO, Asemblon Inc.

Megan Rast (Colorado), Corporate Sustainability Professional; James Rehrmann; Emily Reichert (Massachusetts), CEO & Executive Director, Greentown Labs; Camila Restrepo (Colorado), Project Manager, Intelx; Theo Revlock (California), Principal, Q Architecture; David Ringle (Michigan), Cedar Springs Brewing; Tom Rinker (Delaware), President, Cape Henlopen Consulting, Inc.; Jonathan Roberts (Illinois), Director of Development, Solstage.

Liz Robinson (Pennsylvania); Helda Rodriguea (Florida), President, NovaCharge; David Rosenheim (California), Founder and CEO, JobsWithImpact; Jackie Rosenheim (California), David Rosenstein (California), President, Intex Solutions; Bill Rosenzweig (California), IdeaGarden; Joan Rossetti (Massachusetts), Chair, Environmental Affairs Committee of the Prudential Center Residents' Association; Amy Roth (California); Scott Rotman (New Jersey), Senior Project Manager, Matrix New World Engineering; Jacqueline Royce (Massachusetts), Independent Scholar; Karen Rucker (Colorado), President, ByHandConsulting; Michael Rucker (Colorado), CEO, Scout Clean Energy.

Julie Rudick (California); Stuart Rudick (California), Partner, Mindful Investors, LLC; Meg Ruxton (California), Partnerships Manager, Charge Across Town; Randy Salim; Paul Salinger (California), VP, Marketing, Oracle; Mel Samaroo (Illinois), Civil Engineer, Borrego Solar Systems, Inc.; Cristine Sanchez (New York); Gonzalo Sanchez, Offshore Wind Development Intern, EDP Renewables North America; Frank Sandoval (Colorado) Principal, Pajarito Technologies.

Kate Sandrini (California), Amy Santullo (California), California Clean Tech Open, Downtown College Prep Scholarship Committee; Michael Santullo (California), Co-

Founder and Board Member, California Clean Tech Open; Jan Schalkwijk (California), Investment Adviser, JPS Global Investments; David Schwartz (California), Tom Sciacca (Massachusetts), Co-founder, Intelligent Energy Systems; Brad Seaman (Colorado), Director of Project Finance, Scout Clean Energy; Lt Gen (ret) Noman Seip (Virginia), Owner, NS Solutions, LLC; Anneke Seley (California), CEO, ALIO Inc.; Christopher Senger (Illinois), Owner, Penguin Energy Services LLC; Joel Serface (Colorado), Managing Director, Catalyzed.

Douglas Shackelford (District of Columbia), Managing Partner, Exseleration; Jigar Shah (California), Co-founder and President, Generate Capital; Cathleen Shattuck (Washington), Creative Director, evluma; Rebecca Shaw (California), World Wildlife Fund; Scott Sidlow, Plan Review Coordinator, TopBuild Home Services; Greg Simon (California); Barbara Simons (California), Research Staff Member, Retired, IBM Research; Divya Singh (California), Project Finance Associate, Cypress Creek Renewables; Ian Skor (Colorado), Co-Founder, Sandbox Solar.

Joshua Skov (Oregon), Industry Mentor and Instructor, University of Oregon, Lundquist College of Business; Jon Slangerup (California), Chairman and CEO, American Global Logistics; Brian Smith (Texas), Founder and Managing Partner & Investor, Clean Energy Catalyst; Michael Smith (California), Founder, Adaptation Research; Patrick Smith (New York), New Mobility Policy Analyst, NYC Department of Transportation; Richard Smith, Doctor; Ethan Soloviev (New York); Roger Sorkin (Massachusetts), Executive Producer, American Resilience Project; Rachel Stern (California), Senior Environmental Specialist, Port of San Diego.

Naomi Stone (California), CEO and President, MugenKioku Corporation; Eric Strid (Washington), Co-Founder and Retired CEO, Cascade Microtech; Robert Sullivan (Illinois), Dean, UCSD; Mark Sylvia (Massachusetts), Managing Director, Blue Wave Ezgi Takmaz (Illinois), Energy, Energy Resources Center; Russ Teall (California), President and Founder, Biodico; Trey Teall (California), VP Operations, Biodico; Andrew Thomaidis (Colorado), Consultant; Todd Thorner (District of Columbia).

Cariad Thronson (California), CEO, Forefront Communications; Robert Thronson (California), VP Business Development, Vigilant; Leslie Tidwell (California), Ian Todreas (Massachusetts), Vice President, ERG; Colin Tomkins-Bergh (Colorado), Strategic Business Development Manager, FoodMaven; John Tourtelotte (Massachusetts), Managing Director, Rivermoor Energy; Elisa Townshend (Colorado), Ian Tran (Michigan), Special Projects Strategist, AGI Construction Solutions; Todd Travaille (Nebraska), Owner/President, USA Insulation.

Doug Trimbach (North Carolina), Vice President and Director, Lighting Services, Energy Optimizers, USA; Patricia Trumbull (California), Terry Trumbull (California), Trumbull Law Firm; Zach Tucker (Missouri), Founder, Good Meets World; Bill Unger (California), Partner Emeritus, Mayfield Fund; Amy Van Beek (Iowa), Co-Founder, Designer, Ideal Energy, Inc.; Troy Van Beek (Iowa), President, Renewable Energy Expert, Ideal Energy, Inc.; Lorna Vander Ploeg (California), Mark Vander Ploeg (California), Retired, Investment Banker.

John Vernacchia (Pennsylvania), Segment Manager, Alternative Energy, Eaton Corporation; Ariana Vito (California), Sustainability Analyst/EV Program Coordinator, City of Santa Monica; Puja Vohra (Massachusetts), Owner, consultant, Green Elements LLC; Dan Von Seggern (Washington),

Staff Attorney, The Center for Environmental Law & Policy; David Walls; David Watson (California), Director & Investor, Ultra Capital; Dave Welch (California), President, Infinera Corporation; Heidi Welch (California).

Ian Welch (California) Jordan Wildish (Washington), Research Analyst, Earth Economics; Tony Williams (Colorado), Engineering PM, USPS; Bruce Wilson (Pennsylvania), Owner Bruce Wilson Contracting; Tonia Wisman (California); Andrea Wittchen (Pennsylvania), Principal, iSpring; Sarah Wolbert (Minnesota) Architect, Piece Work Design; Gary Wolff (California), Founder, 3E Engineering; Garrett Wong (California), Sr. Sustainability Analyst, City of Santa Monica.

Bryndis Woods (Massachusetts), Researcher, Applied Economics Clinic; Christopher Woodward (Massachusetts), Vice President, Credit Research, Breckinridge Capital Advisors; HansJorg Wyss (Massachusetts); Leila Yassa (Massachusetts); Denny Young (California); Mark Yuschak (New Jersey); Instructor, Thomas Shortman; Peter Zahn (California), President and Director, Moxie Foundation; Rosamund Zander (Massachusetts), Chairman, Independent Design Center for the Environment.

CERES,

April 26, 2019.

Re H.R. 9, The Climate Action Now Act

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, on behalf of the Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy (BICEP) network, a 51 company coalition of major American businesses representing many sectors across the U.S. economy, I write to respectfully request that you vote in support of H.R. 9, The Climate Action Now Act, which would ensure that the United States does not withdraw from the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement. As you know, H.R. 9 will be brought up for consideration the week of April 29th.

As a network of major businesses based throughout the United States and around the world, BICEP sees international engagement and maintaining U.S. commitments under the Paris Climate Agreement as critical to our continued economic success. Climate change is a global problem and requires a global solution. The United States cannot solve the climate problem on its own, which is why a strong international framework is required to assure that other countries also meet their commitments, reduce their greenhouse gas emissions, and do so in a transparent and verifiable manner.

Every nation in the world has signed on to the Paris Agreement, which creates a structure for countries to submit non-binding, voluntary targets for greenhouse gas emissions reductions. Only one, the United States, has announced its intent to withdraw. Since the development of this global agreement, the understanding of the impacts of global warming has only become more clear. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change—the world's foremost body of climate scientists, has released its 2018 IPCC 1.5 Report, which details the consequences of allowing average global temperature increases to exceed 2.7 F /1.5 C. Additionally, the most recent U.S. National Climate Assessment report projects the impacts that American industry and communities will face (and are already facing) from climate change-related impacts.

Days after the administration's June 2017 announcement of its intent to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement, many BICEP members joined other sectors of the U.S. economy, including states, cities, universities, faith groups, healthcare systems, and others to declare that "We Are Still In." The now 3,750+ signatories to We

Are Still In include members from all 50 states and represent \$9.46 trillion of the American economy—demonstrating significant real economy support for U.S. participation in the Paris Climate Agreement.

Remaining in the Paris Climate Agreement is essential for the U.S. to retain a seat at the table, contribute in a positive manner to international negotiations, and reflect the deep ambition among U.S. businesses to fight climate change and protect from the worst economic impacts associated with a warming world.

As companies across the United States, BICEP recognizes that a zero-carbon economy is necessary to achieve long-term climate goals and are taking steps in their own operations to accelerate this transition. However, domestic and international policy structures are critical to drive change at the scale and speed necessary to reflect our latest understanding of the science. Maintaining our participation in the Paris Agreement is one such policy structure that the U.S. should retain.

On behalf of the businesses in our BICEP network, I respectfully request that you vote in support of H.R. 9, The Climate Action Now Act when it comes up for a vote.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. I am happy to connect further on this issue and answer any questions you may have. Please do not hesitate to follow up.

Sincerely,

ANNE L. KELLY,

Vice President, Government Relations.

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS,
LEADING INTERNAL MEDICINE, IMPROVING LIVES,

Washington, DC, May 1, 2019.

Hon. KATHY CASTOR,

House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. CASTOR: On behalf of the American College of Physicians (ACP), I am writing to express our strong support for the Climate Action Now Act (H.R. 9), which directs the United States to uphold its commitment to the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. We applaud your leadership in introducing this legislation and urge its quick passage in the U.S. House of Representatives today. ACP is deeply concerned about the negative impact that climate change is having on public health and patients, and that these effects will worsen without immediate action. This is an important issue for the medical community and patients, and we all need to be part of finding a solution.

The American College of Physicians is the largest medical specialty organization and the second largest physician group in the United States. ACP members include 154,000 internal medicine physicians (internists), related subspecialists, and medical students. Internal medicine physicians are specialists who apply scientific knowledge and clinical expertise to the diagnosis, treatment, and compassionate care of adults across the spectrum from health to complex illness.

Because physicians are on the front lines of patient care, they are witnessing—here and now—the harmful health effects that climate change can and does have on the human body. These harmful effects include: higher rates of respiratory and heat-related illness, increased prevalence of vector-borne and waterborne diseases, food and water insecurity, and malnutrition, as outlined in ACP's 2016 position paper, "Climate Change and Health," published in the *Annals of Internal Medicine*. People who are elderly, sick, or poor are especially vulnerable to these potential consequences. As climate change worsens, an increase in global temperature and frequency of heat waves will raise the risk of heat exhaustion. Asthma

and other chronic lung conditions will be exacerbated by increased particulate matter and ground-level ozone in the atmosphere. Exposure to infectious disease from vectors such as ticks and mosquitoes, which carry the harmful Zika virus, has and will continue to escalate.

Physicians, both individually and collectively, are encouraged to advocate for climate change adaptation and mitigation policies and communicate about the health co-benefits of addressing climate change in objective, simple language to their community and policymakers. For its part, the American College of Physicians is committed to working with lawmakers, its international chapters and with other professional membership and public health organizations within the United States and globally to pursue the policies recommended in its position paper. ACP is a founding member of the Medical Society Consortium on Climate and Health, which brings together 22 medical associations representing approximately 550,000 clinical practitioners. Just two days ago on Monday of this week, I joined my colleagues from the Consortium to educate members of Congress about how climate change affects health and the need to take action now. In addition, ACP was pleased to submit its perspective and recommendations on climate change to the House Resources Committee earlier this year.

Your legislation represents a vital step in the fight against climate change, and in maintaining this nation's role as a leader in combatting the harmful impact of climate change. H.R. 9 prohibits the use of funds to advance the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement and requires the President to develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees and make available to the public a plan for the United States to meet its nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement.

A global effort is required to reduce anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions and address the health impact of climate change. The United States must commit to taking both a leadership and collaborative role in developing, implementing, and ensuring the success of such a global effort and in reducing its own contributions to greenhouse gas emissions. For this reason, ACP remains strongly opposed to the United States' withdrawal from the Paris Agreement. Climate change adaptation strategies must be established, and mitigation measures, like switching to clean, renewable energy and promoting active transportation, must be adopted.

ACP looks forward to continuing to work with you in your leadership role on this critical issue. We stand ready to serve as a resource for you and other lawmakers in helping to communicate the harmful impacts of climate change on the public's health.

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. MCLEAN, MD, FACP,
President.

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Chair, the people of the Northern Mariana Islands, whom I represent, are on the front line of climate change. In the past year, back-to-back typhoons struck our islands. Lives were lost. We suffered hundreds of millions in damage.

No single weather event can be attributed to climate change. But science tells us that global warming means more frequent and more intense storms of the kind that hit the Marianas.

And we know the sudden increase in intensity of one of those storms, Super Typhoon Yutu, just before landfall in the Marianas, is characteristic of a new normal caused by higher atmospheric temperatures and warmer

ocean waters. We saw the same acceleration of force as Hurricane Michael came ashore in the Gulf last year.

Today, Congress has an opportunity to act to slow climate change and reduce the disasters being caused. We can vote to return the United States to the company of nations that is working to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with the Paris Agreement of 2015. I support H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

There are those who argue it is too expensive to lower carbon pollution of our planet's atmosphere. I point to the disaster supplemental appropriation bills this House will take up shortly and previously passed in January. If we are willing to spend billions to repair the impact of climate change on communities around our nation, should we not be willing to spend to prevent that damage in the first place? Would that not be wise?

I make this plea especially for people in the Marianas and other Pacific islands. We are increasingly battered by storms. As sea levels rise, our islands are disappearing. And the coral reefs that protect our coasts and give us nourishment are dying before our eyes.

We are the front line of the consequences, yet had little to do with the decades of carbon pollution that are causing this destruction. Nevertheless, we in the islands are willing to transform, just as our nation as a whole must transform to reduce carbon emissions and protect our safety in the decades ahead.

A yes vote on H.R. 9 is an important first step.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9

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 "Climate Action Now Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) In Paris, on December 12, 2015, parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) reached a landmark agreement to combat climate change and to accelerate and intensify the actions and investments needed for a sustainable low carbon future.

(2) The Paris Agreement's central aim is to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change by keeping a global temperature rise well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5 degrees Celsius.

(3) The Paris Agreement requires all parties to put forward their best efforts through nationally determined contributions (NDCs) and to strengthen these efforts in the years ahead.

(4) The Paris Agreement further requires each party to update its nationally determined contribution every 5 years, with each successive nationally determined contribution representing a progression beyond the previous nationally determined contribution, and reflecting the party's highest possible ambition.

(5) The United States communicated its nationally determined contribution to

achieve an economy-wide target of reducing its greenhouse gas emissions by 26 to 28 percent below its 2005 level in 2025 and to make best efforts to reduce its emissions by 28 percent.

(6) A number of existing laws, regulations, and other mandatory measures in the United States are relevant to achieving this target, including the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-486), and the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140).

(7) On June 1, 2017, President Trump announced his intention to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement, which would leave the United States as the only UNFCCC member state that is not a signatory to the Paris Agreement.

(8) Under the terms of the Paris Agreement, the earliest possible effective withdrawal date by the United States is November 4, 2020. However, the United States is still obligated to maintain certain commitments under the Paris Agreement, such as continuing to report its emissions to the United Nations.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO ADVANCE THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE PARIS AGREEMENT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds are authorized to be appropriated, obligated, or expended to take any action to advance the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement.

SEC. 4. PLAN FOR THE UNITED STATES TO MEET ITS NATIONALLY DETERMINED CONTRIBUTION UNDER THE PARIS AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees and make available to the public a plan for the United States to meet its nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement that describes—

(1) how the United States will achieve an economy-wide target of reducing its greenhouse gas emissions by 26 to 28 percent below its 2005 level by 2025; and

(2) how the United States will use the Paris Agreement's transparency provisions to confirm that other parties to the Agreement with major economies are fulfilling their announced contributions to the Agreement.

(b) UPDATES TO PLAN.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and make available to the public an updated plan under subsection (a).

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Environment and Public Works, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

SEC. 5. PARIS AGREEMENT DEFINED.

In this Act, the term "Paris Agreement" means the decision by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change's 21st Conference of Parties in Paris, France, adopted December 12, 2015.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 116-42. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report,

shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 1 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ESPAILLAT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, after line 19, insert the following:

(3) The Paris Agreement acknowledges that all "Parties should, when taking action to address climate change, respect, promote and consider their respective obligations on human rights, the right to health, the rights of indigenous peoples, local communities, migrants, children, persons with disabilities and people in vulnerable situations and the right to development, as well as gender equality, empowerment of women and intergenerational equity".

(4) The Paris Agreement notes the importance of "climate justice" when mitigating and adapting to climate change and recognizes "the need for an effective and progressive response to the urgent threat of climate change".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment today lays before this House a very simple fact, an undeniable fact: Communities of color across this great Nation and, in fact, across the world are least responsible for climate change. They contribute far less to the carbon footprint of the world; they don't drive as many cars; in fact, they most often take public transportation. So they contribute less to climate change, and yet they suffer the most harm from its impact.

The most vulnerable among us, from my home in Washington Heights, in Harlem and the northwest Bronx communities and around the world, are all experiencing greater impacts and stand to suffer even more.

At home, I see it in the worsening of asthma rates among African American and Latinx children when parents come to my office looking for help for ballooning healthcare costs that they cannot afford.

I see it with seniors who have an array of respiratory diseases, in many cases contributing to long illnesses, if not death.

I see it in Central America, where extreme drought endangers livelihoods and has led to violence and outward migration.

I see it in the Caribbean and even here in the United States, where cli-

mate change has increased the magnitude and frequency of hurricanes, affecting millions who do not have the capacity to prepare for worsening storms and have barely recovered from one before the next one hits.

I see it in southern Africa and in south Asia and in small island developing states, where climate change affects food scarcity and access to clean water, damaging public health and increasing political instability and regional violence.

Mr. Chairman, in the United States and around the world, climate change has an unequal impact on communities of color because it compounds existing injustices of racial and economic disparities. This is fundamentally unjust, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment that I bring before you today is a very simple amendment, one that says that poor communities that are very often communities of color suffer disproportionately from climate change, although they do not contribute more to that ill.

My amendment makes it clear that the Paris Agreement seeks to address issues of environmental justice and the disparate impact climate change is having and will continue to have on vulnerable communities and people of color.

If adopted, I believe it will send a strong message, a very strong message that, with this bill, the United States of America's commitment to remain in the Paris climate agreement also means our agreement to address environmental injustices.

When it comes to mitigating climate change, we cannot forget disenfranchised communities. We cannot forget communities of color. We cannot forget indigenous communities. We cannot forget low-income communities. We cannot forget climate refugees, and we cannot forget the children who will bear this burden when we are all gone.

In every piece of legislation on climate change considered by this House, in every bill on environmental issues we pass, and at every hearing that we hold regarding this important matter, we must ensure that issues of environmental justice are equally addressed and that the disenfranchised communities and communities of color are heard, because, again, Mr. Chairman, they contribute far less to the carbon footprint, they contribute far less to climate change, and yet they suffer tremendously. So this is, fundamentally, an injustice.

Mr. PALLONE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESPAILLAT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I just want to say, on behalf of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee, we support this amendment. It is a good amendment.

Mr. Chair, I also want to thank Mr. ESPAILLAT for working with the committees to make changes to his amendment.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chair, I will close once the gentleman yields back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Chair, I want to thank Chairman ENGEL and the leadership, Chairman PALLONE, for working with me to advance this important issue.

I want to, further, thank my colleagues who have cosponsored this amendment and are similarly dedicated to advancing environmental justice: Congress Members MCEACHIN, OMAR, JAYAPAL, PRESSLEY, CARBAJAL, CISNEROS, and MOORE.

Finally, I want to thank many other groups in my district that continue to advocate day in and day out for environmental justice, a strong and diverse coalition that I am proud to represent.

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

□ 1630

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chair, let me first say, like everyone in this Chamber, I support human rights and climate justice, but this amendment really does nothing to reduce our emissions. We should debate bipartisan solutions, such as boosting research, advancing technologies, and promoting innovation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. OMAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 116-42.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, add the following:

(9) The Paris Agreement further requires that parties "should strengthen their cooperation on enhancing action on adaptation, taking into account the Cancun Adaptation Framework", which includes "measures to enhance understanding, coordination and cooperation with regard to climate change induced displacement, migration and planned relocation, where appropriate, at the national, regional and international levels".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR) and a

Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

My amendment includes findings recognizing the importance of the Paris climate agreement's task force addressing the impact of climate change on displacement and the global refugee crisis.

The United States is responsible for nearly a third of the excess carbon dioxide in the atmosphere today and, thus, bears more responsibility for the climate crisis than any other country. But the climate crisis is a major contributing factor of yet another devastating crisis we are facing today: the global refugee crisis.

In 2017, more than 60 percent of the internal displacements in the world was a result not of conflict but of natural disasters. Since 2008, an average of 24 million people has been displaced by catastrophic weather disasters each year.

Within three of the most vulnerable regions of the world—sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and Latin America—143 million people could be displaced by climate change impacts by 2050.

We do not need to look that far from home to know this. At least 400,000 residents of New Orleans were displaced by Hurricane Katrina for at least a few days, and many were displaced permanently. A disproportionate number of them were Black Americans.

We saw it happen last year in Puerto Rico when 3,000 people died because of Hurricane Maria and our current administration failed to help them recover.

At a time when climate change is making droughts and famines worse, making conflicts fiercer and repression more brutal, our country is resettling historically low numbers of refugees. The United States should be offering protection and support to climate change refugees. Instead, we have capped the number of refugees that we resettle to only 30,000 people next year.

Citizens of some of the countries that have been hit hardest by climate change, including Yemen, Iran, and Somalia, are currently subject to an arbitrary and racist Muslim ban. We cannot be willing to turn our backs on those suffering because of the effects of global catastrophes.

We have to acknowledge that this tragedy is not going to go away any time soon. As food security, drinking water, and energy supplies become scarcer, more and more families are going to be forced to leave their homes.

Countries that are responsible for perpetuating the climate crisis, like the United States, should rise as leaders in offering protection and refuge for displaced communities. It is our duty, as one of the richest countries in the world, to support the Paris Agreement

and its task force on the impact of climate change on displacement and the global refugee crisis.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, let me first say, again, I agree with the premise of this amendment. I met today with U.N. officials on the refugee crisis. I have been to the camps in Jordan and Turkey, so I agree with the premise of this amendment. But, again, it does nothing to reduce our emissions.

We should be debating, I think, bipartisan solutions, such as boosting research, technology, and innovation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. HOULAHAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 116-42.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, line 25, strike “and”.

Page 8, line 5, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 8, after line 5, insert the following:

(3) how the United States may use multilateral and bilateral diplomatic tools, in addition to the expert committee established under Article 15 of the Paris Agreement, to encourage and assist other parties to the Agreement to fulfill their announced contributions.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 9.

Inaction on climate change will lead to the demise of the human species. Science is not a partisan issue, and the science in this case is crystal clear: Climate change is happening, and we, as humans, are causing it.

The amendment that I am offering today would require the President to include in the administration's strategy how the United States will be able to use all the diplomatic tools available to help our partners around the world meet their own goals.

It is simple. Their success is our success; their failure is our failure. We all

share the same planet, the same environment, and the same atmosphere. We cannot fight this alone. We have to be in this fight with every tool available to us, and that includes our diplomacy.

My amendment recognizes the leadership role that our country can and should play in addressing global climate change. This administration has taken a back seat to facing one of our most pressing national security threats, and this amendment puts us back in the global arena, leading this vital charge.

Some naysayers and doubters have expressed concern that developing countries are and will take advantage of the Paris Agreement, placing the burden of addressing climate change on the U.S. This is misleading. The agreement requires all parties to develop their own plans to reduce carbon emissions. Rather than retreat from that effort, we should lead it.

I serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Just today, Ranking Member MCCAUL said that we have always been leaders on the global stage, and when we are not involved, we leave a power vacuum. This applies militarily and diplomatically with respect to humanitarian aid and in the case of climate action as well.

The best way for us to secure the safety and health of our planet is for us to be an aggressive leader in the fight against climate change. Pulling out of the Paris Agreement would send a resounding message to the international community that the United States is not in this fight to save this planet, and that is unacceptable.

Let us be clear: The fight to stop climate change is not just a fight to save our environment. It is a fight for our economy. It is a fight for the health of everyone and for social justice. It is a fight for national security. And, yes, it is a fight for our children, for our future generations, and for humanity.

I introduced this amendment because the threat is too grave for us, as a country, to be doing the bare minimum as laid out in the Paris Agreement. We must also work aggressively with each country to combat climate change at every turn. Inaction is a death sentence for us all.

We have the opportunity before us to stand up for our fellow Americans and brothers and sisters around the world. I am sure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers of Congress would agree: This country we call home and this planet we call home are worth fighting for.

I served our country in the Air Force. I believe in this country, and I believe it is worth fighting for.

Yes, climate change poses one of, if not the, gravest existential threats to our country, but its threats are not insurmountable.

Just 2 days ago, Pennsylvania became the 24th State to join the U.S. Climate Alliance, committing to work toward cutting greenhouse gas emissions in line with the Paris Agreement. We in Pennsylvania are still in.

I am proud of our Commonwealth for joining this fight for our country. We in Pennsylvania know America is worth it.

Mr. Chairman, to vote for my amendment is to commit to our necessary leadership on climate change. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I will close after the gentlewoman yields back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman PALLONE, Chairman ENGEL, and Ranking Member MCCAUL for all of their leadership and guidance on this very, very important issue.

I also thank the members of my community who have brought me here to serve in this way. This issue couldn't be more fundamental to our existence in my community, our Commonwealth, our country, and our planet.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, let me first commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, for quoting me. I do think we should lead as a nation in the world. I support the United States leading the world on the international challenges we face. But, again, this amendment has nothing to do with reducing our emissions.

We should be a leader on the bipartisan approach to solutions to this crisis, like boosting research, innovation, and technologies.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. KUSTER OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 116-42.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, after line 20, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent section accordingly):

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall produce a report that examines the effect of the Paris Agreement on clean energy job development in rural communities.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Hampshire.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ms. CASTOR for her tireless leadership on this landmark legislation.

Nearly 2 years ago, the United States ceded global leadership when President Trump announced plans to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement, a sweeping accord amongst the overwhelming majority of nation-states to curb carbon pollution and mitigate the damaging effects of climate change.

The Climate Action Now Act reverses this misguided decision by ensuring that America honors its commitments to the Paris Agreement and prevents any taxpayer dollars from being used to take any action to advance the United States' withdrawal from the agreement.

I am proud to support this legislation and to offer an amendment that would require the President to produce a report examining how rejoining the Paris Agreement will bolster clean energy job creation in rural communities.

Contrary to the claims that have been made here today by my colleagues across the aisle, we have seen the positive impacts across my district and across New Hampshire that the deployment of clean energy can have on our communities, both for our economy and our environment.

Our rural communities are home to some of the hardest working Americans who are committed to securing good-paying jobs to support themselves and their families. Clean energy jobs are good-paying jobs.

□ 1645

In New Hampshire, a clean energy job pays 50 percent more than the State's median wage.

Rejoining the Paris climate agreement will spur a new clean energy economy that weans America off fossil fuels from countries that do not share our values, protects our environment by reducing carbon pollution, and creates good paying jobs.

My amendment is straightforward. If we are going to rejoin the Paris Agreement, we must ensure that rural communities benefit from the subsequent job creation and manufacturing. My amendment would create a framework for how rural America can thrive and combat climate change.

We know that rural communities face unique economic challenges, and it is imperative that they are not left behind as we move toward the 21st century clean energy economy.

We also know that rural communities can lead the clean energy revolution, and I am very proud to represent five communities that have made a commitment to use 100 percent renewable energy by 2030: Concord, Keene, Plainfield, Hanover, and Cornish.

I am proud and pleased to offer this amendment with my colleague, Congressman CHRIS PAPPAS, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to

vote "yes" on the amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say, on behalf of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee, that we support this amendment. It is an excellent amendment.

I want to thank Ms. KUSTER for working with the committees to make some changes to her amendment.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I will close after the gentlewoman yields back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee chair. I want to thank Ms. CASTOR for her leadership on this issue, and I want to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help us to create good jobs in our rural communities.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I didn't get a chance to come down during the debate on the underlying bill, and the committee, of course, raised this issue.

The hope is that the President is going to sign a bill to go back into an agreement that he already decided to get out of. So, when the statement is made—it only reverses the President's action if the President signs the bill. The President is not going to sign this bill.

So why are we here? Why are we spending a whole week? I understand we need to get this climate debate off our chest and eventually move forward, and I hope we will do that in a bipartisan manner.

As to the amendment that we are debating here, not bad, I think, trying to understand the green jobs that will occur. But I think those of us from fossil fuel areas, coal mining areas, marginal oil, well, we would probably like to see an evaluation of job losses that could occur as part of this.

They are going to tout the job creation. Let's look at the areas—and they touted rural America. Let's look at the areas where coal mines will close, coal-fired power plants will close, and the economic impact that will be impacted there.

We are pretty excited about working with the Energy and Commerce Committee on, as is, I think, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, conservation, innovation, adaptation. Our focus is going to be: Let's affect the carbon dioxide emissions without raising energy costs and slowing the economic activity.

I think we have one of the best economies that I have ever served in, and we do have an increase in carbon dioxide this last year because the economic activity is so great.

So if you believe that, which is true, the reverse would be, if you delay and raise energy costs, you could really hurt economic growth.

Mr. Chair, I ask for a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 4, add the following subsection:

(d) STATE AND LOCAL ACTIONS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit States and cities from taking more ambitious actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions than the actions described in the plan developed and updated under this section.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

My grandsons’ generation will remember President Trump’s decision to leave the Paris Agreement as the day that he condemned them to a world of manmade devastation.

Today, we have a chance to change that. Which side do we want to be on, the side of future generations or the side of those who would profit at their expense?

H.R. 9 mandates that the United States Government honor the commitments we made in the Paris Agreement.

We also need to protect the rights of cities and States to go above and beyond to meet the unique strains climate change puts on their regions.

For example, California has committed to source 100 percent of its electricity from renewable sources by 2045. This is necessary, considering the toll climate change has taken on California, including historic droughts, deadly fires, and terrible flooding.

Despite this, President Trump has tried to make it harder for California to regulate its own greenhouse emissions. I have offered an amendment to

H.R. 9 that would stop President Trump from using the plan mandated in this act to limit cities and States like California from taking more ambitious action to reduce greenhouse emissions.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chair, I will close after my colleague yields back her time.

I reserve the balance of my time

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment.

I would like to point out that oftentimes the opposition party talks about States’ rights, but when it comes to fighting for climate, cleaning up our air and our water, making sure that people can combat a climate crisis, then: Do you know what? We are going to get involved. We are going to stop these States from doing something that they have been doing.

California is a leader in combating climate change—a leader. We have reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and we are on target to implement a lot of our top goals: 100 percent renewable energy and carbon neutrality by 2045, zero-emission vehicles, and curbing greenhouse gas emissions.

I also, when I was in the State legislature, passed a law that said that more of the money from greenhouse gas emission fees must go to the most disadvantaged and the most impacted communities of climate change. That means that not only are we reducing our carbon footprint, but we are also giving resources directly back to these communities.

So let’s not get in the way. Let’s not stop California’s progress, because it is a leader for not only the country, but the world.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA).

Mr. ROUDA. Mr. Chair, I stand today as a cosponsor of this important amendment offered by my colleague and fellow Californian, Representative TORRES.

Our State and many others across the country are showing the world how to take meaningful steps to meet our Paris climate agreement commitments.

While the current administration continues to do everything in its power to prioritize industry conflicts of interest over the sustainability and future of our planet, I am proud of the forward-thinking work being done in our cities, like the ones in my district, in Orange County, and States like the one I call home, California. These important efforts must not be prohibited.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Chair, if we don’t take an aggressive step to deal with this problem, our grandchildren and their grandchildren will pay the price.

A United States Government report found that our economy will lose over \$1 trillion dollars by the end of this century due to climate change. Clean energy is an investment, not only for our communities, but for future generations.

California has over 500,000 jobs created within the clean energy sector. That is about 10 times the number of coal jobs nationwide. This amendment ensures that California’s progress and commitment will not be sabotaged.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for offering this critical legislation.

Mr. Chair, I urge passage of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment.

Listen, in the transmission world, other than Texas, no State is alone. California is in the Western interconnect. So we have great support for States’ rights, but decisions made by California will affect Nevada and will affect Arizona.

For example, we have seen how decisions in some areas actually benefit the fossil energy in other areas, such as support of fossil and nuclear power in Arizona for California’s electricity requirements.

The basic underlying amendment really does nothing to address things that we would like to support—conservation, innovation, adaption—trying to, in a bipartisan approach, address the real issue, which is how do we reduce carbon dioxide emissions in a way that protects the economy, grows the economy. We also feel that our citizens are better served when they have good paying jobs and they are working versus a risk of not doing that if you move down an unchecked path.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1700

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. SHALALA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 116-42.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, insert the following:

(9) Article 8 of the Paris Agreement states that “Parties recognize the importance of averting, minimizing and addressing loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, including extreme weather events and slow onset events”, such as sea level rise, saltwater intrusion, and flooding.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chairman, since 1950, the sea level in south Florida has risen 8 inches and it is only speeding up. By 2030, the sea level in south Florida is projected to rise up to 12 inches, and by the end of the century, perhaps 80 inches. If we continue to do nothing on climate change, my community, and, in fact, my district, will disappear.

We have a moral obligation to mitigate and adapt immediately, as we are already seeing the effects of climate change and sea level rise.

That is why I was so heartened when the international community came together to sign the Paris Agreement, and that is why I was so devastated when this administration announced the United States' withdrawal.

The Paris Agreement strengthens the international response to climate change adaptation, mitigation, and capacity building. It is our best, collective effort to combat climate change.

The withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and the failure to act on climate is a mistake with global implications and catastrophic consequences for my south Florida community.

I am proud to support H.R. 9 because it rejects the decision to withdraw from Paris and requires the President to develop a plan to meet the United States' commitment under the agreement.

My amendment strengthens the bill because it makes clear that addressing climate change means addressing its effects that are ravaging our coastal communities, sea level rise, saltwater intrusion, and flooding.

My region's drinking water is seriously threatened as the sea rises and the saltwater reaches further inland and gets dangerously close to our fragile aquifer.

In south Florida, it no longer takes a strong hurricane to flood our streets. They now flood just from a particularly high tide, such as the king tides. In fact, tidal flooding has become three times as common in south Florida in just the past 19 years, causing so-called sunny-day flooding. We simply cannot wait.

Coastal communities around the world, including my south Florida community, are counting on us. I urge support for this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I represent a coastal district, so the threat of worsening sea level rise is especially important to me, so I am glad my colleague from Florida offered this amendment.

It is a good amendment and speaking on behalf of the Energy and Commerce

Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee, we support its adoption.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chair, I will close after the gentlewoman closes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Chairman, I have completed my statement. This is absolutely critical to my south Florida community.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, let me first say, I agree with the premise of this amendment. Addressing sea level rise is a serious issue as well as saltwater intrusion and flooding.

I am a member of the House Oceans Caucus, but, again, it does not reduce our emissions. It is not, to me, germane to the underlying bill.

I think we should debate, once again, bipartisan solutions on boosting research, advancing technologies, and promoting innovation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, after line 20, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent section accordingly):

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences to produce a report that examines the potential impacts of a withdrawal by the United States from the Paris Agreement on the global economic competitiveness of the United States economy and on workers in the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to follow the previous discussion that was taking place under Mrs. TORRES' amendment, having spent a long time in California on air regulation as an appointee to the California Air Resources Board by three Governors—Republicans and Democrats—where we worked in a bipartisan fashion under Federal regulation in the Clean Air Act, and California regulation, first to improve the air quality for Californians, but other States that followed us under the U.S. Clean Air

Act, on criteria pollutants, but now to do it on carbon.

So my amendment would direct the administration to work with the National Academy of Sciences to evaluate the negative economic impacts to the United States' global competitiveness and to our workforce by leaving the Paris treaty.

Our experience in California has been, by transitioning to renewables and alternative fuels, one of the best arguments—of course, secondary to saving the planet, in my view—is the economic benefit. So, I hear and I respect some of the conversations and perspectives from people from different parts of the country, but that has not been our experience.

Our experience has been that we passed a bill in 2006 that I was involved with in the legislature that called for the California Air Resources Board to drop CO₂ emissions by 2020 to 1990 levels. We were told by industry that there was no way we could do that. We are actually on track to do that.

In fact, the last Governor, Governor Brown, signed legislation to decrease our CO₂ levels and, again, directed the California Air Resources Board to implement a strategy to do that in regulations to 40 percent by 2030.

On the renewable side, we went to 33-1/3 percent, a third of our renewables by 2020 on the stationary source side, and the industry came when I was in the legislature and said: We can't do this. We want your help.

We went through with it, and, in fact, we did it. So now there is legislation saying that by 2030, we should decrease it or only have 50 percent renewables.

So what has that done to the economy? Our economy is the fifth largest in the world. We get more venture capital in the United States for renewables and alternative fuels than the total, combined research investment in venture capital in the other 49 States.

We get half of the venture capital in total in the whole country into California, and it continues to provide for transition and new jobs. Many of our workforce are transitioning from fossil fuel to renewables.

When we get mass-produced electric cars—and I am fearful that my grandchildren will drive Chinese electric cars—but we know that our car companies are transitioning and being somewhat successful and we hope that they will continue to be, as General Motors has indicated it would. It is in our best interest to continue this movement.

My hope is that we would work collectively with the people who are being displaced, whether they are coal miners in West Virginia, or refinery workers in the four refineries in my county, to make sure that they don't lose out as the new economy takes over. The world benefits and the economy benefits. So that is the purpose of this amendment.

I do want to say that right now, 3.3 million Americans now work in clean energy jobs; 2.3 million different jobs

are energy efficient; and 318,000 jobs are in California. The World Bank has an analysis that says the Paris accord will contribute \$23 trillion to the world economy.

So on the basis of that and the fact that there are three times more jobs in the renewable and alternative fuel right now in the world than there are in the fossil fuel industry, I think that my colleagues should support this amendment so that we get the facts from the National Academy of Sciences, and the administration can see that what we are supporting not only benefits the planet and public health, but it benefits the economy and the future of American competitiveness.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chair, let me say first to the gentleman from California, that I appreciate the Californians and the California tech companies expanding to my home city of Austin, Texas, but I find this amendment contrary to the premise of this bill, which prohibits withdrawing from the U.S. Paris Agreement. In fact, it withdraws funding.

So for that reason, I am in opposition to it, and, again, I think, as the gentleman stated, we should be advancing—if this bill doesn't make it through the Senate, doesn't get signed into law—advancing the clean energy technologies I think both of our States want to advance.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Ms. JACKSON LEE, I speak in support of the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, add the following:

(9) The Paris Agreement is an example of multilateral, international cooperation needed to overcome challenges facing the international community, such as reducing emissions, promoting economic growth, and deploying clean energy technologies.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I am offering this amendment on behalf of myself, Congress-

woman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, Congressman MOULTON of Massachusetts, and Congresswoman HAYES of Connecticut, and I express my appreciation to them for their assistance and support.

This amendment improves the bill by adding a finding which emphasizes the importance of international cooperation and multilateralism in responding to the global challenges facing the international community.

Mr. Chair, the Paris climate accord was an example of the international leadership commitment and resolve that defeated fascism, created NATO, the European Union, the Marshall Plan, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and most importantly, preserved peace and freedom for the last 75 years.

Collective international action is also needed to combat growing international challenges such as terrorism, human trafficking, and black-market sales of illegal weapons, drugs, and tobacco.

No one country can solve these problems on its own, and this amendment emphasizes the importance of collective international action.

The landmark Paris climate accord was established to combat climate change and to accelerate and intensify the actions and investments needed for a sustainable, low-carbon future. This also brings all Nations into a common cause to undertake ambitious efforts to combat climate change and adapt to its effects with enhanced support to assist developing countries to do so.

In these efforts, we promote the importance of continued international cooperation that has sustained the global community through epidemics, famines, and natural disasters.

Mr. Chairman, a collection of rational actors acting in a selfless manner to achieve a rational result, such as this, requires leadership and systematic reasoning. Without this type of collective action and selfless resolve, we leave ourselves vulnerable to a tragedy of the commons.

When countries act solely in their own best interests without regard to combating international threats, everyone suffers. That is why a great person and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton so eloquently said, "We are stronger together."

The Jackson Lee-Moulton-Hayes amendment reflects this important insight by Mrs. Clinton, and I urge support of this amendment.

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

□ 1715

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to this amendment, but I am not opposed to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, I will close once the gentleman from New Jersey yields back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of our committee for yielding me time.

The Paris Agreement will still stand with or without the U.S. not meeting our commitment, and it doesn't hurt the Paris Agreement, it just hurts the U.S. diplomatically and economically. So it is so critical that we use this opportunity to express to the world and to express to our own Nation that climate change is a priority for this Congress.

Beyond the diplomatic consequences around the world, a decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement hurts Americans right here at home. The U.S. is in the midst of a major transition to clean energy. As consumers demand access to cleaner energy and cleaner air, prices for renewables are falling across the board. With the market forces increasing favoring renewables, dirty energy is no longer a smart investment.

So I want to thank my colleague, KATHY CASTOR, and I want to thank the members of the House Energy and Commerce Committee for continuing to stand strong and stand firm in our commitment to the American people, because ceding the leadership role on the global stage means losing economic opportunities in the global clean energy economy, hurting American workers and businesses.

As we talk about the international framework, we see China, India, and other countries would lead if America does not.

This decision is just another bad Trump deal for the United States of America. It won't bring the coal industry back, and it cedes ground to creating renewable energy jobs that put Americans to work.

This is the new industrial revolution of the 21st century. Let us not cede our leadership to others around the globe but let us lead them. Let us provide the technology that the world will utilize to make sure that we save and preserve this planet, not only for our generation, but generations to come.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Chairman, as I stated, I am not opposed to this amendment. I think the international community should reduce emissions. I think the issue is that the international community is not living up to the expectations of this agreement, particularly China and India. While we have reduced emissions by 14 percent, they have doubled their emissions, and they have until 2030 to reduce any emissions. That is why fundamentally I think this is a flawed agreement.

But I am not opposed to an international consensus to reduce emissions. I don't think this is the right way to do it.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment on behalf of myself, Congressman MOULTON of Massachusetts and Congresswoman HAYES of Connecticut, and express my appreciation to them for their assistance and support.

The Jackson Lee/Moulton/Hayes Amendment improves the bill by adding a finding which emphasizes the importance of international cooperation and multilateralism in responding to the global challenges facing the international community.

The Paris Climate Accord was an example of the international leadership, commitment, and resolve that defeated fascism, created NATO, the European Union, the Marshall Plan, the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and most importantly, preserved peace and freedom for the last 75 years.

Collective international action is also needed to combat growing international challenges such as terrorism, human trafficking, and black-market sales of illegal weapons, drugs, and tobacco.

No one country can solve these problems on its own, and this amendment emphasizes the importance of collective international action.

The landmark Paris Climate Accord was established to combat climate change and to accelerate and intensify the actions and investments needed for a sustainable low carbon future.

This also brings all nations into a common cause to undertake ambitious efforts to combat climate change and adapt to its effects, with enhanced support to assist developing countries to do so.

And in these efforts, we promote the importance of continued international cooperation that has sustained the global community through epidemics, famines, and natural disasters.

A collective of rational actors acting in a selfless manner to achieve a rational result such as this requires leadership and systemic reasoning.

Without this type of collective action and selfless resolve, we leave ourselves vulnerable to a Tragedy of Commons.

When countries act solely in their best interests without regard to combatting international threats, everyone suffers.

That is why a great person and former Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, so eloquently said: "We are stronger together."

The Jackson Lee/Moulton/Hayes Amendment reflects this important insight.

I urge support of the Jackson Lee/Moulton/Hayes Amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, insert the following:

(9) The Paris Agreement is a treaty and should be treated as a treaty. Therefore, before any action can be taken to execute the goals in the Paris Agreement, the Senate should approve a resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Paris Agreement.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my amendment ensuring the constitutionality of the Paris Agreement. The previous administration refused to abide by the Constitution and called this an agreement, not a treaty, despite the agreement having an impact on every American.

Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution states that the President shall "have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

My amendment simply states that the Paris Agreement is a treaty, and before anything can be implemented to abide by the agreement, it should be submitted to the Senate for approval.

My good friend from Virginia, Representative MORGAN GRIFFITH, said it best yesterday in our Special Order when he eloquently stated: "If we are going to bind our hands and seal our fate to be the number two or number three or number five economy in the world instead of being the number one economy in the world, if that is what we are going to do, then there ought to be votes taken down the hall. Men and women in the United States Senate should put their name on the line and say yes or no. And the American people then will know who has voted yes and who has voted no. They won't be hiding behind any games or circumstances or procedural maneuvers. Then the American people can use the power that was given to them by our Constitution and an inalienable right granted by God to use the ballot box to make a decision as to whether or not they wanted to be bound, whether or not they wanted to have their economy reduced, and have their children and grandchildren to be lesser than what we have today in our economic wealth."

Many radical environmental groups are saying the Paris Agreement does not need to go to the Senate, that the agreement reiterates obligations already contained in article 4 of the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, or the UNFCCC. This is completely a falsehood.

The Congressional Research Service has already proven them wrong.

Let me quote the CRS: "The George H.W. Bush administration stated that Article 4.2 of the UNFCCC, which commits the parties to, inter alia, adopt national policies and, accordingly, mitigate climate change by limiting GHG emissions did not require any new implementing legislation nor

added regulatory programs.' Perhaps, most importantly, it stated that an amendment or future agreement under the UNFCCC to adopt targets and timetables for emissions reductions would be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent."

Furthermore, in a subsequent report, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations wrote:

"A decision by the conference of parties to adopt targets and timetables would have to be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent before the United States could deposit its instruments of ratification for such an agreement. The committee notes further that a decision by the executive branch to reinterpret the convention to apply legally binding targets and timetables for reducing emissions of greenhouse gases to the United States would alter the 'shared understanding' of the convention between the Senate and the executive branch and would therefore require the Senate's advice and consent."

The previous administration purposely ignored the will of Congress by refusing to send the Paris Agreement to the Senate. I often hear Members from both sides of the aisle lament about executive overreach.

Here we have a clear case of the executive branch telling Congress it doesn't matter.

If Congress refuses to exercise its constitutional authority and not demand the Paris Agreement to be sent to the Senate, then this body is telling future Presidents that there are no checks and balances.

Madam Chair, I urge the adoption of my amendment that preserves the constitutional checks and balance, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. NORTON). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I strongly support this amendment. It has been the thrust of our argument.

I support the U.S. Constitution Article I authority. This process circumvented that. I do believe it required Senate ratification. But not only that, the President didn't even consult with the Congress. There was not one hearing on this during the Obama administration and therefore circumventing the American people. For that reason, I strongly support this amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I will finish that up.

The State Department has a Circular 175, and there are ten opportunities

that tell us whether they are an agreement or whether they are a treaty.

So let me highlight just four or five of these.

Number one, the extent to which the agreement involves commitments or risks affecting the nation as a whole.

This obviously impacts everybody across this country, therefore, ratification by the Senate.

Whether the agreement is intended to affect State laws.

This will bind all State laws, because they have to fulfill the ratification based on that activity. So, therefore, it, once again, has to be a treaty.

Whether the agreement can be given effect without the enactment of subsequent legislation by the Congress.

This agreement obligates U.S. taxpayer funds to the Green Climate Fund, which is a slush fund, but it still obligates those applications and that money to that fund. Therefore, it must be fulfilled by a treaty.

Madam Chair, I ask Members to adopt my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, we have heard this argument over and over again. The Republicans said the same thing in the markup before the Energy and Commerce Committee, but these Republican arguments are not going to change the facts.

The fact is the Paris Agreement itself is not a treaty. It is an agreement under an existing treaty, and that is the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, that is UNFCCC, pronounced UNF triple C, and that was signed by President George H.W. Bush and approved by both Republicans and Democrats in the Senate in 1992.

There is no requirement for the Senate to approve subsidiary agreements around already approved treaties.

In fact, the vast majority of international agreements to which the United States is a party are not treaties. According to the Congressional Research Service, more than 90 percent of international legal agreements which the United States supports are agreements that do not require Senate ratification.

Now, President Obama did not have to submit the Paris Agreement to the Senate for ratification for two reasons: first, because the emissions targets are not legally binding; and, second, because the legally binding commitments, which are almost entirely procedural, generally either elaborate or repeat obligations under the UNFCCC.

It is also not true that an agreement with any legally binding provisions must be ratified by the Senate. There are many ways in which the United States can enter into international agreements with legally binding commitments.

As I previously mentioned, the vast majority of international agreements the United States enters into are not

approved by the Senate. Using examples of that, we have the U.S.-Canada Air Quality Agreement, the Minamata Convention on Mercury, and the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution.

Arguments that the GOP are using, that the Paris Agreement needs to be ratified are disingenuous. They are, frankly, trying to avoid climate action at all costs. I really find it unfortunate that rather than arguing on the merits, that they use these arguments about ratification that are simply disingenuous.

For those reasons, I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 3 (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that strikes section 3 of the bill. Section 3 prohibits the use of funds to advance the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement. My amendment ensures any decision made on the Paris Agreement will be based on the merits, not politics.

I have said this before, and I will say it again: Either the Paris Agreement is a treaty, or it is not. If it is not a treaty, then the current administration may independently terminate the agreement without congressional approval, as the previous administration entered into the agreement without congressional approval.

Makes sense, right?

What one administration does by executive action can be undone by the next administration by executive action.

If the Paris Agreement is not an agreement entered into by the United States by executive action and con-

stitutes a treaty, then it should be presented to the Senate and put on the floor for a two-thirds vote per Article II, Section 2 of our Constitution.

□ 1730

For the last several years, Democratic Members have crowed at the top of their lungs about none of the funds provisions and forced the U.S. Senate to agree to only take up appropriation bills if they don't include political riders. Riders have not been included in the final appropriations bills signed into law as a result.

Well, folks, section 3 is a political, none-of-the-funds rider, whose sole ability is to try and prevent the administration from doing something they currently have the authority to do. The hypocrisy here is outrageous, and this amendment should pass based on that precedent utilized over the last several years alone.

We have heard folks on the other side of the aisle claim we need to stay in the Paris Agreement in order to protect future generations. Americans for Tax Reform estimates the Paris Agreement will cost the U.S. an estimated 6.5 million jobs by 2040 and reduce our GDP by over \$2.5 trillion.

NERA Consulting estimates those numbers are even higher, and that the Paris Agreement will cost the U.S. an estimated 31.6 million jobs by 2040 and reduce our GDP by over \$3 trillion.

How does killing 6.5 to 31.6 million jobs and costing our economy more than \$3 trillion protect future generations? I don't know.

The European Climate Action Network reported that no single country in Europe is performing sufficiently to meet the Paris Agreement goals.

A recent United Nations Emissions Gap report found that all participating countries will have to at least triple their efforts in order to meet the Paris Agreement's basic goals.

China and India, the world's two biggest polluters, have said they will not even consider reducing carbon emissions until 2030 at the earliest, while we are pledging to reduce our emissions by 26 to 28 percent by 2025.

How does tying ourselves to a non-binding agreement that puts us at a competitive disadvantage and that countries throughout the world are failing to implement protect the American people?

This is not a partisan issue, Madam Chairwoman. This is about doing what is right for America and about protecting freedom and opportunity for our children and grandchildren.

If the administration didn't already have the authority to withdraw the United States from the fundamentally flawed Paris Agreement, then there should be no reason to include the section 3 political rider being debated here today.

But since the United States Senate has failed to take up the Paris Agreement and weigh in one way or the other whether the Paris Agreement is a

treaty or not, this body should not attempt to tie the administration's hands with a political none-of-the-funds rider.

Either you are for the Constitution or you are not. Either you believe executive action can be taken to enter and leave the Paris Agreement or you don't.

I urge adoption of my amendment, which removes the politics from the bill and allows any decision made on the Paris Agreement to be based on merits, not politics.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Once again, Madam Chairwoman, this is an important application. Once again, you have to realize that we are talking about the Constitution.

The other side talks out of both sides of their mouth. They want it one way when they are in the minority, they want it the other way when they are in the majority, and they can't have that.

This is about the rule of law and about good policy. Good process builds good policy builds good politics, and that is just not what is here today.

So when we start looking at the applications here, let's make sure the American taxpayer, the American family, is treated fairly, not put at a disadvantage by the rest of the world.

Too often we have taken the short end of the stick. It is fine for us to stand up.

And, by the way, if I am not mistaken, in 2015, 2016, and 2017 we led the world in carbon emissions reductions. Yes, it is that very application of entrepreneurialism and technology that has driven that boat. Let's continue doing it that way. Let's get back to good process.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to Mr. GOSAR's amendment, which would gut the heart of the bill, the section that prevents the President from withdrawing from the Paris Agreement.

Now, the Paris Agreement sets a strong foundation for action that will accelerate the shift to a clean energy economy and put us on the path to a safer, healthier planet for generations to come. It is the most ambitious climate change agreement in history and builds upon the unprecedented participation of roughly 200 parties to the convention, including India and China, something that my Republican colleagues have wanted for many years.

It provides a framework for reducing U.S. carbon pollution, while also growing our economy. More energy-efficient appliances, buildings, and vehicles will

result in lower energy costs for consumers, all while lowering emissions of harmful air pollutants and keeping our manufacturing industries competitive in this global transition towards low carbon practices.

So, first and foremost, what H.R. 9 is doing is stopping President Trump's reckless withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, the very agreement our country was instrumental in negotiating. But this move has real diplomatic consequences, further diminishing America's credibility around the world.

Let me be clear, the Paris Agreement will still stand with or without the United States; but not meeting our commitments doesn't hurt the Paris Agreement, it just hurts the United States diplomatically and economically. Other countries, not to mention U.S. cities and States, are still moving forward on climate action, making the Trump administration only appear more isolated and irrelevant as the world moves past us.

But beyond the diplomatic consequences around the world a decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement hurts Americans at home.

The U.S. is in the midst of a major transition to clean energy. As consumers demand access to cleaner energy and cleaner air, prices for renewables are falling across the board. With market forces increasingly favoring renewables, dirty energy is no longer a smart investment.

Ceding the leadership role on the global stage means losing economic opportunities in a global clean energy economy, hurting American workers and businesses. China, India and other countries will lead if America does not.

Leaving the Paris Agreement is just another bad Trump deal for the United States. H.R. 9 is trying to prevent this bad Trump deal from becoming our reality. The Gosar amendment would all but guarantee that the United States feels the full weight of the economic and diplomatic consequences of abandoning our friends and allies.

This amendment ensures we lose the clean energy development race to China or India.

This amendment locks the United States and the world into a future of catastrophic warming that puts all of our lives and livelihoods at risk.

I said this earlier when we spoke on the bill: We cannot look backwards. We can't look back into the 19th century. We have to look forward, with new innovation, with an economy that creates more jobs.

Don't let us fall behind the rest of the world and not lead on such an important issue. It is a huge mistake. That is why we are saying in H.R. 9, in this bill, that the President should not be allowed to withdraw and should put together a plan that leads us forward toward a clean economy and meeting the Paris goals.

So, I oppose the Gosar amendment. I urge my colleagues to join me in vot-

ing against it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CASE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, after line 5, insert the following new paragraph:

(5) The Paris Agreement recognizes that the ocean ecosystems covering more than 70 percent of the Earth's surface have an integral role in climate balance. Seventy percent of nationally determined contributions under the Paris Agreement are ocean-inclusive, and 39 Paris Agreement signatories are focused on the inclusion of ocean action in nationally determined contributions through the Because the Ocean Initiative.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. CASE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 9, which would recognize the importance of the oceans to our global climate system and the international efforts under way to include our oceans in nationally determined contributions, or NDCs, under the Paris Agreement.

When we talk about the impacts of manmade climate change, we focus on the worlds of our lands and air, but we tend to forget the largest world of all, our oceans. Yet, some of the foremost negative consequences of climate change, as well as the positive vital processes that have kept our climate on an even keel until recently and can continue to do so, lie in the ocean.

We cannot forget the oceans. No climate change solutions can work if our oceans are not in the room.

The ocean covers more than 70 percent of the Earth and directly affects weather around the globe. The temperature and currents of the ocean determine storm patterns and strength.

We have seen increases in measures of intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as the number of the strongest—category 4 and 5—storms since the 1980s.

The ocean also absorbs many of the most immediate consequences of carbon pollution, buffering us from some

of its most damaging impacts. The ocean has absorbed 93 percent of the total excess heat energy taken up by greenhouse gas in the atmosphere. Additionally, the ocean is the largest sink for anthropogenic carbon dioxide, or CO₂, absorbing roughly one-third of CO₂ emissions.

The increase in temperature and carbon in the atmosphere and oceans are directly impacting communities throughout the world. According to the 2018 Fourth National Climate Assessment, or NCA, released by the U.S. Global Change Research Program, made up of 13 Federal agencies: “Human-caused carbon emissions influence ocean ecosystems through three main processes: ocean warming, acidification, and deoxygenation.”

Additionally, the NCA states: “The social, economic, and environmental systems along the coasts are being affected by climate change. Threats from sea level rise are exacerbated by dynamic processes such as high tide and storm surge flooding, erosion, waves and their effects, saltwater intrusion into coastal aquifers and elevated groundwater tables, local rainfall, river runoff, increasing water and surface air temperatures, and ocean acidification.”

In just one compelling instance of many from around the world, my State of Hawaii’s oceans and coastlines are on the front lines of dealing with the impacts of climate change in our oceans and coasts.

For example, the Honolulu tide gauge, a constant for over a century now, has measured a sea level rise of nearly half a foot since 1905.

Over 70 percent of our beaches in Hawaii are in a state of chronic erosion, likely caused by a combination of shoreline hardening and ongoing sea level rise.

The frequency of high tide flooding in Honolulu since the 1960s increased from 6 days per year to 11 per year.

We have also seen in Hawaii sea level rise impact traditional and customary practices, including fishpond maintenance, cultivation of salt, and gathering from the nearshore fisheries.

About 550 cultural sites, 38 miles of major roads, and more than \$19 billion in assets will be vulnerable to chronic flooding resulting from a 3.2-foot increase in sea level. Such widespread flooding will change the character of the islands by affecting cultural heritage and daily commerce and lifestyle, and this is chronic throughout the entire Pacific.

We also, in Hawaii, face just one example of the impacts of ocean warming, acidification, on our reefs.

We have seen globally averaged sea surface temperature increase by 1.8 percent Fahrenheit over the past 100 years.

We have seen over nearly 30 years of oceanic pH measurements, based on data collected from Station ALOHA, Hawaii, show a roughly 8.7 percent increase in ocean acidity over this time.

We have seen increased ocean acidification reduce the ability of marine organisms to build shells and other hard structures, adversely impacting coral reefs and threatening marine ecosystems.

We have seen extended periods of coral bleaching, which did not even occur first until 2014 but now are becoming much longer.

This is, again, true throughout the entire Pacific Ocean. And we are not alone, because the ocean is interconnected throughout our world, and we are a clear example of what the world is facing.

These impacts are happening all over the world and our country.

Madam Chair, 39 countries—conspicuously, not including the U.S.—have embraced the challenges and promise of our oceans in facing climate change by signing the Because the Ocean initiative, which has encouraged progress on the incorporation of the ocean in climate change policy debate, with a special focus on the inclusion of ocean action into nationally determined contributions under the Paris Agreement. The efforts of these countries and their partners will be invaluable as we face the crisis of climate change.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Chair, let me just say first, we all recognize the oceans’ ecosystems, 70 percent of the Earth’s surface. I am a member of the Ocean Caucus.

This really has nothing to do with reducing our emissions. It is simply a finding. We ought to be focused on bipartisan solutions and boosting research, advancing technologies, and promoting innovation.

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

□ 1745

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. BOST

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, after line 20, insert the following new subsection:

(d) PUBLIC COMMENT.—The President shall—

(1) in making the plan under subsection (a), and updates under subsection (b), available to the public, and before submitting such plan and updates to the appropriate congressional committees—

(A) publish the plan or update, as applicable, in the Federal Register; and

(B) provide a period of at least 90 days for public comment; and

(2) after each such period for public comment, continue to make the proposed plan or update, as well as the comments received, available to the public on regulations.gov (or any successor website).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, any time Congress considers legislation that will radically change our economy, the American people deserve an opportunity to be heard first. And make no mistake, the underlying bill is a radical change to our economy, and not for the better.

My amendment is simple. Before Congress considers legislation to comply with the Paris climate agreement, let’s give the American people 90 days of public comment. That is a standard exception for legislation as big as this.

Who would dare deny our job creators, working families, farmers, coal miners, and manufacturers the opportunity to be heard?

If you support the underlying bill, then I would think you would need to hear how this agreement will impact people’s jobs and their bottom lines. No one will escape higher prices for energy, food, housing, transportation, or just about anything else. If you come from an industrial State, like my home State of Illinois, you can be especially hard hit.

According to recent studies, the Paris Agreement will devastate employment in steel, iron, cement, and oil refining by killing over 1 million jobs.

Manufacturing jobs are good jobs, and they are jobs that are multipliers, with every new steel job leading to seven additional jobs in the region in which they are created.

We just worked our tail off with the President, President Trump’s administration, to help bring nearly 2,000 jobs back, the steel jobs that were in Granite City that were lost. The underlying bill would throw these jobs right back out the window.

What about our farmers? They have faced tougher times and more uncertainty than at any other time, and this would cripple them.

Coal miners have a proud heritage in my district. They are barely hanging on, and this would be the final nail in the coffin.

All of this risk, and for what? A global climate agreement that holds America to a higher standard than China, India, and other emerging nations with bigger emissions and pollution problems?

Look, I have 11 grandchildren. I want to leave a healthier world for them. I want future generations to look back and say that we cared about the future of our planet. But we also have to worry about the people’s security in the present. We need to work together to find solutions that protect jobs and protect the planet.

So before the people's House considers the underlying bill, let's hear from the people themselves.

Support my amendment and give our constituents the opportunity to be heard on just how bad the Paris Agreement could be for them.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Let me explain. I am only claiming the time in opposition. I actually support the gentleman's amendment.

In the interest of increasing transparency and public participation in the development of the President's climate plan, I believe that Mr. BOST's amendment actually is a good one.

Speaking on behalf of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee, we support its adoption and would accept the amendment.

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

Mr. BOST. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for supporting the amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. MENG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 116-42.

Ms. MENG. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, insert the following paragraph:

(9) The Paris Agreement recognizes "the fundamental priority of safeguarding food security and ending hunger, and the particular vulnerabilities of food production systems to the adverse impacts of climate change."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. MENG. Madam Chair, my amendment adds language that recognizes the fundamental link between climate change and food security, as recognized in the Paris Agreement.

The administration's plan to leave the Paris Agreement is a betrayal of America's global leadership and threatens food security for hundreds of millions of people in the United States and around the world.

Vulnerable communities, including children, the elderly, and low-income individuals, are at a greater risk of malnutrition or chronic hunger if the

effects of climate change are not mitigated.

According to the 2018 "National Climate Assessment," climate change will lead to reduced agricultural productivity, and food production will decline in U.S. regions that experience increased frequency and duration of droughts, floods, and severe storms.

Climate change will cause irreparable damage to New York's agriculture sector, which is the dominant ag State in the Northeast.

According to the New York Climate Change Science Clearinghouse, climate change may affect food production by increased heat stress days above 90 degrees Fahrenheit, which could stress livestock and some crops; increased river flooding, which is likely to cause soil erosion, soil loss, and crop damage; and wetter springs, which could delay planting for crops and reduce yields.

These are just a few examples of how climate change may affect New York's agriculture sector.

However, climate change isn't just an American problem. It is a global problem that will cause already vulnerable communities to face increased malnutrition and chronic hunger.

According to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, chronic hunger is on the rise. The number of people facing chronic food deprivation increased to nearly 821 million in 2017 from around 804 million in 2016.

Food insecurity is already a challenge across the globe and is likely to become an even greater threat as climate change impacts agriculture production. Food insecurity can also further strain communities that are already facing challenges, from conflict to job scarcity.

The 2014 "Worldwide Threat Assessment" noted that "the lack of adequate food will be a destabilizing factor in countries important to U.S. national security."

The President's plan to withdraw the U.S. from the Paris Agreement is misguided and will contribute to food insecurity here and abroad. It is imperative the President understands the consequences of climate change for food security and ending hunger.

Again, my amendment simply recognizes the critical and inextricable link between climate change and food security, as recognized in the Paris Agreement.

I urge support for the amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I will close once the gentlewoman yields back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MENG. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, we all agree with the premise of this amendment—food security, ending hunger.

Again, this amendment does nothing to reduce our emissions. We need to debate bipartisan solutions, such as boosting research, advancing technologies, and promoting innovation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MISS GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 116-42.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 6. STUDY AND REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study and submit a report to the Congress on the impact of the plan under subsection (a) on the United States territories, including the potential positive and negative impacts on their economies, taking into consideration their unique energy needs and systems and the climate change vulnerabilities faced by communities in these jurisdictions.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I rise today to speak on behalf of my bipartisan amendment, Amendment No. 15. This bill will provide for a target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 26 to 28 percent below its 2005 level by 2025.

While I share some of my colleagues' concerns about the effectiveness of these targets and the underlying bill, I strongly believe that it is vital that Congress and the Federal Government pay particular attention to the needs of 3.5 million American citizens living in all five U.S. territories whenever it is considering and crafting policies that tackle climate risk.

My amendment will help us achieve just that. Specifically, it directs the General Accounting Office to study and submit a report to Congress on the impact of the President's plan on the U.S. territories, including the potential positive and negative implications on our economies.

In conducting this analysis, the General Accounting Office will have to consider our unique energy needs and systems and the climate risk vulnerabilities faced by communities across our islands.

U.S. territories are at the forefront of climate risks. Given our geographic location, we are particularly vulnerable to extreme weather events. Hurricanes Irma and Maria in 2017, for example, completely devastated Puerto Rico

and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Typhoon Yutu did the same last year in the Northern Mariana Islands.

□ 1800

We are also vulnerable to rising sea levels and coastal erosion. In fact, it is estimated that approximately 60 percent of Puerto Rico's beaches show some sign of erosion, negatively impacting critical infrastructure, communities, properties, and the economies and livelihoods of coastal communities across our island.

Unlike our fellow Americans in the 48 contiguous States, we are not interconnected with a national or larger power grid. Instead, we have isolated systems with limited access to cost-effective fuel sources, heavily rely on foreign petroleum imports, and face among the highest electricity rates in the Nation.

My amendment will allow the study of whether the President's plan has any impact on addressing and tackling these issues, in terms of providing us important information to ensure we are enacting the most effective policies to help territories become more resilient.

It also allows us to study whether the President's plan is a net positive for territories and ensures it does not further raise energy costs, which will be detrimental to economic growth and development.

We need to have a comprehensive understanding of how any climate policy impacts the U.S. territories and incorporates our unique energy needs and realities.

Madam Chair, this bipartisan amendment—and I thank Congresswoman PLASKETT and Congresswoman RADEWAGEN, as well as Congressman SAN NICOLAS of Guam, for being original cosponsors of this amendment—offers a sensible and simple way to achieve this. That is the reason why I thank all of them for sponsoring this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this amendment for the U.S. territories.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Madam Chair, I join my colleagues today to speak out on the President's intent to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement by supporting H.R. 9 and specifically in support of Congresswoman GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN's amendment that is before the floor right now.

The President's intent to withdraw from the climate agreement is perilous, misguided, and ignores the in-

creasingly stark reality of the impacts of climate change in our Nation as well as in the world.

Rising sea levels are already having devastating impacts on hundreds of vulnerable communities across the country and around the world.

Last week, I visited Charleston, South Carolina, and listened to the mayor of Charleston discuss how they were urgently working to heighten the seawall in Charleston directly as a consequence of drastically increasing carbon emissions, and likely related to warming sea water and the rise in sea level and volatility that has caused so much damage.

The catastrophic effects of global warming were manifested in 2017 and 2018 natural disasters, where the Nation saw unprecedented natural disasters, from the deadliest wildfires in California to the worst hurricanes that hit the East Coast and Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The vulnerability of the island territories is particularly important, as they are isolated and have specific energy issues and concerns that other places do not due to their isolation and being surrounded by and part of the ocean environment.

Madam Chair, I thank Congresswoman GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN for her work on this amendment, which requires a report on the impact of climate change in the U.S. territories that pays particular attention and consideration to their unique energy needs and systems and the climate change vulnerabilities faced by communities in this jurisdiction.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and passage of H.R. 9.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I also thank Congresswoman GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN and, actually, Congresswoman PLASKETT. I was able to visit the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico during the last hurricane, and it was devastating. I appreciate the hospitality shown in difficult times.

Madam Chair, while this is a "let's do an evaluation of good and bad," versus one of the amendments we talked about earlier, I am pleased to support it.

The only caveat we would say is that we would rather have these reports done prior to making major decisions versus making a decision and then seeing how it is going to impact. But I am pleased to support it, and I thank the gentlewoman for bringing it forward.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I would inquire if the gentlewoman has any additional speakers.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Puerto Rico has three-quarters of a minute remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, because I have the right to close, I reserve the balance of my time.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, let me say, this is a good amendment, and speaking on behalf of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee, we support its adoption.

Madam Chair, I thank Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN for working with the committees to make changes to her amendment. It has already been mentioned by my colleague, Mr. SHIMKUS, that she was our gracious host when we went to Puerto Rico and also to the Virgin Islands in the aftermath of Hurricane Maria, where we saw the devastation of the hurricane.

Of course, part of the reason why we as Democrats support the Paris Agreement is that we are very concerned about these severe and more severe weather conditions that are occurring because of climate change.

Madam Chair, this is a good amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to support it. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. BRENDAN F. BOYLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, insert the following:

(9) The Paris Agreement recognizes that adaptation is a global challenge faced by all with local, subnational, national, regional and international dimensions, and that it is a key component of and makes a contribution to the long-term global response to climate change to protect people, livelihoods, and ecosystems.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I thank Chairman PALLONE, my colleague and neighbor from New Jersey. I also thank Chairman ENGEL for his leadership on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

My amendment to H.R. 9 takes language from the Paris Agreement and

recognizes that adaptation of the agreement is a key component of the global response to climate change.

Climate change is one of the defining issues of our time, and we are in a defining moment. From shifting weather patterns that threaten food production to rising sea levels that increase the risk of catastrophic flooding, the impacts of climate change are global in scope and unprecedented in scale.

Without dramatic action today, adapting to these impacts in the future will be far more difficult and costlier.

The Paris Agreement for the first time brought all nations into a common cause to undertake ambitious efforts to combat climate change and to adapt to its effects. The agreement chartered a new course in the global climate effort.

This amendment stands for the American leadership that was displayed throughout the development and the adoption of the Paris Agreement.

In order to bring every nation to the table, it is essential that we retain our commitment to this agreement. That is why I urge support for this amendment as well as for the underlying bill.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I will close once the gentleman has yielded back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Chair, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Madam Chair, this amendment basically attempts to state the following: Not only is climate change real and not only are there profound environmental reasons for addressing it, the Paris climate agreement was also a tremendous achievement of U.S. foreign policy. That is why we must keep it. The United States must remain in it.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, again, I agree with the premise of this amendment, but it does not address reducing emissions. We should debate bipartisan solutions, as I stated in the past.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 2, add the following new paragraph:

(9) American leadership encouraged widespread international participation in the Paris Agreement.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act.

As we know and as we have been hearing all day, this bill that we are considering ensures that the United States honors our commitments detailed in the Paris Agreement and lays the groundwork for further action on climate change.

By including this amendment in this bill, it will then be crystal clear that it is the United States that has led and will continue to lead when it comes to influencing other nations to participate in the Paris Agreement.

Now, yes, I do admit that it was the leadership of the United States that got other nations of the world to come together and boldly declare our unified commitment to dealing with the growing climate crisis. We did that by explicitly committing ourselves to play a leadership role. We had to do that in order to attract other countries to join in the goal of limiting the temperature of our globe.

That is why the United States gave structural and directional leadership with ready greenhouse gas reduction targets and a vision for institutional design principles.

Moreover, in our efforts to entice other nations to be a part of the deal, the United States made recommendations for financing adaption, energy investment, and support for developing countries.

The U.S. then stepped up and led by example by announcing its intent to reduce carbon pollution by drastic levels, an act that underscored our role as a global leader on the issue of climate change.

It was that American ambition, that American action, that encouraged other nations around the world to set their sights and their standards higher and to be bolder on the most pressing issue that we face when it comes to climate change. As a result, we saw an unprecedented display of a global commitment to address that pressing issue.

That is why it is all the more disappointing that this administration announced its intention to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement, an act that would make the United States, the country that pushed us and others into this agreement, the only country to reject this agreement.

□ 1815

If the United States abdicates its leadership role here, it will not only cost us influence in this agreement, it will also invite other countries to walk away from combating the climate crisis.

As Todd Stern, the former U.S. special envoy for climate change, stated at a World Resources Institute conference on May 30, "In the absence of the United States, you have a phenomenon of a fair number of countries . . . trying to pull back a little bit on some of the things that were agreed to, some of the compromises that were reached in Paris."

Madam Chair, we cannot let this happen. That is why I seek to include my amendment to H.R. 9 to strengthen this important bill, to stop the administration from advancing the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement, and to reclaim our leadership role in combating climate change and protecting our planet.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I agree with the premise that the world looks to the United States as a leader. Unfortunately, other countries are not leading—China and India, for instance.

This amendment, again, does not address reducing emissions. We need to look at leading as a nation on technology, innovation, and bipartisan solutions.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. ROUDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, insert the following paragraph:

(9) American cities, States, and businesses are stepping up and pledging to meet the Paris Agreement goals in the wake of absent and uncertain United States Federal leadership.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Chair, this amendment recognizes that American cities, States, and businesses are stepping up and pledging to meet the Paris Agreement goals in the wake of absent

and uncertain United States Federal leadership.

While the current administration takes steps to actively undermine the position of the United States on the global stage with regard to climate change, an unprecedented coalition of American States, cities, and businesses are taking action and working to lead the United States to a low-carbon future, as affirmed by the Paris Agreement.

Cities across the country and in my home State of California are taking on the challenge of combating climate change. These cities are implementing new sustainability initiatives by targeting 100 percent renewable energy, recycling 100 percent of wastewater, and working toward net zero carbon emission goals.

As California continues to be an international leader in forward-thinking policy and environmental stewardship, we are not alone.

When describing the ongoing work and the action still needed, California Governor Jerry Brown said, "We're at the base camp of Mount Everest, and we're looking up at the long way we still have to go." That is why, without Federal leadership, States are left taking the lead.

The United States Climate Alliance, a bipartisan coalition of Governors committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions consistent with the goals of the Paris Agreement, just added its 24th State this week.

I reiterate: This bipartisan coalition of Governors is committed to taking real, on-the-ground action to urgently address climate change by implementing policies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 26 percent below 2005 levels by the year 2025, tracking and reporting progress to the global community, and accelerating new and existing policies to reduce carbon pollution and promote clean energy deployment.

Businesses, large and small, are stepping up across a wide range of industries. Large corporations and small businesses alike have already taken steps to develop and deploy high-impact climate action strategies. They see opportunities in working toward a low-carbon future and support the aims of the Paris Agreement.

However, for this transition to succeed, federal governments must also lead. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of my amendment and the underlying bill. We must remain in the Paris climate agreement and work to meet our commitment for future generations. The time for action is now.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, I will close after the gentleman closes. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), my colleague.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, Congressman ROUDA, of which I am a cosponsor.

It was a low point of the Trump Presidency when President Trump announced his plans to recklessly begin withdrawal of the United States from the Paris climate agreement. This was an abandonment of our global leadership.

But I took heart watching the many cities, States, and localities step forward to declare their intention to keep the emission reduction commitments of the Paris accord. These include 20 cities and villages in the 10th District that have joined the Greenest Region Compact to implement sustainability plans to reduce the risk of global climate change and mitigate its effects.

Regardless of the lack of leadership from the White House on addressing climate change, our cities continue to drive the change needed to prevent a climate disaster.

I am glad this House is finally taking action with H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act. I fully support this amendment to recognize the actions of our cities and States that continue to uphold the spirit of the Paris climate agreement.

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chair, bravo for our States and bravo for our communities. I think the only problem I have with the amendment is you seem to have to believe that the United States has to be involved in an international agreement for us to lead. We are the largest carbon reducer since 2015 in the world.

I think the Energy and Commerce Committee over the last Congress has led with bipartisan solutions that have come to the floor. That is where we need to get to eventually, instead of the "he said, she said," point fingers, "you are bad."

What can we do that gets across to the Senate? What can we do to get it to the President's desk? Moving an amendment and a bill that says, "Mr. President, you got out of the Paris accord, now sign this bill to undo what you just did," no one believes he is going to sign that.

We also know that even if he vetoes that bill, we will be able to sustain it on this side.

We look forward to doing things that we did in the last Congress. We can address carbon capture, sequestration, utilization; advanced nuclear reforms; hydropower; and clean natural gas, which has also enhanced our national security; and energy efficiency.

Republicans are willing to work with my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee on conservation, things like energy efficiency, new source review, and forest management. We are willing to talk about innova-

tion, things like advanced nuclear power, as I mentioned; carbon capture, utilization, sequestration, pumped storage; battery technology through research and development; adaptation addressing the grid, adapting to the climate change issues; resiliency of our communities; genetically modified crops, if we have weather conditions or drier conditions.

There are things that we think we can move to address this debate that could get through the Senate and could get to the President's desk, but haranguing and harassing a President who has already decided to leave the accord and think he is going to sign a bill is just not going to happen. That is why I oppose this amendment.

I disagree with the basic premise of the amendment. I agree that communities are doing great things. States are leading. When you argue that States are leading, that is contrary to your argument that we have to lead. If the States and local communities are doing it, why does it take the Federal Government to do that?

We don't have to bash to work together and move a policy forward.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUDA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. PORTER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 116-42.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, insert the following:

(9) Article 10 of the Paris Agreement states that "Parties, noting the importance of technology for the implementation of mitigation and adaptation actions under this Agreement and recognizing existing technology deployment and dissemination efforts, shall strengthen cooperative action on technology development and transfer."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Chair, I am honored to be here today to introduce my amendment to the Climate Action Now Act, which highlights the critical role of technology in the fight against climate change. The United States must continue to invest in research and development of clean energy technology in order to meet our nationally determined contributions under the Paris climate accord.

We need American leadership in the fight against climate change. The U.S. has always led in the field of research and innovation. Our laboratories and research universities are among the best in the world, and their ability to

innovate to combat the world's challenges are without parallel.

Climate change is an urgent challenge we must address, and America's scientists and technologists have always risen to this challenge. Yet, instead of fighting climate change, this administration proposed slashing the budget for climate research and renewable energy programs.

Let's take a look at the President's proposed 2020 budget for the Department of Energy. President Trump would slash the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy by more than 85 percent. This is the home at the Department of Energy for supporting every kind of renewable technology that we have developed and implemented.

President Trump proposed completely zeroing out the ARPA-E budget. ARPA-E was created to incentivize researchers to develop promising research into game-changing technologies that can meet our future research needs. Since 2009, 136 of these projects have attracted billions in private follow-on funding, creating private-public partnerships and American jobs.

□ 1830

President Trump has even proposed cutting State Energy Programs, which help States implement energy efficiency in schools and government buildings, saving taxpayers money.

That is why I believe that it is so important that we now recognize and support the critical role that United States leadership in research and development can and must play in the fight against climate change.

These programs help our country develop new and improved technologies, foster entrepreneurship, urge small business growth, and create clean energy jobs.

In my home, California's 45th Congressional District, there are 5,239 renewable energy jobs and 14,140 energy efficiency jobs. That is a total of 21,622 clean jobs. Those programs filter down to our laboratories, our universities, and our entrepreneurs leading American innovation.

I am proud to say that some of the great research and development happening to combat climate change is happening in California's 45th District at the University of California, Irvine.

UC Irvine is a leader in clean technology innovation and research, helping bring our country closer to meeting the goals of the Paris climate accord.

UC Irvine is home to the Advanced Power and Energy Program and the National Fuel Cell Research Center, which focuses on developing new fuel cell technology.

UC Irvine engineers created the first power-to-gas hydrogen pipeline injection project in the country. This pipeline takes surplus energy from the school's solar panels, converts water to hydrogen and blends it with gas, which can be stored for later use. This allows

us to use clean electricity that would otherwise go to waste, helping reduce pollutants in our air.

Now is the time to harvest the innovative technologies we have while investing in improving clean technologies for tomorrow. I am proud to champion and advance research and innovation.

We need to act now and keep the commitments we made to our coastlines, our community, our country, and the world when we signed the Paris climate accord.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I will close once the gentlewoman yields back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, again, I agree with the premise of this amendment. Clean energy technologies are important in my hometown of Austin.

We have a lot of clean energy in Irvine, California, a lot of clean energy, a lot of collaboration between our two States, but this is simply a finding and does not reduce our emissions.

I again would urge, since I do not think this will become law, that we work on a bipartisan solution, talking explicitly about what you are talking about. We can pass these bills out of the House; we can pass them out of the Senate; and if we can do it bipartisanship, we can get it signed into law.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MRS. LEE OF NEVADA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 116-42.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 7, after line 5, insert the following paragraph:

(9) Article 8 of the Paris Agreement states that "Parties recognize the importance of averting, minimizing and addressing loss and damage associated with the adverse effects

of climate change, including extreme weather events and slow onset events" such as drought conditions and water scarcity.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 329, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Chair, my amendment would ensure that the administration takes into account the problems caused by water shortages and droughts when addressing climate change.

Climate change is no longer a threat to the future. We are experiencing the damaging consequences now globally and regionally in the United States.

According to the Government Accountability Office, climate change has already cost taxpayers over \$350 billion over the last decade.

Water scarcity and drought conditions as a result of climate change have direct economic, legal, and national security implications for our society and for our systems of governance.

In my home State of Nevada, the water supply at Lake Mead is already dangerously low and could face emergency levels as soon as next year. As our water supply continues to diminish, water prices will continue to rise for families across southern Nevada, the United States, and the world.

Under Article 8 of the Paris Agreement, parties must recognize the importance of addressing loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, including drought and increased water scarcity. And since the United States cannot leave the Paris climate accord until November 4, 2020, we are still obligated to maintain certain commitments, and that includes recognizing the fact that rising temperatures pose an imminent threat to our water supply, especially in already arid regions.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, I will close once the gentlewoman yields back.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Chairwoman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Chair, again, I agree with the premise of this amendment. Drought conditions, water scarcity are important in, I know, the gentlewoman's home State, certainly important in my home State of Texas. It will be—as climate change advances, the entire continent of Africa will face drought conditions.

But, again, this is a finding. It doesn't, in and of itself, reduce the emissions, and I would again urge bipartisan solutions to advancing technologies and promoting innovation.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PAPPAS) having assumed the chair, Ms. NORTON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to direct the President to develop a plan for the United States to meet its nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING STATE TEACHERS OF THE YEAR

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

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 57 State teachers of the year from around the country who have convened in Washington.

These educators illuminate what is working in our education system. Their unique and important achievements fill me with pride and inspiration about what teachers can do for our communities when we put students first.

I welcome these outstanding teachers to Washington this week and to Capitol Hill this Thursday as part of a celebration of excellence.

I would like to congratulate the 2019 National Teacher of the Year, Rodney Robinson, who is a committed advocate for all his students and has made it his mission to bring a voice to the voiceless and to those who feel unseen or undervalued by their communities.

Mr. Robinson has been teaching social studies for 19 years to students at Virgie Binford Education Center inside the Richmond Juvenile Detention Center, teaching some of our Nation's most vulnerable students.

Every student deserves a high-quality, equitable education. Mr. Robinson and all these educators work every day to fulfill that promise to their students.

Equity and empowerment are at the core of Mr. Robinson's work and should also be at the core of our work here at the Federal Government.

I also want to thank the Council of Chief State School Officers, or CCSSO,

which, since 1952, has focused on excellence in public education. They are the oldest and most prestigious national honors program for teachers, and their work to celebrate and elevate the voices of teachers should be commended.

It is, likewise, our job as Members of Congress to continue to elevate the profession of teachers, elevate the voices of students, and work together to make sure their dreams are recognized.

CONGRATULATING NATE MACK ELEMENTARY ROBOTICS TEAM

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

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, almost 2 months ago, I spoke on this very floor to congratulate the robotics teams at Nate Mack Elementary and Greenspun Junior High School for advancing to the global robotics competition.

Today, I am proud to report back that Nate Mack Elementary robotics team is now the 2019 VEX IQ STEM Research Award World Champions. Greenspun Junior High also put up a tough fight and made it to the world finals.

I have closely followed the journey of both these robotic teams this year and even visited them. They are big sources of pride for Nevada's Third District, and we could not be more honored to have been represented by them.

So, today, I want to congratulate Nate Mack Elementary robotics team and their coach, Casey Juliano, for their well-deserved win and once again recognize Greenspun Junior High and their coach, Matt Christian, for making it to the world championships.

On behalf of Nevada's Third Congressional District, congratulations. We are proud.

WE ALL HAVE A PLACE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent terror attacks throughout the world and in our country, many people are very, very fearful.

The Nation and the Jewish community mourn another senseless attack after the shooting in California during the Passover celebration, while still grieving those lost in the attack at the Pittsburgh synagogue last year.

We stand with our Jewish brothers and sisters against the face of terror. These despicable attacks of hate have no place in our world. We all have a place in America. Hate, however, does not.

The American people have the right to pray together; they have the right to love together; and they have the right to worship together without fear.

□ 1845

HONORING THE LIFE OF JUDGE DAMON KEITH

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a civil rights icon. Judge Damon Keith passed away this past week. He said one of his mentors, Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, would say to him: When you finish Harvard law, Judge Keith, I want you to use the law as a means of social change.

Judge Keith said: That is what I am trying to do in my lifetime.

The civil rights icon was courageous. He will be sorely missed by many, but even more in his home community of the city of Detroit.

In one of his most famous cases, he said, in his opinion, that: "Democracies die behind closed doors."

And from a recent Detroit Free Press article, in 1973, Judge Keith ordered Detroit Edison to pay \$4 million to Black employees who were victims of job discrimination and ordered it to create an affirmative action program.

Some of these are just a little hint of the incredible contribution that Judge Keith had to our Nation. He will be sorely missed, but, hopefully, his legacy on civil rights and justice for all will continue on in our work here in this Chamber.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO UNITED STATES-CHINA ECONOMIC AND SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 1238(b)(3) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2001 (22 U.S.C. 7002), as amended, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following individual on the part of the House to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission for a term expiring on December 31, 2020:

Dr. Larry M. Wortzel, Williamsburg, Virginia

STUDENT DEBT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today recognizing the amazing contribution of our Congressional Progressive Caucus in allowing many of our colleagues who are pushing bold and progressive ideas, especially around college affordability.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, college students around the

country will cross the graduation stage, accept their diplomas, and get ready to begin their careers. It will be a weekend of well-deserved celebration. Their hard work and years of study have paid off. Yet, for too many of these students, they will soon face the reality of paying the high price of their diplomas.

Too many of these students will soon come face-to-face with a mountain of debt that will take them years, often decades to pay. Today, nearly 43 million Americans, that is one in six adults, have Federal student loan debt. The Federal student loan portfolio has risen to over \$1.4 trillion.

Tomorrow's graduates will face an average of \$30,000 in debt, a crippling amount for any young person to shoulder before they have even entered the workforce. That amount of debt increases every single year. How can we expect young people in this country to choose the course of their careers, to contribute to their communities, and to plan and start their families while simultaneously allowing lenders to saddle them with loan burdens on decades-long repayment timelines?

Among borrowers of all ages with outstanding student loan debt, the median self-reported amount owed among those with less than a bachelor's degree was \$10,000. Bachelor's degree holders owe a median of \$25,000, and those with a postgraduate degree owe a median of \$45,000.

I have heard stories from students at colleges and universities throughout California's 45th Congressional District.

Merhpad and her family immigrated to the United States in 2014. After they settled in Orange County, earning a college degree became her primary goal. But without Federal financial aid programs, such as the Pell grant, she would not have been able to afford and pursue an education. Her commitment and dedication to her education inspired her parents to also attend Irvine Valley College to pursue degrees.

She uses her financial aid to afford transportation, food, healthcare, and school supplies. Because she lives with her parents, she doesn't need to spend financial aid on housing. But other students aren't so lucky.

Community colleges typically don't offer housing for their students, and with an average rent of \$1,000 to \$2,000 in Orange County, it is almost impossible to afford to live near our colleges' campuses.

Jose, a student at Saddleback College in Orange County is studying psychology and playing football. He is the eighth of 11 kids. He received a scholarship to cover his tuition and meals, but it isn't enough to help him afford housing. Jose was homeless for two semesters, sleeping in his car and at his football teammates' houses. Despite these challenges, Jose has a 3.8 GPA and he hopes to graduate from Saddleback to go on to pursue a degree in clinical psychology.

He explained, "I move forward towards graduation, believing that if I can overcome the adversities I have faced in my life, anyone can."

His persistence and dedication are inspiring. But no student should ever have to choose between getting an education and being homeless. Unfortunately, these stories are all too common. Too many students are struggling just to keep a roof over their heads.

Recently, I met with students from the University of California Irvine to discuss the challenges they are facing. One of those students was Stephanie, a first-generation student studying public health.

She completed the full college application process on her own, including applying for financial aid. She received both a Pell grant and a Cal grant, but she still has to work three part-time jobs throughout the year to afford housing and food.

She spends more than 12 hours most days in class and at her part-time jobs, fighting to ensure that she doesn't have to take on student loans, so she can go on to pursue a masters in global public health. Stephanie is not the only one facing challenges affording living expenses while in college.

Another one of those students was Deshay, a junior at UC Irvine who will soon become the first person in his family to graduate from college. Deshay left home at 17, so when he applied for financial aid a year later, he did so on his own, declaring himself as an independent.

His expected family contribution was zero. While he got the funding necessary to attend UC Irvine, the aid didn't cover all of his living needs, including groceries. Deshay had a goal when he started college. He wanted to graduate loan free. He didn't want to take out loans to pay for his living expenses and so he took on two part-time jobs. But the reality of the cost of living in Orange County soon set in.

After nearly 2 months of eating only one meal a day, Deshay was left with few choices. When he finishes college next year, he will graduate with nearly \$30,000 of debt.

Still, he is excited to graduate and to start giving back to our community. He plans to move home to Sacramento and he hopes to open a youth center modeled after Boys & Girls Clubs across the country. But Deshay is worried that he may not be able to successfully apply for the loan that he will need to start his business, in large part because of the student loan debt he carries.

College students who have fought to pursue an education, who work tirelessly toward their dreams, are being forced to put these dreams on hold. Why? Because the education necessary to achieve their dreams has left them buried in debt.

This Congress, as we work on the reauthorization of key legislation for students across this country, we need to ensure that students graduating this

weekend and in coming weeks don't have to choose between a job serving their communities or financial security or choose between putting food on the table and attending classes.

That is why I will be introducing the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Student Loan Integrity and Transparency Act, along with Senators WARREN, BROWN, and UDALL. The bill does just what it says. It mandates that the Department of Education and student loan servicers share information and cooperate with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's student loan education ombudsman. That ombudsman is the number one Federal official tasked with advocating for our students who are struggling to repay loans.

It also requires the ombudsman's office be fully staffed at all times so the office can conduct the level of oversight necessary to protect student borrowers.

This is just the first step of many needed to improve student loan oversight and improve college affordability. I look forward to opportunities to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that our students have the opportunity to access an affordable college education.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the student debt crisis that is holding back our students, our families, and our economy.

Last year, American's collective student loan debt surpassed \$1.5 trillion. The shackles of debt keep former students and their families from seeing the economic prosperity promised to them by their education.

More than 40 million Americans now have student debt, and the amount of debt that the average student carries is rising. Student loan balances have more than doubled real terms since 2005. Average real student loan debt per capita for individuals between the ages of 24 to 32 has risen from \$5,000 in 2005 to \$10,000 in 2014.

It is driving down home ownership rates, especially for young people. One study found that a \$1,000 increase in student loan debt causes a 1-to-2 percent drop in home ownership rates for borrowers in their late twenties and early thirties, threatening to undermine the long-term financial stability of an entire generation.

Young adults who graduate college with a student debt now have negative net worth with a median net worth of \$1,900, down from \$9,000 in 2013.

Student loan debt does not only impact young people. The number of people over 60 with student loan debt has quadrupled in the last four decades. Parents are increasingly jeopardizing their retirement to pay off loans they took out to pay for their kids' education.

The source of student debt does not affect all Americans equally. Students

of color face a higher risk of defaulting on their student loans and struggle to find jobs to pay off these loans due to discrimination in hiring practices.

First generation and immigrant college students face much higher default rates, and women own two-thirds of the \$1.4 trillion total of student debt.

The burden of this debt will be intensified postgraduation by the gender gap. It is time we started treating student debt like the national crisis it is. We need urgent action to address it. That is why I support debt free and tuition-free college and will be introducing a bill to cancel all student debt.

Our Debt-Free College Act would make debt-free college a reality for students within 5 years. We can ensure that students graduate debt free and are not at a competitive disadvantage as a result of the burden of student loan debt.

Making public 2-year and 4-year colleges free and accessible to all is essential in investing in an equitable future. It would also provide an enormous middle class stimulus that would boost economic growth, increase home purchases, and fuel a new wave of small business formation.

Student debt is not the result of bad choices or behaviors. It is the result of a system that tells the students to get an education, go to college in order to have a stable life, but then does not provide the resources so that they can afford that education.

But I believe together we can reform that system.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, we talk about opportunity a lot in this Chamber. The opportunity to thrive, the access to get ahead in life if you worked hard. We tell our kids every day that opportunity is abundant. It is everywhere, in every corner. If you just work hard, you can have access to a tremendous amount of opportunity.

□ 1900

Yet we know now that many roadblocks exist through no fault of their own. This is why it is so critically important to talk about the college affordability issue and crisis in our country.

There are many motivations to go to school. For many first-generation college students like me, it is to help their families. Many want to give back to their community, yet many are not able to fulfill this dream because of affordability.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, Michigan ranks among States in the bottom half in college attainment. Fewer than 30 percent of Michigan adults hold at least a bachelor's degree. We are closing the door on those who want to help others, whether it is their family or their broader community.

Studies show that first-generation college students go to college in order to help their families. Sixty-nine percent of them say they want to help their families compared to 39 percent of students whose parents have earned

a degree. This desire also extends to the community with 61 percent of first-generation college students wanting to give back to their communities compared to 43 percent of their non-first-generation peers.

Regarding college school loan debt, students used to think about getting good enough grades when we go to college. That is what we were focused on. Not anymore, Mr. Speaker. Students today are forced to make a decision between a degree and access to that opportunity or debt.

In 2016, 64 percent of Michigan college graduates left school with debt, an average of over \$30,000 a year, the 11th highest in the Nation. Even after factoring in grant programs, low-income families have to pay more than 70 percent of their income to cover college costs.

I want to share a story of my friend in college. It took him close to a decade because he was serving our country. He came back after serving not only as a U.S. marine but also doing civil service work for the United States Army. He came back, and all he wanted to do was become a schoolteacher, a public educator. He loves it. It is his passion.

As he sits in his classroom every single day educating our children, he has to also deal with the increase in debt, with the high cost of interest, and with all those things that now put him in a financial crisis.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that low- and middle-income households already face higher burdens. They are less likely to have family assistance and more likely to have other pressures such as a part-time job or family caretaking roles in addition to their schoolwork.

As many low-income students avoid applying to college altogether due to costs, borrowers who are tens of thousands of dollars in debt aren't able to purchase homes, start their families, obtain employment in certain fields, and save for retirement.

Student loan debt is further putting low- and middle-income students and their families into a downward spiral that leaves many worse off than they were when they started school.

This is not how it has to be. Student debt has a greater impact on low-income borrowers, as many of us know. In fact, borrowers in low- and moderate-income households face education debt that has averaged 24 percent of their income in 2010 alone. The average for all households was 6 percent.

Looking at that more deeply and really unpacking that, we also have to look at food insecurity and housing insecurity when it comes to college affordability. The current state of college affordability leaves so many students in housing insecurity as well as food insecurity.

Most college students, Mr. Speaker, attending at least half-time are not eligible for SNAP assistance unless they

work at least 20 hours per week or they work part-time in a work-study program, have young children, or meet certain other requirements. Again, they are stuck in a spiral of insecurity. However, working 20 hours a week has been shown to lengthen the time it takes to graduate, just like for one of my best friends.

Increased college costs lead to a heightened risk of dropping out as well. I have seen many, many of my friends who started with me who could not finish because they couldn't afford it.

On-campus housing comprises anywhere from 24 to 42 percent of students' total budgets. Meanwhile, the cost of off-campus housing surrounding universities tends to be higher than the standard market rate. We see that in all our districts across the Nation.

These steep costs have consequences. One survey alone found that 42 percent of their undergraduate students had experienced housing insecurity within the past year.

In many cases, housing insecurity is coupled with food insecurity. In one study, 59 percent of students at a 4-year university experienced food insecurity. What that means is not having enough to eat, just like my colleague from California talked about for a specific resident in her community who only could afford to eat once a day.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that the more college becomes unaffordable and out of reach for working- and middle-class families, the more we subject students to poverty as they try to obtain higher education.

As income inequality increases and as we see it across our Nation every single day, and college tuition and living expenses go up as well, we are creating an environment where fewer people have an opportunity to thrive, fewer people can help their families, and fewer people have the means to help their community. This should not happen in our country, and we should be working day in and day out to correct this.

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

FAIR HOUSING MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to stand here in the House of Representatives, to have the opportunity to address colleagues, friends, and the Nation. I especially thank the leadership for allowing these privileges.

I am grateful to the many people who are still here as we continue with our statements on the floor of the House. You work tirelessly, and it seems that you work endlessly, Mr. Speaker. I think it appropriate that we thank you for being here with us into the late hours as we present our floor messaging.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be here tonight to announce that my dear friend and colleague, Representative EMANUEL CLEAVER, has joined me in reintroducing a resolution in recognition of Fair Housing Month.

Housing, Mr. Speaker, is a basic human right, but access is too often limited based upon race, sex, national origin, and sexual orientation. This resolution marks the 51st anniversary of the congressional passage of the Fair Housing Act, properly styled title 8 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

The Fair Housing Act prohibits discrimination concerning the sale, rental, and financing of housing based upon race, national origin, religion, sex, or familial status. This year, Mr. Speaker, also marks the 31st anniversary of the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988.

More than 50 years ago on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C., Dr. Martin Luther King delivered his famous “I Have a Dream” speech. It was considered, and it is still considered, one of the greatest speeches in American history.

In his speech, Dr. King called for racial equality and an end to discrimination. Passionately, he argued that all men are created equal and should be treated equally. Although that was not the case in America at that time, he believed it must be the case for America’s future.

I must tell you, we have come a long way, Mr. Speaker, but we still have a great distance to go to realize the dream of Dr. King, a world where persons are judged by the content of their character, not the color of their skin. Dr. King was a very strong supporter of fair housing, and he envisioned a society free of discrimination.

I would like to speak just a moment about access to affordable housing. Each year, the Department of Housing and Urban Development releases the “Annual Homelessness Assessment Report.” This is released to Congress. It provides the best available estimates of homelessness and how it is impacting the United States.

According to the 2018 report, there were 552,830 persons experiencing homelessness in the United States on a single night in 2018.

The report also provides details on the demographics of the people experiencing homelessness. For example, for women and children in 2018, nearly 160,000 children and youth experienced homelessness, representing nearly 30 percent of the total persons who are in a state of homelessness. Over 216,000 women and girls experienced homelessness, or 40 percent of the total persons who experienced homelessness.

Racial minorities were disproportionately represented among people experiencing homelessness in 2018. African Americans comprised 40 percent of all people experiencing homelessness, despite making up only 13 percent of the Nation’s general population.

Hispanic or Latino persons comprised 25 percent of the total, despite making

up but 18 percent of the Nation’s general population.

Nearly 38,000 veterans experienced homelessness in 2018, or 9 percent of the total.

Furthermore, according to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, the U.S. has a shortage of more than 7.2 million rental homes that are affordable and available to the lowest income renters in our country.

After the 2008 financial crisis, it became clear that we need to address the epidemic of discrimination in lending where communities of color are disproportionately targeted. I can recall, having been on the Financial Services Committee, how we received testimony from persons who indicated to us that as a result of this downturn in 2008, the community of color, the African American community in particular, lost a generation of wealth. This is something that we are still trying to recover from.

This is why we need the Fair Lending for All Act. The Fair Lending for All Act would create such a fair lending testing program that would penalize individuals who discriminate. When they do so, and they discriminate invidiously and cause harm to persons, when they hold predatory loans and they make these loans, they will be held accountable because we must ensure we are not only understanding the patterns of housing discrimination more thoroughly but also understand that we are providing clear oversight and guidelines to combat housing discrimination.

In 1968, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, commonly known and well-known as the Kerner Commission, concluded in a groundbreaking report that White racism led to pervasive discrimination in employment, education, and housing.

In 2015, the Black homeownership rate was just over 40 percent, virtually unchanged since 1968. Over that same period, White ownership increased 5.2 percentage points to 71.1 percent, 30 percentage points higher than the Black homeownership rate.

As a result, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Fair Housing Act on April 11, 1968, 1 week after the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King. In fact, there are many people who contend that before the demise of Dr. King, the Fair Housing Act would not have been signed as quickly as it was.

Dr. King, as you know, was assassinated. For many of us, it was a sad and dark day in the history of our country. We were saddened by what happened to Dr. King, notwithstanding the fact that the Fair Housing Act became law as a result of his untimely demise.

The Fair Housing Act was conceived to battle discrimination in housing related to these housing transactions that are supposed to allow everyone to access housing but don’t always accomplish those goals.

More than 4 million Fair Housing Act violations occur each year against peo-

ple of all protected classes, including based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Less than 1 percent of the violations of Fair Housing Act laws are reported each year.

□ 1915

In 2017, approximately 28,843 housing discrimination complaints were filed. Of these, 20,595 complaints, or approximately 70 percent, were filed with local private, nonprofit, fair housing centers.

Housing bills in the 116th Congress include H.R. 123, the FHA Additional Credit Pilot Program Reauthorization Act.

We introduced this on January 3, 2019. This would extend section 258 of the National Housing Act, which established an automated process for providing alternative credit rating information for mortgagors and prospective mortgagors.

I would add that, simply put, this would give persons who pay their light bills, their gas bills, their water bills, all of their utility bills timely but they don’t have thick credit files—in fact, they have thin credit files, and some of them have no credit at all, in addition to these bills that they pay on a monthly basis—an opportunity to have these payments scored so that they, too, might have the opportunity to own a home.

Representative VICENTE GONZALEZ is one of the cosponsors of this legislation.

H.R. 166, the Fair Lending for All Act, was introduced on January 3 of 2019, and this would establish an Office of Fair Lending Testing to test for compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, ECOA, and to create criminal penalties for invidious discrimination in lending.

H.R. 149, the Housing Fairness Act, was introduced on January 3, 2019, and it would instruct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to conduct a nationwide testing program.

This nationwide testing program would be utilized to detect and document differences in the treatment of persons seeking to rent or purchase housing or obtain a refinance of a home mortgage loan. It would measure patterns of adverse treatment because of race, color, religion, sex, familial status, disability status, or national origin of renters, home buyers, or borrowers. And it would measure the prevalence of such discriminatory practices across the housing and mortgage lending market.

H.R. 165, Improving Access to Homes for Heroes Act. This was introduced January 3, 2019. It would provide Congress with the information it needs, as we work toward ending homelessness among our veterans, by requiring HUD to provide Congress with an annual report that gives a comprehensive assessment of the efforts being made to provide housing assistance to our veterans, and it would also require public housing agencies to include veterans in their public housing planning.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be associated with all of the bills. We are honored to act as original sponsors of all of these pieces of legislation, but I am much more proud of the fact that, in this country, we are still making progress, but we really have come a long way.

I can remember a time when the public housing in this country was segregated, literally—tax dollars providing housing that was segregated.

I am proud to say that we have come a long way and integrated the public housing, housing paid for with American tax dollars.

I can remember a time in this country when there were neighborhoods that persons of African ancestry were restricted from living in. Restrictive covenants were prevalent. And there are still some neighborhoods that there is a degree of difficulty acquiring access to; but, generally speaking, restrictive covenants are no longer in existence to the extent that they are commonly used to exclude persons of color, and other persons as well, based on religious preferences, from the neighborhoods.

This is a country that still has a long way to go, but this is a country that has made some great strides.

Notwithstanding the strides, however, we must continue to do our very best to make sure every person who wants housing and can afford it can get housing, which means that we have to have affordable housing.

I was very proud this week that just passed, in Houston, Texas, to visit an area in my district, the Ninth Congressional District of Texas, where a project had been razed, as in eviscerated, and there was a raising, if you will, of another project.

This project cost approximately \$30-plus million, and it was subsidized in part from CDBG dollars from this Congress to the tune of about \$3 million.

It was a wonderful thing to see this new growth, if you will, this new housing development in this community. It is a wonderful project that has amenities that you might expect to find in an upscale neighborhood.

Within the center for persons to use, the common area, there is a business center right within that complex. There is also a facility for meetings. There is an exercise room. And their plan is to have a swimming pool. Yes, people who need affordable housing do swim. They enjoy exercising, and they want to have the opportunity to go online and conduct business just as other people do.

So it was a wonderful thing to see this project have all of these various amenities that you might find in an upscale neighborhood.

I was there with a good many people who were just proud to be a part of the community and to see this development take place within their neighborhood.

As you know, we dwell in our houses, but we live in our neighborhoods. And

in living in a neighborhood, you want to make sure that you have got quality housing. You want parks. You want schools. You want the opportunity to have your food source immediately available to you, readily available.

This is all a part of what is being developed as a result, in part, of these new housing projects coming online.

So it is important for us to continue to use community development dollars in a very positive way, so that we can continue to develop, not just homes for people, but neighborhoods for people to live in as well as homes for them to dwell in.

Houston, Texas, I am proud to say, has a mayor who has made it his mission to be a good partner in the wise and judicious use of these community development dollars. That is but one project that I can call to your attention. I have attended the ribbon cutting of many other projects that are similarly situated.

I would add, as I come to a close, that the housing crisis that we are experiencing now is one that is quite visible. In my lifetime, I don't think I have seen this number of people dwelling on the bridges, dwelling along the side of freeways, dwelling under trees.

We say that home is where the heart is. If this is true, we have to query: Where is the heart of the homeless? Where is the heart of the homeless? Is it on a bridge or under a bridge or near a park bench at night? Is it someplace where those of us who lead lives adorned with luxury don't have them in sight?

Where are the homeless? Where is the heart?

But the question really isn't, where is the heart of the homeless person. The question is: Where is our heart?

Where is the heart of a nation that is the richest in the world that can tolerate this level of homelessness that is in plain sight?

You don't have to look very far to see it. Many of us take the freeways and we avoid it, but it is right there for all to see.

Where is our heart? Where is the heart of the country that can put people on the moon, the country that can house people in space stations; where is the heart of the country that can do all of these magnificent things, yet have persons who are sleeping under bridges?

I am proud that the Honorable MAXINE WATERS, the chairperson of the Financial Services Committee, has a bill that we are taking up, a bill that would accord some many billions of dollars for the homelessness part of it, some \$5-plus billion, and it would attempt to tackle this problem of homelessness in a very positive way.

It is not just another Lilliputian effort. This is a noble effort to do what we can to provide homes for people who are living on the streets of life in the richest country in the world.

So, this month I am proud to bring this resolution to the floor, and I am

proud to tell you that we are going to tackle these problems. We may not solve them immediately, but we have the will to solve them eventually.

This is our challenge. This is our quest. And this is what we must do in the richest country in the world.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, May 2, 2019, 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:

848. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Colonels Gregory Kreuder and Ty W. Neuman, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

849. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's intent to commence chemical agent destruction operations at the Blue Grass Army Depot Chemical demilitarization site in Richmond, KY, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1512(4); Public Law 91-121, Sec. 409(b)(4); (83 Stat. 209); to the Committee on Armed Services.

850. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's 2019 Annual Report to Congress on Chemical and Biological Warfare Defense, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1523(a); Public Law 103-160, Sec. 1703; (107 Stat. 1854); to the Committee on Armed Services.

851. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a partial report comprising six report requirements out of seven examining the health of the defense electronics industrial base, including analog and passive electronic parts, substrates, printed boards, assemblies, connectors, and cabling by January 31, 2019, pursuant to Public Law 115-232, Sec. 845(a); (132 Stat. 1881); to the Committee on Armed Services.

852. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Determinations; Erie County, New York (All Jurisdictions) [Docket ID: FEMA-2019-0002; Internal Docket No.: FEMA-B-1128] received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

853. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Maine; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide NAAQS [EPA-R01-OAR-2018-0637; FRL-9992-50-Region 1] received April 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121,

Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

854. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Revisions; California; Correcting Amendments [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0133; FRL-9992-71-Region 9] received April 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

855. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Arizona: Approval and Conditional Approval of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Maricopa County Air Quality Department; Stationary Source Permits; Correction [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0481; FRL-9992-61-Region 9] received April 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

856. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Allegheny County Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2018-0764; FRL-9993-02-Region 3] received April 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

857. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0787; FRL-9992-14-Region 9] received April 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

858. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Commercial Fuel Oil Sulfur Limits for Combustion Units in Allegheny County [EPA-R03-OAR-2018-0513; FRL-9993-01-Region 3] received April 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

859. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Reasonably Available Control Technology in the Houston-Galveston-Brazoria Ozone Nonattainment Area [EPA-R06-OAR-2017-0055; FRL-9992-51-Region 6] received April 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

860. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bentazon; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0476; FRL-9991-75] received April 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

861. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG Revision — Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About Commercial Radiopharmacy Licenses [NUREG-1556, Volume 13, Revision 2] received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

862. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, 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.

863. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, 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.

864. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

865. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a vacancy and a designation of acting officer, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

866. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's summary of the inventories of commercial and inherently governmental activities for fiscal year 2018, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

867. A letter from the Director, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's FY 2018 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

868. A letter from the Acting Manager, Equal Opportunity Compliance, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the Authority's FY 2018 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

869. A letter from the Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the 2018 Report to Congress on the Disclosure of Financial Interest and Recusal Requirements for Regional Fishery Management Councils and Scientific and Statistical Committees and on Apportionment of Membership for Regional Fishery Management Councils, pursuant to Secs. 302(b)(2)(B) and 302(j)(9) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

870. A letter from the Executive Director, Improvement Steering Council, Permitting Council, transmitting the Council's FAST-41 Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2018, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4370m-7(a)(1); Public Law 114-94, Sec. 41008(a)(1); (129 Stat. 1760); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

871. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2018-1010; Product Identifier 2018-NM-148-AD; Amendment 39-19596; AD 2019-05-

14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

872. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0151; Product Identifier 2019-NE-04-AD; Amendment 39-19604; AD 2019-06-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

873. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Division Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0920; Product Identifier 2016-NE-09-AD; Amendment 39-19605; AD 2019-06-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

874. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule— Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1236; Product Identifier 2017-SW-136-AD; Amendment 39-19613; AD 2019-07-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

875. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31243; Amdt. No.: 3844] received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

876. A letter from the Attorney, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Railroad Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Railroad Noise Emission Compliance Regulations [Docket No.: FRA-2017-0038, Notice No.: 2] (RIN: 2130-AC69) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

877. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2018 Report to Congress from the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1315a(g); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XI, Sec. 1115A(g) (as amended by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 3021(a)); (124 Stat. 394); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

878. 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 first session of the 116th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Oversight and Reform, Foreign Affairs, Small Business, Science, Space, and Technology, and the Budget.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLINE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 2426. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HOYER, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. McEACHIN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. LURIA, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2427. A bill to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ALLRED, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 2428. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage from imposing cost-sharing requirements or treatment limitations with respect to diagnostic examinations for breast cancer that are less favorable than such requirements with respect to screening examinations for breast cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COLE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2429. A bill to restore administrative law judges to the competitive service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MENG, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. OMAR, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. AGUILAR):

H.R. 2430. A bill to provide for punishments for immigration-related fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2431. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a loan repayment program for mental health professionals to relieve workforce shortages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 2432. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress on the artificial intelligence strategy of the De-

partment of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. COOK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TURNER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BACON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 2433. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to modify, for purposes of veterans' preference for Federal hiring, certain requirements with respect to service and retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2434. A bill to resume the operation of the page program for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2435. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish an interagency task force on the use of public lands to provide medical treatment and therapy to veterans through outdoor recreation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS (for himself and Mr. HUIZENGA):

H.R. 2436. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise the definitions of a "small business" and "small organization" for purposes of assessing the impact of the Commission's rulemakings under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 2437. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide parity for outlying areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. COLE, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KILMER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BASS, Mr. COOK, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CASE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KIND, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2438. A bill to increase intergovernmental coordination to identify and combat violent crime within Indian lands and of Indians; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on 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. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Ms. STEFANK):

H.R. 2439. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions to help combat the opioid crisis; to the Committee on 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. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 2440. A bill to provide for the use of funds in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for the purposes for which the funds were collected and to ensure that funds credited to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are used to support navigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to

the Committee on the Budget, 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. SARBANES (for himself and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 2441. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve the public service loan forgiveness program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. CRIST, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2442. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide for the humane treatment of dogs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BARR, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana):

H.R. 2443. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to update certain procedures applicable to commerce in firearms and remove certain Federal restrictions on interstate firearms transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 2444. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to make direct loans under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 2445. A bill to provide minimum standards for transactions secured by a dwelling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 2446. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that bonds used to finance professional stadiums are not treated as tax-exempt bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRINDISI (for himself and Mr. MARCHANT):

H.R. 2447. A bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; 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. CARBAJAL (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 2448. A bill to provide for ocean acidification collaborative research grant opportunities; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 2449. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for limitations on duty hours for yardmaster employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas (for himself and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 2450. A bill to establish a demonstration program at a military installation in the United States to evaluate the feasibility and benefits of using innovative technologies and systems to assist in the management of military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 2451. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 575 Dexter Street in Central Falls, Rhode Island, as the "Elizabeth Buffum Chace Post

Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CLAY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. RYAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York):

H.R. 2452. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a Medicare for America health program to provide for comprehensive health coverage for all Americans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and Labor, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, and House Administration, 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. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. GOLDEN):

H.R. 2453. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to vehicle weight limitations for certain logging vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 2454. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 East Sharpfish Street in Rosebud, South Dakota, as the "Ben Reifel Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. BRINDISI):

H.R. 2455. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to citizen petitions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 2456. A bill to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2457. A bill to help train individuals in effective and evidence-based de-escalation techniques to ensure that individuals at diverse levels of society have and retain greater skills to resolve conflicts, manage anger, and control implicit bias without the use of physical or other force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL:

H.R. 2458. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to require a certain percentage of funds appropriated for revolving fund capitalization grants be used for green projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Mr. STANTON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mrs. LESKO):

H.R. 2459. A bill to approve the settlement of water rights claims of the Hualapai Tribe and certain allottees in the State of Arizona, to authorize construction of a water project relating to those water rights claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PENCE (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 2460. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a working group to study regulatory and legislative improvements for the livestock, insect, and agricul-

tural commodities transport industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PHILLIPS (for himself and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 2461. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit with respect to any stillborn child of a taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 2462. A bill to establish a pilot program to enhance the mapping of urban flooding and associated property damage and the availability of such mapped data to homeowners, businesses, and localities to help understand and mitigate the risk of such flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on 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. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2463. A bill to provide for the establishment of Medicare part E public health plans, and for other purposes; 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. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 2464. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program supporting trauma centers with violence intervention and violence prevention programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SABLAN (for himself and Ms. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 2465. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a program that enables college-bound residents of the Northern Mariana Islands and American Samoa to have greater choices among institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Ms. SHERRILL, and Mr. RIGGLEMAN):

H.R. 2466. A bill to extend the State Opioid Response Grants program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 2467. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce from authorizing commercial finfish aquaculture operations in the Exclusive Economic Zone except in accordance with a law authorizing such action; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. DELAURO):

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of October 28 as "Honoring the Nation's First Responders Day"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Res. 336. A resolution condemning the terrorist attacks on Christian worshippers in Sri Lanka on Easter Sunday, April 21, 2019, and standing with the Government of Sri Lanka to encourage the protection and preservation of religious liberties; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR,

Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LI-PINSKI, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. COX of California, Mr. BEYER, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. PORTER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KILMER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RYAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H. Res. 337. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2019 as "Mental Health Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H. Res. 338. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2019 as Motorcycle Safety Awareness Month; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Res. 339. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 15, 2019, as "National Senior Fraud Awareness Day" to raise awareness about the barrage of fraud attempts that seniors face, to encourage the implementation of policies to prevent these scams from happening, and to improve protections from these scams for seniors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BACON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. TITUS, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 340. A resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H. Res. 341. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May as "National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself and Ms. DEAN):

H. Res. 342. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Healthy Schools

Day; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. OMAR, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland):

H. Res. 343. A resolution recognizing the commencement of Ramadan, the Muslim holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and commending Muslims in the United States and throughout the world for their faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Res. 344. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2, 2019, as a “National Day of Reason” and recognizing the central importance of reason in the betterment of humanity; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H. Res. 345. A resolution recognizing widening threats to freedoms of the press and expression around the world, reaffirming the centrality of a free and independent press to the health of democracy, and reaffirming freedom of the press as a priority of the United States in promoting democracy, human rights, and good governance in commemoration of World Press Freedom Day on May 3, 2019; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. OMAR, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. CHABOT):

H. Res. 346. A resolution recognizing the devastating April 21, 2019, terrorist bombings in Sri Lanka and observing 10 years since the end of Sri Lanka’s decades-long civil war, which ended on May 18, 2009; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. DELGADO, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. KIM, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. CROW, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. BURCHETT, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WATKINS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. HORSFORD):

H. Res. 347. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of May 5, 2019, through May 11, 2019, as “National Small Business Week” to celebrate the contributions of small businesses and entrepreneurs in every community in the United States; to the Committee on Small Business.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 2426.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 2427.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 2428.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 2429.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 2430.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 2431.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 2432.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 2433.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2434.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 5, Clause 2: “Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two thirds, expel a member.”

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2435.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 2436.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 2437.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. HAALAND:

H.R. 2438.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 2439.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2440.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 2441.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2442.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 2443.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, and Amendment II of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 2444.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution of the United States

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 2445.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2446.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section VIII, Clause I

By Mr. BRINDISI:

H.R. 2447.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 2448.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 2449.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:

H.R. 2450.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 2451.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2452.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 2453.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—Congress has the authority regulate interstate commerce

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 2454.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 2455.

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

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—Congress has the ability to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 2456.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2457.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL:

H.R. 2458.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 2459.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 2460.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the authority 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. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 2461.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises."

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 2462.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2463.

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

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 2464.

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

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to institute legislation which is necessary and proper for the protection of the American people.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 2465.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TRONE:
H.R. 2466.

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

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution:

"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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 2467.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among several states, and with the Indian Tribes"

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 6: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 35: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 36: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. STEVENS, and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 40: Ms. WATERS and Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 41: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 77: Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 85: Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 95: Ms. UNDERWOOD and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 141: Mr. ALLRED.
H.R. 303: Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 375: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HECK, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. COOK, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 397: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. LURIA, Ms. MENG, and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 435: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 445: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 497: Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 510: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 532: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 553: Mrs. LESKO, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. CLINE, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. ALLRED, and Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 586: Mr. FLORES, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 598: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 642: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 647: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. DELAURO, and Mrs. MILLER.
H.R. 649: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 651: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 663: Mr. COLE and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 674: Ms. HAALAND and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 693: Mr. ALLRED, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. BERA, Mrs. ROBY, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 732: Ms. DEAN, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 832: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 873: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 874: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 897: Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 913: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 925: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 938: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 943: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. COX of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. MCADAMS, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. COLE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LAMB, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. SHERRILL, and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 945: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 946: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 956: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 961: Ms. ESHOO and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 965: Mr. KIM.
H.R. 987: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 989: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 996: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1004: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1019: Mr. KINZINGER, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. LAMB, and Mr. GRJALVA.
H.R. 1030: Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 1035: Mr. VISOSCLOSKY.
H.R. 1042: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1058: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 1074: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 1078: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1133: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 1139: Miss RICE of New York, Ms. MENG, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1146: Mr. KIND, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 1155: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1157: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 1163: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 1166: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BACON, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. BRINDISI.
H.R. 1171: Mr. CORREA and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1174: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1186: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 1220: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1224: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LAMB, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1225: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CASE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. TRONE, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1236: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 1237: Mr. WALTZ.
H.R. 1240: Mr. PAPPAS and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1255: Ms. WEXTON, Mr. COLE, and Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 1256: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1257: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1289: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1301: Mrs. WALORSKI and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 1309: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MORELLE, and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 1316: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1321: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. GRJALVA.
H.R. 1327: Mr. BACON, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. PORTER, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1335: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 1342: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 1346: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 1354: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 1364: Mr. EVANS, Ms. DEAN, and Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 1386: Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1396: Mr. POCAN, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCADAMS, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr.

GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BACON, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1400: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1418: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. COLE, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1439: Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 1443: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BACON, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1446: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1471: Mr. ESPALLAT.
H.R. 1488: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1497: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1499: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 1503: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 1527: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1545: Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 1546: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1554: Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. MILLER, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1572: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 1595: Mr. VELA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1610: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1622: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1628: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1636: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Mr. ESPALLAT.

H.R. 1692: Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. FRANKEL.
H.R. 1695: Mr. VISLOSKEY.

H.R. 1696: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1697: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 1698: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1713: Mr. MAST, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KIM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SOTO, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1753: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 1766: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1786: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1789: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 1793: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1794: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 1814: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COLE, and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1846: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 1854: Mr. SPANO, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 1863: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 1869: Mr. COX of California, Mr. PHILIPS, and Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1872: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
H.R. 1878: Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1897: Mr. HECK, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1903: Mrs. MILLER.
H.R. 1911: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1914: Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 1939: Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 1948: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FLORES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr.

DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. POCAN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1978: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1981: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 1987: Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. WILD, and Mrs. CRAIG.

H.R. 2003: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2004: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2009: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2010: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 2013: Mr. CASE and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2015: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 2062: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 2070: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2073: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2076: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2081: Mr. RYAN and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 2091: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2094: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 2101: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2115: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 2142: Mr. SPANO.
H.R. 2148: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DOGGETT, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2150: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CASE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GUEST, Mr. GOLDEN, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 2156: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. LAMB.
H.R. 2161: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 2178: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2184: Mr. CASE and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2191: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2195: Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 2199: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2201: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 2204: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

H.R. 2215: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2219: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2222: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 2250: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2266: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 2271: Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BASS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2289: Mr. COX of California, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 2293: Mr. POSEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 2294: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 2300: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 2313: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2317: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2327: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 2333: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2334: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. GOODEN.

H.R. 2335: Mr. ROY.
H.R. 2343: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2353: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CRIST, Mr. RYAN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HECK, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ESPALLAT.

H.R. 2354: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 2355: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2376: Mr. COHEN and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2381: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. VELA, and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 2388: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 2420: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2421: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 2422: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. HECK.

H. Con. Res. 8: Ms. NORTON.
H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H. Con. Res. 32: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 36: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H. Res. 23: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H. Res. 54: Mrs. LURIA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mrs. MILLER.

H. Res. 91: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H. Res. 109: Mr. LUJÁN.
H. Res. 114: Mr. FLORES.

H. Res. 189: Mr. COOK and Mr. COLE.
H. Res. 214: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H. Res. 230: Ms. MENG and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 233: Mr. TRONE.
H. Res. 242: Mr. FLORES.
H. Res. 270: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H. Res. 277: Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 297: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. LEWIS.
H. Res. 299: Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 310: Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 311: Mrs. LOWEY and Miss RICE of New York.

H. Res. 325: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. KILDEE, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. PORTER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

15. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Commission of Coconut Creek, FL, relative to Resolution No. 2019-082, urging the United States Congress to Enact H.R. 763, The Energy Innovation and Carbon Dividend Act of 2019; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 2019

No. 71

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable KEVIN CRAMER, a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, strong to save, whose arm has bound the restless waves, we praise You for Your magnificent love that awakens us each day.

Thank You for lawmakers who strive to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with You. Lord, continue to guide their feet and teach them Your paths.

In these complex times, show yourself strong on behalf of those who love You. Solve the riddles that confound us. Confuse those who seek to hinder the unfolding of Your loving providence.

Lord, bring sanity to a world that often seems to spin out of control. Nothing is impossible for you, so transform our dark yesterdays into bright tomorrows.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2019.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable KEVIN CRAMER, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CRAMER thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this week the Senate is continuing to make progress in consideration of the President's nominees. By the end of this week, three more executive branch and five court vacancies will have been filled with thoroughly qualified individuals.

Already, these uncontroversial nominees have earned overwhelming bipartisan support. Yesterday, more than two-thirds of the Senate voted to confirm William Cooper to serve as general counsel for the Department of Energy. Mr. Cooper's expertise and energy policy was evident to Chairman MURKOWSKI and our colleagues in committee who voted by voice to report this nomination to the full Senate. Now we have put a sharp lawyer on the job at DOE.

Later in the day, we confirmed two more well-qualified executive branch nominees to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation and the State Department's Bureau of Political-Military Affairs by even wider margins. Each received bipartisan support in committee. So, again, I am glad to see a similar degree of swift, reasonable consideration here on the floor.

I might add that these are the kinds of nominees who, a few years ago, would have been approved on a voice vote. Today the Senate will turn to a slate of judicial nominees with their own impressive trail of credentials—things like prestigious clerkships and strong reviews from the American Bar Association. Most importantly, all have demonstrated their commitment to the rule of law.

Celebrating small wins for comity in the personnel business is, of course, only necessary in the wake of, literally, years of unprecedented partisan obstruction. But I will readily express my hope that in the coming days and weeks, we will continue to work toward clearing the Executive Calendar backlog and confirming more well-qualified nominees.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, while the Senate may be writing a new chapter of bipartisan productivity, the same cannot be said for the House under Democratic leadership. On this side of the Capitol, we have passed timely legislation to address real, urgent policy priorities. S. 1, for example, helps fight back against anti-Semitism and attends to several other pressing matters with respect to American foreign policy in the Middle East.

The Senate debated the bill and passed it by a wide bipartisan majority. We sent it over to the House, and now it is just sitting there, gathering dust. It is gathering dust because Democratic leadership is more interested in making flashy political points and picking fights with the President than in making meaningful bipartisan progress.

House Democrats are uninterested in our important foreign policy legislation. What has captured their energy and attention instead? This week they are giving prime billing to a scheme

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2533

that would snatch away the private health insurance plans that more than 180 million Americans rely on and jeopardize the Medicare coverage counted on by tens of millions more. That is what they are up to this week.

The House Rules Committee, and by extension the Democratic leadership, have officially granted a platform to this proposal, which could best be described as Medicare for None. That is not just some cute phrase. It is literally what the plan would usher in—an end to the Medicare Program as American seniors have known it for generations. Democrats want to take the program that seniors have paid into, which we ought to be shoring up and stabilizing, and, instead, pile every other American into it—one size fits all. That is what it is: End Medicare as we know it; reuse its name for a new sort of built-from-scratch, government-administered plan, and make sure the resulting Washington nightmare is the only game in town by outlawing choice and competition from the private sector. That is what they want to do.

To the 60 million seniors on Medicare, most of whom like things the way they are, Democrats say: Too bad. To the 180 million-plus other Americans who rely on private health coverage from their employers, many of whom like their own plans, our Democratic colleagues say: Too bad. All of these things that American families count on, I guess my Democratic colleagues want to wipe them all away in favor of this untested government takeover—completely untested.

In Congresses past, this kind of far-left proposal would have been unlikely to even receive a hearing. Democrats would have taken one look at this socialist steamroller and run away from it like the plague. Jeopardize current health coverage for nearly all Americans—one way or another—for the sake of leftwing ideology? Who would go for that?

Needless to say, times seem to have changed. Now, across the aisle, this level of radical intrusion is the proud rallying cry both here in Congress, and, of course, out on the Presidential campaign trail. One of the major ironies is that Medicare is not even safely on autopilot as things stand right now, let alone herding every other American into the system. As I have noted, the Administrator of CMS herself recently explained that “the program’s main trust fund for hospital services can only pay full benefits for seven more years.” That is the Medicare we have now.

Instead of a serious plan to shore up Medicare or address costs for middle-class families, Democrats are focused on raising taxes massively, trading consumer choice for Washington control, and destabilizing the current system in the process.

Senate Republicans will stay focused on middle-class families’ priorities. We will leave the destructive daydreams to our friends across the aisle.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination J. Campbell Barker, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last week we got the first estimate of economic growth for the first quarter of 2019, and the news was excellent. The economy grew at a robust 3.2 percent in the first quarter of 2019, smashing expectations. The news is particularly notable because the first quarter of the year is typically regarded as a weak quarter for growth.

Then, this morning, CNBC reported that 275,000 jobs were created in April—also, far exceeding expectations.

And of course these are just the latest pieces of good news about the economy. The economy is thriving, unemployment is low, job creation is up, personal income is up, wages are up, business investment is up, and much more.

How did we get here? Well, just a couple of years ago, our economy was struggling. Some experts were predicting that weak growth would be the new normal and the economic progress we have made over the past 2 years wasn’t supposed to happen.

At the beginning of 2017, the Congressional Budget Office projected growth of 2.3 percent for 2017, 2 percent for 2018, and just 1.7 percent for 2019.

Actual growth, of course, exceeded those numbers: 2.5 percent for 2017, 3 percent for 2018—a full percentage point higher than the CBO’s projection—and 2019 is clearly off to a great start.

So, again, how did we get here? Well, after President Trump was elected and Republicans took office, we set out to do something about the economy. We knew that Americans were struggling. Recovery from the great recession was long and slow, wages were stagnant, and too many families were living paycheck to paycheck. American families needed relief, and Republicans were committed to giving it to them. That meant getting our economy going again.

If the economy isn’t thriving, then, American families aren’t thriving. You need a strong economy to produce the kinds of jobs, wages, and opportunities that American workers need to flourish.

So we got right to work trimming some of the burdensome regulations that were acting as a drag on economic growth, and we made it clear to businesses that we were committed to creating the conditions that would allow them to create new jobs and opportunities for American workers.

But we knew that while cutting oppressive regulations was important, more needed to be done. So at the end of 2017, we passed a historic reform of our outdated Tax Code. We lowered tax rates for businesses, expanded business owners’ ability to invest in their operations and their workers, and made American businesses more competitive in the global economy.

Now we are seeing the results: a thriving economy that is producing good jobs, better wages and benefits, and more opportunities for American workers.

Importantly, the benefits of this economic growth are being spread far and wide. In March, the Wall Street Journal noted:

All sorts of people who have previously had trouble landing a job are now finding work. Racial minorities, those with less education and people working in the lowest-paying jobs are getting bigger pay raises and, in many cases, experiencing the lowest unemployment rate ever recorded for their groups. They are joining manufacturing workers, women in their prime working years, Americans with disabilities and those with criminal records, among others, in finding improved job prospects after years of disappointment.

That, again, is from the Wall Street Journal.

Getting our economy going again was a huge part of tax reform. We wanted to make life better for American workers, and we knew that a strong economy was the only way to create prosperity for Americans. We wanted to make life better for American workers, and we wanted to make sure that their families and the employees in the workplace all participated in a stronger economy. So we focused on creating the conditions for economic growth.

But that is not all we did with tax reform. We also cut individual tax rates across the board, we doubled the child tax credit, and we nearly doubled the standard deduction. Thanks to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the average family

of four received a tax cut of more than \$2,000 in 2018.

We also made it easier for millions of Americans to file their taxes by reducing the need to itemize. In addition to promoting economic growth generally, we created opportunity zones to focus specifically on helping to revitalize distressed communities. Championed by Senator SCOTT, the opportunity zones provisions of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act provide incentives for long-term investment in low-income communities, with the goal of creating new jobs and economic opportunity for local residents.

We also took action to provide additional support to families by creating an incentive for employers to offer paid family leave to their workers.

Two-plus years ago, Republicans in Congress and the President set out with one goal in mind—to make life better for American families. I am proud that tax reform has expanded opportunity for Americans and made life easier for families, and we are not stopping here.

Republicans will keep working to ensure that the economic growth that we are experiencing continues and that every American has access to a secure and a prosperous future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF RODOLFO ARMANDO RUIZ II

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Rodolfo Ruiz to serve as a judge for the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

I first met Judge Rudy Ruiz in 2012 when I appointed him to the Miami-Dade County Court, when he was only 33 years old. He served Miami-Dade County very well, and 3 years later I had the opportunity to appoint him to the circuit court bench.

Judge Ruiz has an impressive record. He graduated from Duke University and earned his law degree from Georgetown University.

Following law school, Judge Ruiz clerked for Federal Judge Federico Moreno in the Southern District of Florida and later served as assistant county attorney for Miami-Dade County.

With 7 years of distinguished service as a judge in Florida, it is no surprise that the administration has nominated him for this position, and the American Bar Association agrees. They unanimously rated him as “well qualified” for the robe.

Judge Rudy Ruiz has honorably served the State of Florida, and I am proud to support his appointment to the Federal bench today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

ATTORNEY GENERAL WILLIAM BARR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as we speak, Attorney General William Barr is testifying before a hearing in front of the Judiciary Committee.

There may not be a member of this administration with more to answer for than the current Attorney General, and that is a pretty high bar. His confirmation occurred only a few months ago. Yet, in a short time, Mr. Barr's conduct has raised damning questions about his impartiality and about his fitness.

Just last night we learned that Special Counsel Mueller sent a private letter more than a month ago to the Attorney General that took issue with Mr. Barr's early description of the Russia investigation's conclusions.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated March 27, 2019, to Mr. Barr.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

THE SPECIAL COUNSEL'S OFFICE,

Washington, DC, March 27, 2019.

Re Report of the Special Counsel on the Investigation Into Russian Interference in the 2016 Presidential Election and Obstruction of Justice (March 2019).

Hon. WILLIAM P. BARR,

Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL BARR: I previously sent you a letter dated March 25, 2019, that enclosed the introduction and executive summary for each volume of the Special Counsel's report marked with redactions to remove any information that potentially could be protected by Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e); that concerned declination decisions; or that related to a charged case. We also had marked an additional two sentences for review and have now confirmed that these sentences can be released publicly.

Accordingly, the enclosed documents are in a form that can be released to the public consistent with legal requirements and Department policies. I am requesting that you provide these materials to Congress and authorize their public release at this time.

As we stated in our meeting of March 5 and reiterated to the Department early in the afternoon of March 24, the introductions and executive summaries of our two-volume report accurately summarize this Office's work and conclusions. The summary letter the Department sent to Congress and released to the public late in the afternoon of March 24 did not fully capture the context, nature, and substance of this Office's work and conclusions. We communicated that concern to the Department on the morning of March 25.

There is now public confusion about critical aspects of the results of our investigation. This threatens to undermine a central purpose for which the Department appointed the Special Counsel: to assure full public confidence in the outcome of the investigations. See Department of Justice, Press Release (May 17, 2017).

While we understand that the Department is reviewing the full report to determine what is appropriate for public release—a process that our Office is working with you to complete—that process need not delay release of the enclosed materials. Release at this time would alleviate the misunderstandings that have arisen and would answer congressional and public questions about the nature and outcome of our investigation. It would also accord with the standard for public release of notifications to Congress cited in your letter. See 28 C.F.R. 609(c) (“the Attorney General may determine that public release” of congressional notifications “would be in the public interest”).

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT S. MUELLER, III,

Special Counsel.

Mr. SCHUMER. What a stunning indictment of the Attorney General, whose principal job in all of this was to make sure—to make sure—that he wasn't mischaracterizing or spinning results. This letter shows what an awful, awful Attorney General Mr. Barr has been so far. I will have more to say on this later.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. President, on infrastructure, yesterday Speaker PELOSI and I had a productive meeting with President Trump at the White House on the topic of infrastructure. We all agreed on the need to invest substantial resources in infrastructure. We all agreed on the need to modernize and rebuild our roads, bridges, highways, and also our schools, our housing, and our power grids, and there was a specific conversation about the need to invest in expanding broadband to underserved communities.

We told the President we needed labor protections, we needed a green bill, and we needed to see that minorities, women, and veterans got their fair share when contracts were let out.

It was a good discussion, but there is more to be decided. So what we agreed was that we would have another discussion in which the administration will present proposals for how to pay for the bill.

Let's face it, the reason we haven't gotten far in infrastructure is that the administration has come up with no way for pay-fors. We Democrats put in a \$1 trillion plan—not \$2 trillion—but we paid for all of it. We used tax breaks on the wealthy and the powerful who got huge, huge benefits recently to pay for it. That may not be the way the President wants to pay for it, but we want to know how he would because last time he came up with a bill that had virtually no real pay-fors—public-private partnerships, which even he discredits.

The bottom line is simple. We will get an infrastructure bill if the President will come up with pay-fors, and then we can put ours forward—we have

already—and see if we can come to an agreement.

Seven or eight people at the meeting all told the President that we will not get a bill done unless he comes up with pay-fors. He agreed. He said: I will. He said: I will take some heat from some of my fellow Republicans, but I will do it. We will be waiting. We will be waiting.

At the White House, I made it explicitly clear that in an effort to pay for infrastructure, the administration must not take the Tax Code and make it any more regressive than it already is. I prefer to make it more progressive. To tell the wealthy that they are getting a huge tax break and then to tell the middle-class, working people that they are paying for the bulk of this is totally unfair and unacceptable to this Member.

The President said he would come up with pay-fors, but this morning I was disappointed. I saw both the Acting Chief of Staff, Mr. Mulvaney, and the Wall Street Journal editorial board mock the effort we are trying to make to rebuild the Nation's infrastructure. Their criticism? Too much spending, the deficit is too high, and we can't find revenue. Funny that we didn't hear those same criticisms when the Republicans in Congress were jamming through a partisan, unpaid-for \$2 trillion tax cut for the wealthiest of Americans. That doesn't have to be paid for, but our roads and bridges do. We are willing to pay for both, although I am not willing to pay for any big tax cuts on the wealthy that didn't pass with a single Democratic vote. I hope, for the good of the country and for the need of infrastructure—we know when we build infrastructure, America grows, and jobs are created. So we hope Mr. Mulvaney and the Wall Street Journal editorial board will rethink their knee-jerk partisan reactions.

Let's face it. Mulvaney is different. He was with the President. He supported the tax cuts. The Wall Street Journal editorial board believes it is OK to increase the deficit to reduce tax cuts on the wealthy but not OK when you are building infrastructure. Ninety-five percent of all Americans don't agree with that. Let's hope Donald Trump doesn't follow their ministrations.

The bottom line is, we hope to hear from the White House in several weeks, one way or the other.

Mr. President, what are your pay-fors? We want to know, and the American people want to know. Right now it is the biggest barrier to preventing us from getting an infrastructure bill.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, finally, on climate change, over the past few months, I have been asking Leader McCONNELL and my Republican colleagues three simple questions on climate: Do they agree that climate change is real; do they believe it is caused by humans; and do they believe we should take significant action? It seems that after re-

peating those questions over and over again, we have finally gotten some results.

Yesterday the New York Times said in an article that some Senate Republicans, "in a switch," are starting to cite climate change as the reason for some of their policy suggestions, be they support nuclear energy or carbon capture research. That is a first.

The fact that we have been asking our Republican colleagues the question: Do you believe in climate change, and now the fact that they feel compelled to say yes, even though we don't agree with their solutions—which we may not—is progress. It is not enough progress, given that the globe is at stake, but at least it is a step forward, and we haven't seen any steps come out of our Republican friends in a long time.

Hopefully, our Republican friends are finally coming around to realizing that climate change is real and caused by humans. Maybe they are looking at poll numbers and realizing that calling climate change a hoax looks as crazy as it sounds. Maybe they are seeing the changes in their own States with the climate. Whatever the reason, it is at least a little bit of progress—and we will have to take whatever little bit we can get from our normally intransigent Republican friends on this issue—and we welcome it.

That said, the types of policies my Republican colleagues talk about when they talk about climate do a disservice to the term "low-hanging fruit." Of course, I welcome smart and sensible solutions from anywhere in this Chamber, but there is a difference between getting serious on climate change and just mouthing the words or coming up with solutions that don't really solve the problem.

Some of my colleagues have called for funding for more research on carbon capture, and that is a good idea. It should be part of any plan, but in the face of an existential threat of our time, if they support carbon capture but don't go bigger, don't advocate more solutions than that, they are not doing close to enough of what we need. We must go bolder. We must grapple with the central challenge—reducing carbon emissions as quickly as possible. The good news is, we can do that with affordable and reliable technologies that exist today.

We have waited far too long to address the climate crisis in a serious way. We now need to act in a way that matches the urgency and scale of this challenge. My Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle mocked the Green New Deal, but the growing youth movement leading the fight for the Green New Deal understands something that I think most Americans do: We must think big, bold, and fast, and that we can create jobs and economic opportunity for working families in this transition. We welcome the glimmer, the little, small green sprouts of progress, whatever we can get.

Our Republican friends are starting to answer our pointed questions on climate change, but now the next step is, they have to think bigger and talk to the leader about pursuing real legislation instead of just partisan stunts.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The Senator from Oklahoma.

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

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

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, every President since 1952 has signed a national declaration declaring a National Day of Prayer. It is bipartisan cooperation to recognize people who pray and who set aside time to spend time with God and pray for the Nation. Quite frankly, for us as a party and as a body and as a nation, it is a good thing to pause.

This year, on May 2, with the theme "Love One Another," we will again have a National Day of Prayer. There is not a requirement for Americans to pray. There is not a requirement for people to direct themselves to pray by a certain method at a certain location. It is just a call to the Nation to say that we have great needs as a country.

As we watch the attacks on synagogues in our country, as we watch bombings of Christians in Sri Lanka, gun battles that have erupted in churches in the United States, mosques that have been attacked, people of faith being targeted simply because of their faith, it is reasonable for us as a nation to pause and say "How are we doing?" as this year's theme is "Love One Another."

We as a nation have a long history of prayer. Hanging in the Rotunda in this Capitol Building is a painting called the Embarkation of the Pilgrims. That painting depicts the beginning of America. It has been hanging in that same spot in the Rotunda since 1843. The painting is simply of a group of people on a deck of a ship leaving out from Europe and huddled around an open Bible and praying. The painting was designed and created to depict how America began in the 1600s—people on the deck of a ship, around an open Bible, praying.

That is still something I would encourage Americans of faith to stop and do, and it is still one of the most humbling experiences that I experience each time someone from my State of Oklahoma catches me, as someone did this morning, and says: Every day, my wife and I pray for you.

It is not a terrible thing to do as a nation—to love and pray for each other and for the future direction of our country.

If I can model for the Nation for just a moment in my own way and encourage the Nation on our National Day of

Prayer to pause and pray, I would simply say this:

Let us pray as a nation.

Father, guide us. We need Your help. The controversy, the division in our Nation, the anger, the struggle. Help us to be able to love one another. Help us to be able to see each other as You have created us and to respect You, Your wisdom, and Your guidance. Father, we admit that we do not know as much as You, so we need Your help. We need Your insight.

For our first responders and our military scattered around this Nation and around the world, we pray for Your protection for them. We pray that You would give them insight to help them to represent us well.

For members of our State Department, members in our government who are scattered around the Earth, members of our intelligence community and others who serve us every day, God, would You guide them and would You protect them in their tasks and give them the insight they need.

For Federal employees who serve our Nation each day and for members of our Nation who are finding ways to serve each other in our communities, would You help us this day to love one another and to be able to set the tone for a world that is watching us as a nation.

Help us represent well, You, who You have called us to be individuals.

In the Name of Jesus, I pray. Amen.

CONTRABAND CELL PHONES IN PRISON

Mr. President, on Facebook, a posting was made not long ago, and it was sent to a correctional facility in Oklahoma, and this was the posting, simply a question: "How do I contact the facility regarding your inmates that sex offenders have a cell phone in your prison and they are having contact with children on social media?"

An inmate who is a sex offender with a cell phone in a prison in Oklahoma contacting children should give a chill to all of us. I wish that were the only example. Just in Oklahoma last year, 7,518 cell phones that were contraband cell phones were picked up in Oklahoma prisons—just last year, 7,518 contraband cell phones.

This is within the correctional facility. This is from one of the facilities. That table is 12 feet long, and in many spots, the cell phones are stacked up 10 deep on this picture. These were all taken from inside the prison. Do you want to know what that looks like for the whole State and how that is gathered? The picture would look like this. This is the gathering of cell phones from my State, from correctional facilities across the State.

The challenge that we have is—for all of us—how do we stop these cell phones from getting inside the prison? That is a corruption issue, and sometimes it is a perimeter issue. It will be wrapped in duct tape and thrown over the fence. It will be slipped through at some point. A guard or someone who works inside the prison will be paid off to deliver it

and drop it in a certain spot. The result of it is the same: contact with people on the outside—contact that leads to dramatic effects. It is not only contact with people outside, like these predators who are sex offenders reaching out to children from inside the prison, but over and over again there are consequences.

We have the consequences of individuals—for instance, white-collar criminals who are continuing to run their companies. There was the famous occasion of the person known as the Pharma Bro, who bought out pharmaceutical companies, drove out competition, jacked up the prices, and ended up going to Federal prison, but even from prison he was able to get access to a cell phone and continue running his pharmacy operation from inside the prison.

There was an occasion not long ago in Oklahoma where an individual who was a murderer and, while he was in the State penitentiary, used cell phones to direct others to distribute methamphetamine for him across all of Northeastern Oklahoma. He was running a meth ring with his cell phone from inside the prison.

There was a prison facility, Lee Correctional Institution, where there was a mass riot that broke out inside the facility. In that riot seven inmates were killed and 17 others were injured. This happened in South Carolina. Afterward the South Carolina Department of Corrections director blamed cell phones for fueling the deadliest prison riot they had in South Carolina.

In another case, back in an Oklahoma prison, many of those charged within the prison have gang ties—MS-13, Crips, Indian Brotherhood, Universal Aryan Brotherhood, Irish Mob. Records show that those individuals had access to cell phones and were running their gangs outside the prison from inside the prison. We have one individual who is serving 20 years in prison for robbery and assault with a dangerous weapon and drug manufacturing and who used his cell phone to control the methamphetamine distribution and transactions outside the prison.

We have a RICO case in the Northern District of Oklahoma right now, which is racketeering, which is happening from large numbers of cell phones in an Aryan Brotherhood gang, a White supremacist group that is operating a drug ring outside the prison and coordinating their work and operation inside the prison.

This is not unique to Oklahoma. This is happening in prisons all over the country. We can go to one after another after another.

The two issues that have to be addressed are stopping the flow within, but the second, more obvious question that I hear from people when I raise this issue is this: Why can't the prisons just jam the cell phones?

That is a great question. Federal law does not allow State prisons to jam the cell phones.

Why don't we change that law?

That is another great question, and it should have been answered by this body a long time ago. But communications companies and cell phone company lobbyists overwhelmed this body and pushed back and said: Let's study the issue.

For years the cell phone lobby has come to Members of Congress and said: We totally agree with you that this is a problem. Let's study it.

I have met personally now for several years with the leadership of the FCC, which has jurisdiction over this, and said "Let's resolve this issue about prison cell phones," and every year when I meet with FCC folks, they say "We are studying it." At the same time, meth rings and sexual predators are operating inside our prisons. "We are studying it."

I waited patiently until the last study just came out. The summary of the last study that just came out on cell phones in prisons and jamming them—the study basically came back and said: We need more study on this issue. That was the result of the study.

One of the prisons got permission and a waiver to test a cell phone jammer in their prison with what is called a microjammer; they can put a jammer to block the cell phone coverage in one particular housing unit. They came back with the results of that from one individual State prison and said it was successful. The cell phone companies responded by saying: Hey, we wish you would have included us in that study. We should have been involved in that study. We need to do another study on top of your study to make sure it is all correct. Study after study after study is done when this is what is happening in our prisons.

So let me just bring this up to the cell phone industry: You do not want your company name attached to pedophiles in prisons who are contacting children outside the prison, waiting until they are released. You do not want your company name attached to a meth ring being operated inside a prison because you wanted to study the issue more. You do not want your company name attached to a prison riot where they directly linked the access to cell phones as leading up to that riot.

Every one of the major cell phone companies in the United States has done lab testing of jammers in their labs. This is not something that needs to be studied again. They all know the results.

What is worse, if you go back to 2005—New Zealand had already seen this issue arising in 2005. New Zealand worked with all of the cell phone companies in their country, and guess what. They studied it and implemented a policy to start jamming cell phones in their prisons in the following years. The cell phone companies overseas have already studied this in New Zealand.

Let's take it to the UK in 2012. In 2011, all of the cell phone companies

worked with the UK Government to be able to study cell phones in prisons, came to a decision about the best way to jam those signals, and, in 2012, the UK passed a piece of legislation to get this resolved.

So this has been studied in labs; it has been studied in New Zealand; it has been studied in the UK; and all we are hearing is it needs to be studied more here.

My suggestion is simple. Let's jam cell phones in prisons for the protection of our guards, our families, and to block criminal activity operating from inside our prisons. We know how to do this. We have the technology to do this. This body needs to address it in law and make sure it gets resolved in the days ahead. I look forward to passing that and not doing one more study to delay action on it.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN MOORE

Ms. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. President.

I think it is fair to say that most Americans didn't wake up this morning thinking about the role the Federal Reserve plays in their lives. The people we represent are focused on putting in an honest day's work, taking care of their families, and gradually climbing the economic ladder. The Fed is focused on making sure our economy is giving them every opportunity to do just that—or at least it is supposed to be.

The Fed's mission is to keep employment high, prices stable, and our financial system in good working order. When it succeeds, we see the full potential of the American economy, the greatest force for prosperity the world has ever known. When it fails, ordinary people can wind up losing their jobs, their homes, and their savings.

Even though most Americans don't know their names or think about their work, the seven members of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, nominated by the President and confirmed by Congress, have an important job to do.

The Fed is not supposed to be a place for politics. It is not a job for politicians. It is a job for the most accomplished and thoughtful economists and financial experts we have—men and women who truly understand not just what makes an economy work on paper, but what makes our economy truly work for working Americans.

Through his choice of nominees for this position, a President demonstrates whether he understands the importance of a functioning financial system and respects the American people, who rely on the Fed to keep our economy on solid footing. Through our consider-

ation of those nominees, we here in the Senate do the same—which brings me to the President's latest choice for this position: Stephen Moore.

Let's be clear about who Mr. Moore is. He is not a professor of economics at a prestigious university. He has won no prizes for his intellectual scholarship. In fact, he has never authored or coauthored a single peer-reviewed article or journal ever.

While some have suggested it might not be a bad thing to have a range of experience on the Federal Reserve Board, it is unclear what experience Mr. Moore has that would contribute a useful perspective. He has never run a bank or a business of any size. In fact, he has barely any experience in the private sector at all. No, Stephen Moore is a political operative and a pundit. There is nothing wrong with that, *per se*, but the fact is that President Trump picked him not because of anything he has accomplished in business or in the study of economics but rather because of what Mr. Moore believes—or at least what he goes on TV and says he believes.

As we try to decide who Mr. Moore is and whether he is, in fact, suitable for a job that has never before been held by someone with his total lack of qualifications, we might start by taking a look at the opinions he has shared over the decades he spent doing little else but sharing his opinions. For example, nearly all economists agree that empowering women to participate fully and equally in the workforce would result in huge gains for our economy. In fact, earlier this decade, a McKinsey analysis found that the increased number of women entering the workforce between 1970 and 2011 accounted for roughly a quarter of the gains in GDP achieved over that time period.

This McKinsey study noted:

Still, the full potential of women in the workforce has yet to be tapped. As the U.S. struggles to sustain historic GDP growth rates, it is critically important to bring more women into the workforce and fully deploy high-skill women to drive productivity improvement.

That is why so many of us in Washington are focused on empowering women to find jobs and build careers, to balance the responsibilities of work and family, and to participate in the economy on equal footing with men.

Mr. Moore apparently disagrees. He believes and has written that “the male needs to be breadwinner of the family.” When it comes to pay discrimination, Mr. Moore was unconcerned with the fact that, on average, women were earning 77 cents on the dollar compared to men. In fact, just 5 years ago, he warned that raising women's pay “could be disruptive to family stability.”

Perhaps Mr. Moore should read the McKinsey study. After all, it was produced for the Wall Street Journal, where he is a frequent commentator and used to serve on the editorial

board, so I am sure he could get a copy of it. But the more Mr. Moore's public statements are examined, the more it becomes clear that his views on women and the economy might have less to do with the economy and more to do with women.

Here is just one example. Mr. Moore apparently believes that efforts to address sexual harassment and assault on college campuses are quote “draining all the fun out of college life.”

He goes on to elaborate:

Colleges are places for rabble-rousing. For men to lose their boyhood innocence. To do stupid things. To stay out way too late drinking. To chase skirts. (At the University of Illinois we used to say that the best thing about Sunday nights was sleeping alone.) It's all a time-tested rite of passage into adulthood. And the women seemed to survive just fine. If they were so oppressed and offended by drunken, lustful frat boys, why is it that on Friday nights they showed up in droves in tight skirts to the keg parties?

This is the sort of thing a college freshman writes on his Facebook page that comes back to haunt him in his first round of job interviews. Mr. Moore chose to put those words in a newspaper column, underneath his name, at the age of 40.

Then again, anyone familiar with his record wouldn't be surprised to learn that Mr. Moore doesn't take sexual assault seriously. CNN recently unearthed that years earlier he had mocked the Violence Against Women Act as “objectionable pork” and referred to a program designed to promote gender quality in education as “vile.”

So in addition to “chasing skirts” on college campuses, Mr. Moore seems to believe that women's equality is ruining another favorite pastime—sports. He wrote that “co-ed sports is doing irreparable harm to the psyche of America's little boys,” and he mused about urging his young son to assault a kindergarten named Kate Lynn just because she was a better soccer player.

In another bit of sports commentary, Mr. Moore wrote:

Here's the rule change I propose: No more women refs, no more women announcers, no women beer vendors, no women anything. There is, of course, an exception to this rule. Women are permitted to participate, if and only if, they look like Bonnie Bernstein. The fact that Bonnie knows nothing about basketball is entirely irrelevant.

At the time Mr. Moore wrote this, Bonnie Bernstein was a prominent journalist and ESPN analyst, and he was a 42-year-old married man. But that didn't stop him from further underscoring his creepy affections for Ms. Bernstein, adding that she should be required to wear a halter top on the air. “If Bonnie were President of the United States,” wrote this adult male in a national publication about a complete stranger, “she'd be a Babe-raham Lincoln.” Perhaps that is why Mr. Moore has also said that powerful men should never meet alone with women, because they might wind up being accused of sexual harassment. Maybe it is a rule he should follow. Frankly, if I

were Bonnie Bernstein or any woman who read that column, I wouldn't want to be alone in a room with him.

Mr. Moore has tried to explain away some of these misogynistic comments as jokes, so maybe he just has a profoundly unfunny sense of humor. But he didn't sound like he was joking when he called for the elimination of child labor laws, adding, "I want people starting to work at 11, 12."

He didn't sound like he was joking when he went on CNN 2 years ago and claimed falsely that the Civil War was not fought over slavery or when he claimed bizarrely that liberals were to blame for the rise of White supremacist violence that resulted in the death of a young woman in Charlottesville. He didn't sound like he was joking when he attacked equal rights for LGBTQ Americans, arguing that rulings in favor of marriage equality were "overturning the will of the people."

He didn't sound like he was joking when he referred to the unemployment insurance that millions of Americans rely on to make ends meet during hard times as "paid vacation" or when he warned that guaranteeing paid sick leave for workers was "very dangerous."

And if he was joking when he referred to most of the Midwest, including great cities like Cincinnati and Cleveland, as "armpits of America," well, I know my friend Senator BROWN didn't think that was funny and neither did I.

Still, Mr. Moore tried to change the subject from his long history of offensive remarks, and he went on FOX News last week and said: "I'm no angel." No kidding.

Indeed, the best possible argument in Mr. Moore's favor is that it is possible to be a jerk about women, LGBTQ Americans, low-income workers, and anyone who has ever lived anyplace other than New York or Chicago or Georgetown and that you could still be that person and be a good economist, except, of course, that Mr. Moore isn't even a good economist.

For example, he opposed the farm bill that provides the lifeblood to rural communities that I represent in Minnesota, and he believes we should get rid of safety net programs that help those rural communities. Well, I think most people living in rural America would rather withstand Mr. Moore's insults than suffer the consequences of his agenda. The truth is, we need policymakers who are committed to creating more economic opportunities in rural communities by expanding access to credit, investing in education and infrastructure, and protecting the agricultural safety net. I guess Mr. Moore doesn't care what goes on in those parts of the country that he calls the armpits of America.

Here is another example. Mr. Moore has repeatedly called for a return to the gold standard, a position described by a Washington Post reporter as "a lot like playing Russian roulette with the economy." Now, an economist who

believes in a return to the gold standard is like a zoologist who believes in the existence of unicorns. It is a plainly ludicrous opinion for a serious expert to hold, which is probably why Mr. Moore has tried to deny that he has ever said this, claiming that he has "never actually been a gold standard guy." But he has—consistently and forcefully.

In 2009, he told a Washington Policy Center reception: "We need to go back to the gold standard." In 2010, he told an audience at the Fort Henry Club in West Virginia: "We have to reestablish some kind of gold standard." In 2011, he went on the FOX Business channel and said: "I do think we have to peg the dollar to gold." In 2012, he was asked on CNBC whether he wanted to go back to the gold standard, and he answered: "Yes, I do."

In 2015, he told a tea party crowd: "We have got to get rid of the Federal Reserve and move towards a gold standard in this country." In 2016, he told a group of young conservatives: "We should go back to some sort of gold standard."

Mr. Moore apparently doesn't understand that things have changed a lot since the 1950s, not just when it comes to the role of women but when it comes to the ubiquity of video cameras. He is on tape again and again giving voice to this crazy idea that he claims he has never supported. Indeed, his position on the gold standard isn't just an example of being badly out of step.

Mr. Moore is out of step with mainstream economics, and it is a pretty good illustration of his difficult relationship with the facts. A few years ago, he was banned from the opinion pages of the Kansas City Star after he wrote a column claiming that low-tax States were performing better than high-tax States. He wrote:

No-income-tax Texas gained 1 million jobs over the last five years; California, with its 13 percent tax rate, managed to lose jobs. Oops. Florida gained hundreds of thousands of jobs while New York lost jobs. Oops.

It turns out that Mr. Moore got his facts wrong—never a good thing when you are in the economics business. Instead of adding a million jobs, Texas had actually added less than half that number. Florida hadn't gained hundreds of thousands of jobs; it had lost nearly half a million jobs. New York hadn't lost jobs; it had gained 57,000 jobs. "Oops" is right.

The truth is Mr. Moore is wrong a lot. He predicted that the Affordable Care Act would kill jobs. It didn't. He claimed that President Trump's tax giveaway to corporations would pay for itself. It didn't. He argued that the Fed should return to a rule tying monetary policy to commodity prices. No such rule ever existed. I could go on and on, and it would take me hours to even get to the kind of scandals that have disqualified previous nominees, like the \$75,000 in unpaid taxes it was discovered he owed after filing what the IRS called a "fraudulent" tax return, or the

time his political committee agreed to pay \$350,000 in fines for campaign finance violations, or the time he was held in contempt of court for failing to pay \$300,000 in alimony and child support after his divorce, or even the time he bought his mistress a T-shirt with the words "Doing It," which is pretty amazing coming from a guy who, again, thinks paying women a fair wage is, in his words, "disruptive to family stability."

We would be making a mistake if we made this story entirely about Mr. Moore. It is certainly troubling that President Trump was able to look past so many red flags in selecting this man for this important position, but it is even more troubling to consider why he wanted to pick someone like Mr. Moore for this role. It is not hard to figure out. This President wants an Attorney General who will act as his personal lawyer. He wants an Environmental Protection Agency staffed with scientists who will push the phony science of his energy industry donors. He wants a Consumer Financial Protection Bureau where his Wall Street friends get a free pass to rip consumers off. Now President Trump wants a Federal Reserve that, instead of acting in the economic interest of the American people, will act in the political interest of the President. That is the only explanation for Mr. Moore's nomination.

You see, Mr. Moore isn't really an economist at all. He is a political operative. When he is wrong—and he is wrong a lot—it isn't because he made a mistake. Mr. Moore has made a career out of being wrong on purpose.

Catherine Rampell wrote in the Washington Post:

Moore has repeatedly, and falsely, claimed that the country is experiencing "deflation." That means prices are falling, which they are not. But claiming this gives him cover to argue that the Fed should pump more stimulus into the economy just as Trump begins running for reelection.

Conversely, when we were in the depths of the financial crisis and prices were falling, Moore claimed that we were on the brink of Weimar-style hyperinflation. He therefore called on the Fed to tighten monetary policy, which would have crippled the economy—and, just coincidentally, maimed President Barack Obama.

If confirmed, Mr. Moore would not see his job as fulfilling the Fed's dual mandate of stabilizing prices and raising employment. He would not see his job as providing effective oversight to the financial system. He would see his job as getting President Trump reelected, no matter what it meant for American workers, investors, and businesses. That is why President Trump picked him.

Two years ago, President Trump allowed his advisers to talk him into nominating Jerome Powell, an accomplished financial expert with long experience in both public service and in the private sector, as Chair of the Federal Reserve Board. Now, Chair Powell and I certainly don't agree on every aspect of monetary policy, but we do agree that the Fed should be focused on the

productivity of our economy and the protection of American workers, not partisan political goals. In a recent hearing, for example, I discussed with Chair Powell the specific challenges of the labor market in rural areas, and he came prepared with a serious and thoughtful economic analysis that showed his keen understanding of these issues.

Chair Powell has resisted pressure from the White House to intervene in the economy to produce results in line with President Trump's political agenda, and that has infuriated President Trump, who has attacked Chair Powell on Twitter and harangued him in meetings. The President feels he made a mistake in choosing an actual, serious, sober-minded, thoughtful public servant, and he is set on not making that same mistake again.

Either President Trump doesn't understand what the Fed is for or he is hoping that we don't. And whether it is Mr. Moore or someone with the good sense to keep his misogyny to himself, we on the Senate Banking Committee should be prepared to give special scrutiny to any Federal Reserve nomination that this President sends to us because, while these issues might not be the flashiest, they are of critical importance to the people whom we represent.

Indeed, when I joined the Senate Banking Committee earlier this year, few Minnesotans took notice, but I see it as a chance to make an enormous impact on people's lives by opening up new opportunities for people to bet on themselves and to build the lives they want. Our work can help to open up access to credit for families and small businesses and underserved communities, especially communities of color. As a Senator from Minnesota who is proud to represent our States' Tribal communities, I know how badly they have been neglected by our financial system, and I am determined to rectify that injustice. As a Senator who is proud to represent so many rural communities, I am excited to use my place on this committee to expand opportunities for economic development in parts of our State that too often go overlooked.

Our work can make sure that our financial system remains on solid footing, not just so that our economy can continue to grow but so that more people can claim their stake in it—buying homes, starting businesses, and building wealth they can pass down to their next generation. Our work can help to hold Wall Street greed in check and to make sure that people don't get ripped off when applying for student loans and mortgages and so that we never again see a repeat of the great recession that wiped out so many jobs and pensions. Yes, our work can help to protect the integrity of the Federal Reserve from people who see it as a tool for partisan politics, as a laboratory for radical ideas, or as a playground for extremist ideologues who love to spout off with-

out knowing their facts—people like Stephen Moore.

So I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this nomination. I also urge us all not to let the important work of the Federal Reserve slip out of the public eye once this nominee is defeated. Instead, let's make this a moment to highlight the important issues that the Fed deals with every day and ensure that it is led by men and women who understand its mission and appreciate the impact it has on the people that we all serve.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) would have voted "yea."

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

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 85 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Jones	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Harris	Reed	

NOT VOTING—2

Inhofe Young

The nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Andrew Lynn Brasher, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Deb Fischer, David Perdue, Todd Young, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Andrew Lynn Brasher, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 86 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Jones	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Harris	Reed	

NOT VOTING—1

Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, and the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Andrew Lynn Brasher, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

RAPE KIT BACKLOG

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, from time to time, our country has listened with empathy and heartbreak as survivors of various forms of sexual abuse come forward, men and women alike, who have bravely shared their stories, reviving a national conversation about sexual violence and inviting others to share their stories after years or even decades of silence. We know that these cases aren't limited to any class, place, age, gender, or circumstance. We have heard from major public figures and close friends alike, highlighting an issue that has for too long hidden in the shadows.

Some of the most disturbing allegations are those that take place against our children in school. Last month, Senator HASSAN and I introduced the Jenna Quinn Law, which would help educators and caregivers identify and prevent child sexual abuse. It literally teaches people how to recognize the symptoms, what children are saying, when they are not vocalizing their plight, by the way they act. It would allow the use of grant funds for specialized training to ensure that teachers and school personnel are prepared to recognize and report child sexual abuse.

This legislation is named after a brave Texan, a child abuse survivor herself, and has been modeled after successful State legislation. It is an important step in our efforts to stop sexual abuse, and I hope we can take these reforms, which have been adopted now by more than half the States, and make them nationwide.

Of course, protecting students from sexual abuse doesn't end after high school, as we know. In recent years, our country has followed high-profile cases involving students even at our colleges and universities. We all remember 2011, when the now notorious Penn State football coach, Jerry Sandusky, was arrested and charged with 52 counts of sexual abuse of boys. What happened next was a combination of support for the survivors and disgust with those who knew about the allegations but did nothing. Employees, ranging from a graduate assistant to the university president himself, were aware of the allegations but remained silent.

Then there is Larry Nassar, an employee at Michigan State University

and a former USA Gymnastics national team doctor. He was accused of molesting hundreds of young athletes under his care, and more than 250 women shared their testimony at his sentencing last year. Despite numerous complaints about Nassar's behavior, some dating back to the 1990s, university officials kept quiet. Law enforcement was never informed, and his disgusting abuse was allowed to continue unreported for years.

Sadly, these are not the only instances of university officials turning to avert their gaze from sexual misconduct. It has happened at other major universities across the country, including one in Texas. In each of these cases, university leaders did not take action against the abusers despite the fact that official Title IX or external investigations had been conducted. Some of them said: "We just simply didn't read the results of the report."

These stories of abuse are difficult to hear, but they have led to positive changes by highlighting the ineffective and sometimes nonexistent policies to handle these types of abuse.

That is why last month, along with my colleagues from Michigan, Senator PETERS and STABENOW, I introduced the Accountability of Leaders in Education to Report Title IX Investigations Act, or ALERT Act for short. The purpose of this legislation is to ensure greater accountability by requiring colleges and universities to submit an annual certification to the Secretary of Education, to include the following:

First, it would affirm that the university president and the board members have reviewed all Title IX and Clery Act sexual offense reports of an employee involving sexual misconduct. This would compel administrators to take this matter more seriously and thoroughly examine all the allegations.

Secondly, it would require that the university certify that the president or board members had not interfered with or inappropriately tried to influence an ongoing investigation.

In any educational institution, especially those that receive taxpayer funds, administrators should be held accountable for their actions and place the health and well-being of their students above all else.

The public conversation regarding these abuses has encouraged more victims to confront their abusers and pursue justice.

Throughout my career, dating back to my time as Texas attorney general, it has been my privilege to work with advocates for victims' rights and to help provide them with the resources they need in order to heal and recover. But what if we could do more to prevent people from becoming victims in the first place? What if we could improve accountability on college campuses related to reports of sexual assault perpetrated by their employees? Well, it seems to me the answer is obvious. While there is nothing we can do to turn back the hands of time and pre-

vent these young men and women from being taken advantage of in the first place, we can take action to hold universities accountable for employee sexual misconduct that they already know about and stop abusers from continuing to harm students.

I hope this bill can work its way quickly through the regular order through Congress, the House and the Senate, and make its way to the President's desk so we can begin to improve accountability on college campuses all across our country.

While we continue our work to prevent sexual abuse in all its forms, there is more we need to do to support victims. Tomorrow, the Senate Judiciary Committee will vote on what I have no doubt will be a major bipartisan achievement for the 116th Congress.

We see many pieces of legislation that divide Members of the Senate, and sadly those are often the ones that get the most attention. But the Debbie Smith Act is the type of bill we should be talking about and celebrating. The namesake of this legislation is an incredibly courageous woman whom I have had the pleasure of working with over the years.

Debbie Smith is an ardent advocate for eliminating the rape kit backlog and expanding the DNA database to provide victims with answers and peace of mind. Sadly, her personal advocacy was borne from experience. In 1989, Debbie was home doing laundry when a stranger broke into her house. He blindfolded her, abducted her, and took her to a wooded area behind her home, where he robbed and repeatedly raped her. Debbie reported the crime to the police and went to the emergency room for a forensic exam, but because of the nationwide backlog, there were no immediate answers. Her rape kit was not even tested right away, as it should have been.

Although exact numbers are difficult to estimate, experts believe that as many as 400,000 rape kits remain untested in the United States. We really don't know with any precision. Each one of them represents a story of a sexual assault victim and holds the key to identifying and apprehending a vile criminal. Like every other victim whose DNA evidence sat or still sits on a shelf, Debbie simply had to wait. In her case, it took 6½ years before she finally got the answers she had been looking for when a cold hit revealed the identity of her rapist.

Debbie knows the fear and uncertainty that comes upon victims just by not knowing the answers to who did it and how we make sure justice is served. She made it her mission to eliminate the backlog. She has become a trusted voice for sexual assault victims all across this country and, of course, works the Halls of Congress on a bipartisan basis to make sure we don't lose sight of this important goal, which is to eliminate the rape kit backlog.

The Debbie Smith Act was signed into law in 2004 and provides local and

State crime labs with resources they need to end the backlog of unsolved crimes. So far, more than \$1 billion has been provided to forensic labs because of this law and has led to some pretty incredible results.

One reason it is important that the Federal Government assumes part of this responsibility is because many jurisdictions—small police departments, rural counties—simply don't have the tax base, don't have the money, and don't have the expertise to be able to solve this problem of untested rape kits. Since 2005, thanks to Debbie Smith, more than 860,000 DNA cases have been processed because of the Debbie Smith Act, accounting for 43 percent of all forensic profiles in the FBI's DNA database.

Though the primary goal is to reduce the rape kit backlog and identify their assailants, processing this DNA evidence can assist investigations for non-violent crimes as well. Similar to criminal fingerprint databases, this DNA evidence can help convict people who commit other crimes.

The Debbie Smith Act of 2019 will reauthorize this important funding that supports testing of these rape kits so we can eliminate the backlog and ensure it will not grow again in the future. This law also authorizes important training for law enforcement, correctional personnel, forensic nurses, and other professionals who assist victims of sexual assault.

So I am grateful to Debbie for her courage and the courage of countless other survivors who have shared their stories publicly—it can't be easy—and who continue to advocate for reforms to eliminate the backlog. Two other inspiring survivors from Texas, Lavinia Masters and Carol Bart, have also been strong advocates in my State and at the Federal level. It has been my privilege to know them and work with them on this issue.

This legislation is undoubtedly stronger because of the input of these and other brave survivors who are champions for victims all across the country. I admire these women who have given their voice to the voiceless and continue to fight for these reforms.

I thank Chairman GRAHAM and Ranking Member FEINSTEIN of the Senate Judiciary Committee for quickly moving this important legislation through the committee, and I hope we will soon be able to vote for it on the Senate floor.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, during the last week I was home in Wyo-

ming, traveling the State, visiting with people, talking to constituents, listening to what they had to say. I had the chance to attend a couple of health fairs in Rawlins, WY, and Mountain View, WY. The health fair is a gathering of the community. It is based on prevention and early detection of problems as ways to help lower the cost of care. For many years, I was the medical director of the Wyoming Health Fairs bringing low-cost health screening to people of Wyoming. At the fair, people come out. There are booths from the heart association, diabetes association, the American Cancer Society. People learn information about diseases, how they work, and how they affect their bodies. It can aid in early detection of problems. People can get their blood drawn and visit with healthcare providers from the community to go over blood results. All of this is aimed at prevention, early detection, and early treatment.

It is interesting that during the same time Democrats running for President have been traveling the country talking about healthcare as well, and specifically Senator BERNIE SANDERS has talked about "BernieCare"—Medicare for All.

To me, Medicare for All is going to drive up costs for Americans in terms of taxes, and it is also going to take away the kind of choice people look for when I talk with them at Wyoming health fairs.

I come to you today to talk on the floor about the real problems I see with this so-called Medicare for All, and I come to it as a doctor who has practiced medicine in Wyoming for 25 years, taking care of patients for decades. When I go to health fairs, more people refer to me as Dr. BARRASSO rather than Senator BARRASSO.

I also want to talk as the husband of a breast cancer survivor. My wife, Bobbi, has had three operations, chemotherapy twice, and is now disease-free for 15 years, but I know how critically important it is as a doctor as well as a husband to make sure that people with preexisting conditions are protected.

I also speak as the son of a 96-year-old mother, and she is a motivating force in our lives. She is a constant reminder to me that we must do everything we can to care for our seniors. So as I have been listening to the Presidential candidates talk about this Medicare for All proposal, whether it is Senators HARRIS, WARREN, GILLIBRAND, or BOOKER, all of them back what Senator SANDERS has been proposing. I am just not sure most Americans understand what Medicare for All means and what it would mean for them personally. Maybe some of the Presidential candidates don't even want people to know what it means.

Senator SANDERS has claimed that Medicare for All is, as he said, "a struggle for the soul of who we are as a nation." Let's be clear. Americans are facing a critical choice. It is a choice between a big, government-run

healthcare system and a system that gives Americans access to quality, affordable care that they can choose that is right for them and their families. That, to me, is the choice we are facing.

Medicare for All essentially means a complete government takeover of all healthcare in this country. Central planners in Washington, DC, would then be in control of the healthcare for all of us.

Medicare for All would enroll every American in a government-run healthcare system. It will take away America's healthcare choices. Senator HARRIS talks about, perhaps, a supplemental plan, but the legislation I have read that has been introduced is crystal clear—Medicare for All outlaws private health insurance plans. The only exception, Senator SANDERS says, is some limited insurance for cosmetic surgery—he says procedures like nose jobs.

With about 180 million Americans getting insurance through work, currently covered through their employers, people who get insurance through work like the insurance they have. All of them will lose their coverage under what is proposed under the Medicare for All legislation. All of them will be forced onto this new government program—every one of them. Never mind that 71 percent of Americans covered through their employer actually say they like their current plan. A single-payer Medicare for All proposal says, basically, if you like your current healthcare plan, you cannot keep it. The government will take it away and make it illegal.

Seniors are going to suffer, too, and, actually, I think seniors may end up suffering the most. I am talking about people who are already on Medicare because this legislation threatens the 60 million Americans who currently get their healthcare as part of Medicare. They get their healthcare today through Medicare. Medicare is already expected to run out of money by 2026. It was confirmed by last month's trustee report, but the Democrats' proposal will even outlaw Medicare Advantage, a program that 22 million Americans currently use for their healthcare. It is called Medicare Advantage because there are advantages to being on this program in terms of preventive care and coordinated care. There is a reason people sign up for Medicare Advantage. All 22 million would lose that as well under the Democrats' Medicare for All plan.

Healthcare programs benefiting military families and children will also be eliminated. Democrats plan to abolish servicemembers' TRICARE and the Children's Health Insurance Plan. All of that goes away under what the Democrats' radical proposal is talking about.

Perhaps the greatest deception of Medicare for All is the suggestion that government-run care would be free. Let me say to the American people: Do not

be deceived. Do not be deceived. Americans will pay a very high price. Medicare for All has been estimated at a 10-year pricetag of \$32 trillion. There is only one way to even try to pay for this massive plan and that is to dramatically raise everyone's income taxes to the point where they may need to pay double. That is what is being proposed.

So the result will be less freedom, lower quality of care, and longer lines as people have to wait to get to a doctor, because Washington will be controlling the doctor-patient medical decisions—and, mark my words, Washington will ration care. Rationing means delays and delay means denial of care. Government-run healthcare is notorious for producing long lines, long waiting periods, delay in care—even urgently needed care.

The government-run system has failed where they tried to put it in place in Vermont, in Senator SANDERS' home State. They started it and ended up having to eliminate it. They couldn't afford it. It wasn't working. It was too complicated. That is in one State.

We also have the situation of what is going on both in England and Canada right now in terms of costs and limits of care, the denial of treatment, the delay in treatment.

I think people watching may have seen the stories as a result of what is happening in England, where elderly patients are going blind in Britain right now. Why would they be going blind? Because the government is rationing cataract surgery. People can Google "going blind in Britain." It is the British healthcare system that is causing it because of the rationing of care. So Democrats are promoting this Medicare for All. Basically they are saying that ObamaCare needs to be repealed and replaced because it has failed the American people. The solution they are offering is not one that I think would make things better, but it is one that I think would make things worse.

Republicans, at the same time, are working for meaningful, workable solutions that lower the costs of prescription drugs, solutions that increase healthcare choice and transparency, and solutions that expand all Americans' access to affordable care. We want to make sure patients can get the care they need from the doctor they choose at a lower cost.

So instead of proposing higher taxes, which is what the Democrats are proposing, instead of proposing healthcare rationing, which will come with Medicare for All, Democrats need to begin working with Republicans to improve healthcare for all Americans, and they should start by rejecting BernieCare.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio.

TRIBUTE TO MARK POWDEN

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the career of my long-

time chief of staff, staff director of the Democratic staff on the Senate Banking Committee, former staff director for Republicans on the HELP Committee, and my good friend Mark Powden.

Mark is the model of a public servant and of a Senate staffer. He spent decades serving in these Halls, first for Senator Jeffords, and then, in 2007, he joined my office, becoming my chief of staff less than 2 years later.

I was a brandnew Senator. I still had a lot to learn. There were few better teachers in this institution and this city than Mark Powden. He helped steer our office in its early days, setting up a well-oiled machine, I would like to think, that would serve Ohioans at home and advocate for them in Washington. Under Mark's leadership, we delivered results for the 12 million people in Ohio.

When the country wanted to write off the American auto industry, we said no. We weren't going to abandon this industry and millions of American workers—literally hundreds of thousands in Ohio. Mark was passionate about making sure we got the best deal possible for Ohio workers. It wasn't just auto workers.

Mark took over the job as chief of staff in my office during the depths of the recession around the time President Obama took office, after the economy was tanking with a loss of 800,000 jobs a month at the end of the Bush administration. Ohio had lost 423,000 jobs over a 2-year period—nearly 8 percent of the jobs in the State. Under Mark's leadership, we worked to create the Hardest Hit Fund, which targeted resources to communities in places like Ohio that had been devastated by the financial crisis. Mark and so many others have heard me say that the ZIP Code where my wife Connie and I live in Cleveland, OH—ZIP Code 44105—at that point, in the first half of 2007, there were more foreclosures in that ZIP Code than in any other ZIP Code in the United States of America.

Mark always made sure that investing in Ohio was a priority. We helped secure \$100 million to expand cancer research and treatment at the Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center and James Cancer Hospital.

Through all of these accomplishments, Mark remained true to his Vermont roots. It is where he grew up. His first major job in Washington was with a Republican in those days, a Senator from Vermont. He tried his hardest always to bring Vermont's bucolic vales to the Nation's Capital, and he maintained the utmost respect for the institution of the Senate.

He had an incredible wealth of knowledge on the history of this place and on legislative procedure and tradition, and he passed it on to other staffers—from my new chief of staff, when Mark moved over to lead the Senate Banking Committee, to the LCs new to the Senate, hoping to learn. We will miss all that about Mark Powden.

I will miss Mark's counsel. I will miss his hard work. I will miss his sense of humor. I will miss his modesty. I will particularly miss his farmer jokes that he tells so well after growing up in rural Vermont. It is not surprising that Mark would not want to be here today as I honor him because he just doesn't want to show up to be honored. But after decades in public service, he has earned a long retirement with his wife Wendy; his two sons, Joseph and Russell; and his entire family.

Mark, thank you for what you did for me, thank you for what you did for our State, and thank you for what you do for our country.

I would add to this that one of the people Mark helped to teach is with me on the floor today. She is about to join a Presidential campaign. Her name is Hannah Fine. I want to recognize her service. This is the first time, I believe, she has been on the Senate floor for a moment like this. So, Hannah, thank you.

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN MOORE

Mr. President, this weekend, the President's pick for the Federal Reserve, Stephen Moore, said that we should focus a little less on all of his offensive and outlandish articles, the comments he made about women in print and on the air, the comments he made about places like Cincinnati and Cleveland, the attacks he has made on middle America, on working families. He said: Forget about all that. Let's talk about my economic record.

Well, Mr. Moore should be careful what he wishes for. His economic record is dangerous. It is out of touch. It is a big part of the reason we have suffered so many of the economic problems we have had in the last decade. Even conservative economists have criticized him.

He has claimed over and over again that the country is experiencing deflation. In other words, he thinks prices are falling. I don't know where he gets these ideas. I don't have any constituents who complain to me about prices falling—about deflation—but Mr. Moore seems to see things that aren't really there.

Tell someone who is paying college tuition, whether it is at Sinclair Community College or whether it is at Ohio State or Kent State University, that the prices are going down. Tell it to someone with diabetes trying to afford insulin. Tell somebody in Columbus, OH, who is trying to pay the rent that prices are falling. It is absurd. He makes economic statements like that with so little basis in fact.

He has been a conspiracy theorist. He thinks government statistics on the economy can't be trusted. Maybe that is where he got the idea that the cost of living is going down. He wants to return to the gold standard. He said on CNBC this morning that instead of talking about equal pay for women, the problem actually has been the steady decline in male earnings. I don't disagree the problem has been stagnant

wages for men, but I also can't believe he would say the problem is not women's wages when we know that—I have spent a lot of time on this floor talking about the dignity of work. I understand that so many Americans have seen corporate profits go up; we have seen executive compensation explode upward; we have seen workers working harder and being more productive; and we have seen wages remain flat. The issue is that wages are flat, in large part, because this body and this President have followed the advice of Stephen Moore and continued to cut taxes on rich people, underinvest in infrastructure, underinvest in working families, underinvest in public health, and underinvest in public education. So to put it on women and say that the problem has actually been the steady decline in male earnings—we shouldn't even be talking about women's wages—just makes no sense.

He doesn't seem to understand that, fundamentally, as challenged as so many working families are with stagnant wages and with lack of opportunity, if you are a woman in this country, if you are someone of color, the challenges are even greater. He should know that. Every economic statistic shows that. Sentient human beings walking down the street and listening should know that. But for some reason, this man who wants to be a Governor on the Federal Reserve thinks otherwise.

He wants the entire country—and this is probably even more serious. He wants the entire country to look like Kansas. He was the mastermind—or one of the masterminds—behind Governor Brownback's move in Kansas to basically eliminate tax liability for a whole group of mostly prosperous people, to cut taxes overall on the rich, and then go after public education and cut public education. It was so extreme that once it was enacted in a very Republican State by a Republican Governor, it was the Republicans in the legislature who unenacted it. They repealed most of the things he did and overrode this far-right Republican Governor's veto, again, based on what Mr. Moore had suggested. While almost all of the 50 States were gaining jobs, once-prosperous Kansas lost jobs during this time. He wants that disastrous economic model to go nationwide, and we know he is not alone. It is the same philosophy that so many in this town say we should do—tax cuts for the rich and not for working families. It is this view that if you cut taxes on the rich, the money will trickle down and everybody will have a better standard of living. We tried that with President Reagan, and it didn't work. We tried that with President Bush, and it didn't work. If you remember in the 8 years of the Bush economy, a few hundred thousand in a country of 300-plus million, there was no net job growth to speak of in the Bush 8 years. Then the Trump tax bill cut taxes on the rich, and maybe it will trickle down, and we will

have more jobs and more wages and all that. It just never works. It works for the rich. They get huge tax cuts. Bill Clinton, on the other hand—during his 8 years, in which they increased taxes on upper income people, we saw a 20 million net job increase.

For some reason, Stephen Moore and his corporate crowd don't understand what happens when you cut taxes for the rich. You don't grow the economy by giving more money to the super-wealthy, who will invest it in Swiss bank accounts. You focus on the middle class, and you give the tax breaks to the middle class like our earned-income tax credit bill. If you focus tax breaks on the middle class, you will grow the economy because you are putting money in the pocket of somebody making \$20- or \$30- or \$50- or \$100,000 a year. They are going to spend it. They are not going to put it in a Swiss bank account. When you give tax cuts to some of the people in the Trump Cabinet, they are going to put more in Swiss bank accounts. They are not going to spend it. They are not going to invest it. They are not going to make any difference in our economy.

So I ask my colleagues to vote no on Stephen Moore not only because there is so much about him and what he has done and what he has written, but mostly for what he would advocate as a member of the Federal Reserve.

If you love your country, you will fight for the people who make it work, and you respect and honor work. There is nothing about Mr. Moore's record that would suggest he would do that. We need someone on the Federal Reserve who actually understands that.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to first give approximately a 1-minute speech and then speak for a longer time on another subject.

I am happy to recognize small businesses in Iowa, and, of course, we should recognize them all across our country. We do that by celebrating National Small Business Week.

In my State of Iowa, 99 percent of all businesses are small businesses. Also, almost half of Iowa's employees are employed by small businesses.

Government regulations have a disproportionate impact on small businesses, often costing them 20 percent more than the average of all businesses. So we need to remember that small businesses are the main source of America's innovations and economic strength. We should all be proud of and support these men and women who

work hard to keep our communities vibrant.

This week is devoted to honoring small business.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, a few weeks ago, our tax filing season came to an end. This filing season was a very important milestone as it was the first tax filing season under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act signed by the President before Christmas 2017.

Congressional Democrats sought to turn the filing season into an indictment of the tax reform through a campaign of misinformation and a campaign of half-truths. They were obsessed with finding anything—just anything—they could hang their hat on to declare that the tax filing system was a failure.

I will give you a case in point—maybe, several cases.

They attempted to use early and incomplete tax reform data to mislead taxpayers into believing that since the average tax refunds went down, taxpayers' taxes actually went up. Of course, such a claim is just simple hogwash. The size of the tax refund tells you absolutely nothing about a taxpayer's overall tax liability. The tax refund, as most people ought to know, tells you how much a taxpayer overpaid the Federal Government throughout the year.

None other than the Washington Post Fact Checker called out Democrat tax refund falsehoods as, in their words, "nonsensical and misleading." The Democrat talking points earned the Democrats a whopping four Pinocchios from that Fact Checker. Yet the Democrats wouldn't let facts or reason get in their way, because if it did, it wouldn't be a political win for them. The Democrats continued to mislead and scare the public for several more weeks. And why not? The truth might hurt.

Then, more complete tax refund data came in showing that the average tax refunds were actually in line with the previous years. Much to the Democrats' chagrin, their favorite talking point was, once and for all, exposed for the nonsense that it is.

The fact is that this filing season was a resounding success for the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, signed before Christmas 2017. The filing season happened to run remarkably smoothly. This became even clearer the further into the filing season we went and a more complete picture emerged. On four points, all the IRS computer systems functioned as planned, refunds were processed in a timely manner, the total number of refunds sent to taxpayers are up—and the average refund amount differed by only \$55 compared to the previous tax year—and, lastly and most importantly, millions of middle-income taxpayers saw less of their hard-earned money go to Washington. And, of course, that was the purpose of the tax bill in the first place.

Now, unfortunately, the Democrats remain yet today as determined as ever

to take down tax reform through a campaign of misinformation. For years, they misled the American people and promoted a narrative full of distortions and misrepresentations about what the law does and doesn't do. Even when the bill was a little more than a 1-page outline, Democrats began their campaign depicting tax reform as a giveaway to the wealthy and a tax hike for the middle class. As the committee discussed new ideas and as the committee drafted a final bill, it actually evolved. It was never like somebody 6 months before said: This is what we are going to pass, and we are going to pass it just this way.

No, it evolved considerably from the initial framework.

Yet the Democrat talking points that began when we first started talking about the bill never changed and, still today, haven't changed. Analysis after analysis, ranging from the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation to even the very liberal Tax Policy Center, showed that tax reform would cut taxes on average for every income group. These analyses showed that to the extent there were tax increases, they were largely concentrated on the wealthy—in other words, a more aggressive tax law.

That is right. The taxpayers Democrats claimed were the big winners in the tax reform are actually the ones most likely to see a tax hike. Moreover, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation analysis, the largest percentage of tax cuts are concentrated among low- and middle-income groups. For emphasis, the Joint Committee on Taxation analysis also shows that tax reform made the Tax Code more progressive. I have said it twice now. I say it a lot of times. I am trying to get somebody to understand that this is what experts say, not what this Senator says.

Millionaires now shoulder an even larger share of the total tax burden than under prior law. As you can ex-

pect, Democrats are determined not to let these facts get in their political way. Since the beginning, they have argued that up was down and that tax cuts were tax increases, and have even suggested the bill's passage was a sign of "Armageddon."

Unfortunately, their constant drum beat, coupled with little pushback from the mainstream media, has worked to mislead too many taxpayers. However, there are signs that some in the media are starting to see that the Democrats' talking points are the nonsense that those talking points really are. You might not believe this, but a few weeks ago the New York Times, of all papers, published an article highlighting how Democratic talking points and far too many Americans' perceptions of the law don't match reality.

I would like to ask you to study this chart. It compares the liberal Tax Policy Center's analysis of taxpayers receiving tax cuts under the individual income provisions of the law with a recent survey of taxpayers who think they received a tax cut.

Follow me on this chart. As you can see, there is a large gap between how many taxpayers actually received a tax cut and those who think they did.

Based on the Tax Policy Center analysis, nearly 70 percent of Americans earning between \$30,000 and \$50,000 saw a tax cut, but only about 36 percent think they got the tax cut. Similarly, more than 80 percent of Americans earning \$50,000 and \$70,000 received a tax cut, but only half that amount, 40 percent, think they got a tax cut. The gap between perception and reality continues as you go up the income scale. Only about half as many people who did actually get a tax cut think they did. As noted in the New York Times:

To a large degree, the gap between perception and reality on the tax cuts appears to flow from a sustained—and misleading—effort by liberal opponents of the law to brand it as a broad middle-class tax increase.

Now, read "liberal opponents" as people in the leadership of the Democratic Party, both in Congress and outside of Congress, misleading the people. You can see from these statistics on the chart that they were enormously successful and they probably knew what the information was, but for some people, when it comes to politics, the truth doesn't matter.

Something I don't get a chance to do very often is to applaud the New York Times for finally calling Democrats out for their efforts to mislead the American public, but even in this New York Times article, the paper was selective in its reporting. The paper chose to highlight only the Tax Policy Center's analysis of the individual income tax provisions rather than its analysis of all major tax provisions enacted in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Even the liberal Tax Policy Center recognizes the person who has the legal burden of paying a tax isn't necessarily the one who bears the economic incidence of that tax. For instance, it is widely recognized that a portion of the corporate tax ultimately falls on individuals in the form of reduced wages, so we cut the corporate tax rate. There ought to be a positive benefit from that for the workers.

Thus, when all major provisions of tax reform are considered, the percentage of taxpayers receiving a tax cut is not 70 percent, as reported, but 80 percent. Moreover, when you look at taxpayers with incomes between \$50,000 and \$70,000, the percentage receiving a tax cut climbs to 90 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the complete Tax Policy Center analysis of Americans who receive tax cuts under tax reform.

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

TABLE T18-0026—THE TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT (TCJA). ALL PROVISIONS AND INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX PROVISIONS TAX UNITS WITH A TAX INCREASE OR TAX CUT, BY EXPANDED CASH INCOME LEVEL, 2018
[All provisions]

Expanded Cash Income Level (thousands of 2017 dollars)	Tax Units		Tax Units with Tax Increase or Cut				Average Tax Change (Dollars) for all Tax Units	
	Number (thousands)	Percent of Total	With Tax Cut		With Tax Increase		All Provisions	Major Provisions Included Here
			Pct of Tax Units	Avg Tax Change (\$)	Pct of Tax Units	Avg Tax Change (\$)		
Less than 10	13,260	7.5	19.3	-40	0.3	430	-10	-10
10-20	23,850	13.5	62.0	-100	1.1	850	-50	-50
20-30	22,240	12.6	79.1	-250	2.6	780	-180	-180
30-40	16,640	9.5	87.3	-460	4.5	750	-360	-360
40-50	13,220	7.5	90.4	-670	6.2	710	-570	-570
50-75	24,450	13.9	91.6	-1,010	7.0	810	-870	-870
75-100	16,650	9.5	91.5	-1,540	8.1	1,200	-1,310	-1,310
100-200	30,860	17.5	92.5	-2,560	7.4	1,510	-2,260	-2,260
200-500	11,640	6.6	95.1	-7,000	4.8	2,820	-6,560	-6,520
500-1,000	1,530	0.9	95.0	-22,170	5.0	9,970	-21,240	-20,570
More than 1,000	670	0.4	88.3	-88,940	11.7	121,920	-69,660	-64,300
All	176,100	100.0	80.4	-2,140	4.8	2,770	-1,610	-1,590
(Individual income tax provisions)								
Less than 10	13,260	7.5	4.4	-80	0.3	440	*	*
10-20	23,850	13.5	29.8	-150	1.3	790	-30	-40
20-30	22,240	12.6	51.0	-320	3.1	700	-140	-140
30-40	16,640	9.5	65.2	-520	5.5	660	-300	-310
40-50	13,220	7.5	73.9	-720	7.6	660	-480	-480
50-75	24,450	13.9	81.7	-990	8.7	750	-740	-740
75-100	16,650	9.5	86.6	-1,380	10.1	1,140	-1,080	-1,080
100-200	30,860	17.5	89.1	-2,250	10.1	1,450	-1,850	-1,860
200-500	11,640	6.6	90.9	-6,020	8.5	2,450	-5,280	-5,270
500-1,000	1,530	0.9	92.1	-19,050	7.3	8,930	-17,340	-16,900

TABLE T18-0026—THE TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT (TCJA). ALL PROVISIONS AND INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX PROVISIONS TAX UNITS WITH A TAX INCREASE OR TAX CUT, BY EXPANDED CASH INCOME LEVEL, 2018—Continued

[All provisions]

Expanded Cash Income Level (thousands of 2017 dollars)	Tax Units		Tax Units with Tax Increase or Cut				Average Tax Change (Dollars) for all Tax Units	
	Number (thousands)	Percent of Total	With Tax Cut		With Tax Increase		All Provisions	Major Provisions Included Here
			Pct of Tax Units	Avg Tax Change (\$)	Pct of Tax Units	Avg Tax Change (\$)		
More than 1,000	670	0.4	78.2	-75,110	20.8	98,200	-41,910	-38,290
All	176,100	100.0	64.8	-2,180	6.3	2,760	-1,260	-1,240

Source: Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center Microsimulation Model (version 0217-1).
* Non-zero value rounded to zero.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I hope that the New York Times article will be a wake-up call to congressional Democrats and people outside of Congress to abandon this misleading rhetoric. Unfortunately, it is more likely they will continue their campaign of misinformation. Yet, as more and more hard data come in on the benefits of tax reform, it will become harder and harder for the American public to take the Democrats seriously with their rhetoric.

With the tax filing season now behind us, we are finally starting to get some of this hard data. H&R Block has released data for this filing season based upon its experience in helping taxpayers during this filing season, which demonstrate how taxpayers fared in each State. Again, as you can see from this chart, taxpayers who are in red and blue States alike have all benefited from tax reform.

One knows what the rhetoric was around here even before we voted on this bill: It is an attack on the blue States. Well, it didn't turn out that way. On average for all States, taxpayers saw a 24-percent reduction in their tax bills.

This data directly contradict misleading arguments by these Washington Democrats, as I stated, that tax reform was an attack on high-tax blue States due to the cap on the State and local tax deductions, and we set that cap at \$10,000.

According to H&R Block, not according to this Senator, some of the largest tax reductions are actually found in the high-tax blue States. On average, taxpayers in New Jersey saw the largest reduction in their tax bills at 29 percent. New Jersey, based on the last several elections, is a blue State. Massachusetts had the second largest reduction of 27.6 percent, and California had the third largest with 27.1 percent. They are blue States.

The fact is, on average, taxpayers in every State have benefited from tax reform, and in some cases, high-tax blue States have fared even better than red States.

I am proud of the work we did on tax reform. No bill is perfect, and we still have work to do in addressing a number of technical correction issues, but we have kept our promise to enact meaningful reform that has cut taxes for the middle class.

Even more important is what tax reform means for long-term economic

growth. It doesn't take a tax expert to see that income, wages, jobs, and unemployment numbers have all very much improved since the enactment of this tax bill. That then reflects in significant benefits obtained by American workers. Of course, that is on top of the direct tax relief that hard-working individuals and families are already receiving, which I described at the beginning of my remarks.

Annualized growth in real after-tax personal income averaged 2½ percent during the Obama administration; it has averaged 3.3 percent since tax reform.

Annualized growth in real average hourly earnings averaged a mere 0.6 percent under Obama compared to 1.7 percent following the enactment of the tax bill. So it is about three times as much.

Monthly job gains averaged 110,000 under President Obama; they averaged 215,000 after this tax bill passed.

There have been nearly 5.4 million jobs created since January of 2017, with more than half of that job creation having occurred since the enactment of tax reform.

Under President Obama, the unemployment rate averaged a whopping 7.4 percent. Today, it averages 3.9 percent.

Following tax reform and for the first time since 2001, the number of job openings in the national economy has exceeded the number of unemployed Americans—a phenomenon that has continued for the past year. That means an American who wants a job can get a job.

To say it simply, tax reform is working for America. For the Democrats to suggest otherwise is nothing more than their continued effort to mislead the American public. I invite the Democrats to take a page from the New York Times article, acknowledge the facts, and work with us to continue to improve the economic environment for hard-working individuals and families all across this great country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPPORTUNITY ZONES

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I thank Senator ERNST for allowing me the opportunity to talk about opportunity zones.

So much has happened since President Trump has been elected that I think has brought opportunity. The economy is obviously booming. In the State of Indiana, for instance, we have 156 opportunity zones in 83 different cities and 58 counties. That is a lot in one State. This is investment into these areas that need jobs. Capital investment is hard to measure. Thank goodness it has come along and has been an opportunity that we in the Hoosier State have taken advantage of.

We are one of the lowest unemployment States in the Union. I am from Dubois County, from the town of Jasper, which supports the lowest unemployment rates in our State—a State of enterprise, a State of commerce. Workforce development is probably the most critical issue that faces our State, but we do a lot of other things well. We live within our means. We addressed infrastructure back in 2017 by repairing roads and bridges and by doing a lot of things well.

We have 80,000 jobs in our State that need one simple thing, and that is proper training.

When I went to school back in the seventies—it dates me a little bit—I took industrial arts. You had a shop class. You had a welding class. You had practical training that led you into good-paying jobs. Somewhere along the way, we kind of almost stigmatized that pathway called career and technical education. We have schools like Ivy Tech. When I was a State legislator, there were 19 different programs, and we were spending nearly \$1 billion a year, but we were not providing proper training for high-demand, high-wage jobs.

In our State, we are shipping out twice as many 4-year degrees as we use. Something is not right. I just spoke with an online college, which is another issue I want to mention. The cost of these 4-year degrees has gotten way out of hand. Many graduates spend \$80,000, \$90,000, \$100,000. They take on that debt and have jobs that are not marketable.

We need to pay attention to the simple things that most States need by reorienting the focus of education and providing proper training for jobs that

in many cases pay more than 4-year degrees, those that start in the neighborhood of \$40,000 to \$60,000 and have good benefits and potential wages of over \$100,000 a year. In our State and in most States across the country, those are the jobs that need to be filled.

In my own company, 80 jobs can't be filled because, really, there needs to be a better curriculum at the high school level, one from which you get basic skills taught rather than the misguided approach of overemphasizing 4-year degrees. There is nothing wrong with that, and everyone should aspire to that, but the market doesn't necessarily need it. It will pay more for a lot less education, and you will not be walking away with the debt that so many students do in this day and age.

Tax reform then came along. As a business owner, I can clearly say that there has been nothing in the 38 years of building a little Main Street business into a national company that has catapulted our ability to do more for our employees than what has happened with tax reform.

An opportunity zone is a great idea. We need to have more of it, and we need to make sure this institution starts to set an example across this country whereby we live within our means and not create \$850 billion deficits annually on top of \$22 trillion of debt. We all know that is going to lead us nowhere other than into despair down the road.

Again, I am here to tout what tax relief and the JOBS Act did, as well as opportunity zones, which we have run with in the Hoosier State. We also need to fix a few things, like matching training and education with high-demand, high-wage jobs. If we do that across the country, I think we will be into decades of prosperity that will prevent us from maybe going down that trail of some of the things we have heard about recently, like the Green New Deal, Medicare for All, and a lot of things that we know we can't afford and that will not work.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I thank Vice Chair ERNST for putting this event together on the floor to talk about the success of opportunity zones and what they could mean for so many Americans who desperately need the assistance in so many places. Without any question, this is a great part of the tax bill that has not received enough attention. A lot of folks know about opportunity zones, and a lot of folks are excited about opportunity zones.

I would like to spend a little time talking about the success of our economy and touching on some of the issues that my colleague Senator BRAUN spoke about as well, those being the importance of workforce development and of making sure our workforce has the skills that meet the jobs of our current economy.

One estimate said that perhaps there are a million more jobs than there are people looking for work, and a part of the reason why that is so is because we still need to make sure that we harmonize the skill set necessary to do the work with the skills being taught or trained to our younger folks and folks looking for work.

This has been an amazing journey from an economic perspective, when you think about where we are financially as a country.

This past quarter we saw the announcement of a growth rate of around 3.2 percent. That is astounding because all of the estimates were so significantly lower.

We finished 2018 with a growth rate of around 3.1 percent. Now, we have not seen that acceleration in our economy in a very long time. So it is really good news for those folks looking for work.

Our unemployment rate is near a 50-year low—somewhere between 3.8 and 3.9 percent. This is something we haven't seen in a very long time. African-American unemployment is near 7 percent. Some of the lowest numbers ever recorded in the history of the country for African-American employment are there now. Hispanic unemployment is in the same range—very low, record lows.

We have seen wages in the last several months continue to increase. Wage growth is now hitting the bottom quintile of our workforce at a 3-percent growth rate, which is really good news because it was another one of those targets that we knew was important for us to reach.

Said differently, income disparity is shrinking because of the success of our Tax Code and the success of our regulatory reset, and that is good news for everyone.

The economic recovery, however, has been uneven. Part of the challenge that we see is that there are areas of our Nation that are not doing as well as the numbers I have just indicated. That reinforces the fact that, as a whole, the Nation is succeeding and the people of our country are succeeding at a much higher level and at a faster clip. However, rural America still lags a little behind and needs more tools in the toolkit, more arrows in the quiver to address some of the challenges that are endemic and specific to those rural parts of our country.

I am thankful to have partnered in the opportunity zone legislation with folks who are compassionate and who are committed to making sure that rural America realizes its full potential.

I have had an opportunity to travel this country on my national opportunity zone tour. I have gone from places in Florida, with Senator RUBIO, to parts of our country that I have really enjoyed seeing, but I can't articulate fully the passion that I saw in folks from West Virginia, New Hampshire, and Iowa when we had a chance to tour these three States and learn

more about the rural economy and the potential in those rural economies.

I remember vividly walking down in Huntington, WV, with my good friend Senator CAPITO. We had a great visit in Huntington, WV, and what we realized there was the passion of the people and the willingness to work were evident and that we needed to bring more resources to the table so that the employers and would-be employers would make the investment in Huntington, WV, and in other parts of rural West Virginia.

We left there encouraged and enthusiastic because the opportunity zone legislation was seen as a true tool in the toolkit for rural America that needed to be rolled out. At that time, it hadn't been rolled out like it has been now.

So today we see over \$100 billion migrating toward opportunity funds. That means good news for rural America. If we are able to continue that progress, we will see rural America live its full potential, and that is great news.

I enjoyed visiting New Hampshire with Governor Sununu, where the unemployment rate is 2.4 percent, one of the lowest in the country. But even in a place like New Hampshire, where the unemployment rate is really low, the rural parts of the State were still devastated and needed an infusion of hope and opportunity. The O zone, or the opportunity zone, has presented itself as one of the many solutions necessary to confront some of the rural issues that we saw in New Hampshire.

I enjoyed my time in West Des Moines with Senator ERNST, as we had a chance to visit a potential housing project incubator at a church, where folks were fascinated by using the tax deferral to encourage and to attract more investment into West Des Moines because the people are willing to work. There is dignity in all work, and they understood that. They were passionate about opportunities, and they needed another tool to make it happen.

Opportunity zones are a part of that toolkit, and I will say, without any question, that when you think about great leadership, it is hard to have missed the compassion and the passion that JONI ERNST has for her constituents and her business owners and her willingness to partner with legislation like the opportunity zones and partner with the entrepreneurs of her State and the folks who are looking for ways to reinvest in their own neighborhoods to help encourage and to support a willing workforce.

That tool of opportunity zones can be brought to bear against some of the strongest and hardest challenges in rural America, and I am here to say thank you to my colleagues for, a, making sure that opportunity zones are a reality; b, for taking this time on the floor to encourage others, especially our rural Americans, to stay hopeful; and, c, to continue to address some of the challenges that Senator BRAUN mentioned about the workforce

development and harmonizing the skill set with the workforce in a way that allows for those folks to realize their full potential and live the American Dream.

I yield to Senator CAPITO.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague Senator TIM SCOTT from South Carolina. I am going to talk a little bit about our visit later, but our visit was really tremendous in West Virginia.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time on the Brasher nomination expire at 3 p.m. today and that, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

I further ask that following disposition of the Brasher nomination, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Ruiz II, Arias-Marxuach, and Wolson nominations in the order listed, and that if cloture is invoked on the nominations, the postcloture time on the nominations expire at 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, May 2, and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order in which cloture was invoked; and finally, if confirmed, that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPPORTUNITY ZONES

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I am here to join my colleagues today to speak about what I believe is one of the most significant parts of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act that we passed a little over a year ago, and that is the opportunity zones.

Senator SCOTT is the author and the brains behind this concept that he has been working on for years, and I was really proud to be a cosponsor of that bill and am excited to see what is going to happen.

Ever since that historic legislation that we passed and became law in 2017, I have heard from many individuals, families, and small businesses back in West Virginia about all the ways that they have benefited from this. I have met with families who have been able to save for their children, whether it is to increase their children's education or to actually get some things done around the house that they hadn't been able to afford before.

I have spoken with small businesses that have been able to expand their operations and create new jobs. I have heard from individuals who have been able to give back to their churches and to their communities. I have seen—which, I think, may even be the most significant—a renewed sense of optimism and hope about where our econ-

omy is going, not just in our State but across the country.

Many critics of the tax cut legislation said folks like those living in West Virginia wouldn't feel the positive effects, but I can tell you that we have experienced that in West Virginia. Those same critics then said that the benefits would only be temporary.

I heard Senator SCOTT talk about the growth figures over the last quarter. It is phenomenal. I have seen figures in West Virginia of how wage growth is increasing and how our annual salaries are increasing.

Our unemployment still remains a little bit high, but it is still moving down over the last month.

As recently as last week, I met a small business owner in South Charleston who is currently creating new jobs because of that tax reform.

But thanks to a specific provision in the tax reform bill—a provision, as I said, that Senator SCOTT sponsored and that several of our colleagues joined in—I am positive that the new tax law will continue to drive economic growth and optimism through opportunity zones.

Now there is no State better made for an opportunity zone investment than our State. I am going to sell it right here.

As my colleagues before me have explained, the idea is quite simple. It is to incentivize private investment in communities that need it the most—communities that, for one reason or another, have struggled more than others economically and that have been hit hard and are in need of not just a little but a major jump start. They are communities full of great people—people with great ideas and strong ambition—but they are in need of the capital to get those ideas off the ground, to start and expand their businesses, and to drive that growth and development.

That is something that is really not easy to do in a small State, particularly a small rural State. It is very difficult.

The New York Times actually reported recently that the rural areas around our country accounted for just 3 percent of America's job growth between the years of 2010 and 2014.

But with the creation of the opportunity zones, enthusiasm is growing across the Mountain State when it comes to our economic potential.

Senator SCOTT talked about his visit to Huntington, and he did remark on the enthusiasm that he saw firsthand when he visited with me and we toured 3 of our State's 55 opportunity zones. During that visit, we met with a lot of businesses. We met with local and government leaders, and we met with education officials and city officials about how opportunity zones can shape growth in that community, as well as in others across our State.

I think Senator SCOTT would agree that the optimism was there and the excitement was palpable.

The mayor of Huntington, Mayor Steve Williams, actually put it best when he characterized the trip as an opportunity to show not only what the community has been able to do to attract investment but, better yet, what the community aspires to do and become in the next generations or the next decades.

That is really what opportunity zones are all about—not only driving investments today but building those foundations of growth and development for the future.

I think we can all think of an area we either live near or we have driven through in our respective States that maybe used to be vibrant communities, whether in, say, Wheeling, where they had a big steel industry at some point, or in Weston, where there was a glass industry at some point. The downtowns have begun to shrink, but they are almost like sleeping bears. They are ready to wake up, and that is what I think opportunity zones are going to do.

Today, a little less than a year ago, the Governor made the appointments of 55 areas in our State. Law firms, accounting firms, investors, and several others are working in our State to use this new tax provision to bring jobs and growth to parts of our country that need it the most.

Communities are developing pitch books—I have seen a couple on the internet—to market their projects and proposals. Our city of Parkersburg is a great example of that. A nonprofit put together a pitch book that shows where the investments can occur in and around those opportunity zones surrounding Parkersburg.

We have also seen the establishment of our first opportunity fund, called the Savage Grant.

So we have some great momentum. We are working to build on it. My staff has just done an outreach in almost every single county, and we just finished a 3-day educational tour in partnership with West Virginia Forward, the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, the West Virginia Department of Commerce, and the Benedum Foundation to spread the word.

Also, nonprofits are really interested in seeing this work. It takes some of the pressure off of them. If the private investor can come in, then the nonprofits can come in and provide some of the alternative services and additional services that would be needed.

So we are going to keep at it, and with Treasury's release of the most recent opportunity zone regulations, the program will be a viable tool that will be more viable than ever for investments in our operating businesses.

I am confident that West Virginians and others will make the most of it, and we should make the most of it because this is a great idea and a great opportunity. It is a way to transform our communities and to improve our communities and to lift up individuals and businesses that contribute, and to

build that bigger and greater foundation for a brighter future.

So these are the kinds of opportunities that, as Republicans, when we voted for this bill, we knew that this was a core part of our mission in terms of being able to deliver that firm foundation, and we are going to continue to deliver for West Virginians and for all Americans.

I wish to thank the Senator from Iowa as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, today we have an economy that is booming. Unemployment is at its lowest in Iowa since 2000, and wages are up.

In the first quarter of this year, we saw 3.2 percent GDP growth, which far exceeded expectations, but we know economic statistics alone don't completely tell the story of the health or wealth of a community.

More than 52 million Americans, including approximately 90,000 Iowans, live in economically distressed communities. Some have dubbed these communities as "left behind" due to low incomes, their high housing vacancies, people out of work, and not a lot of hope for the future. For too long, so many of these communities were limited not because of lack of ingenuity but simply by a lack of access to opportunity. Folks across Iowa have felt the door to a better job or a higher wage was closed to them.

The Governor of Iowa, Kim Reynolds, has been doing a tremendous job working to help these areas through both economic development and workforce development efforts. Programs like Future Ready Iowa help folks learn the skills they need to prepare for rewarding careers and the jobs of tomorrow.

Places like Dubuque, through its Development Corporation and Chamber of Commerce, are working day in and day out to improve the local economy, spur on investment, and get workers trained and back on their feet. They also recognize the challenges unique to the city and its people, like childcare access and housing.

At the Federal level, we also took concrete steps in late 2017 to recognize the specific needs of these communities. Senator TIM SCOTT's wonderful initiative, Investing in Opportunity Act, was included in the tax reform package and created what we now know as the Opportunity Zones Program. I thank Senator TIM SCOTT for working so hard on this opportunity for millions of Americans. They are seeing the benefits. Thank you, Senator, very much.

The Opportunity Zones Program is tremendous. This program incentivizes long-term investment in these low-income and distressed communities by allowing private capital to be used to support small businesses, encourage our entrepreneurs, and to develop dilapidated properties in ZIP Codes most in need of resurgence.

From the heart of Des Moines to rural areas around my State of Iowa, opportunity zones are beginning to unleash the economic potential of Iowa's communities.

Nearly a year ago, the Treasury Department approved 62 opportunity zones in Iowa, which include the communities of more than 200,000 Iowans.

Last summer, as part of his opportunity zone tour, Senator SCOTT joined me in visiting two of these Iowa organizations located in one of the opportunity zones. He had talked about these briefly. One was the Des Moines Dream Center, and the other was the Phenix School Apartments in West Des Moines. Since becoming eligible for private investment, the Des Moines Dream Center has been able to carry out their mission of working to restore hope and helping Iowans to pursue their dreams.

Today I am proud to say that with the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, we are working for Iowa families and communities to help them turn a page and to change the rhetoric from "left behind" to "moving ahead."

One of the best parts of the Opportunity Zones Programs is that it is powered by the people on the ground, not by bureaucrats right here in Washington, DC. That is a very good thing. The 62 designated opportunity zones were nominated by their mayors and Governors because folks back home in Iowa know where help is needed the most.

As a result of the Opportunity Zones Program, we are seeing greater investment in Iowa's small businesses and entrepreneurs, more educational programs for our children, and affordable housing for our families.

Opportunity zones can help power a renaissance in communities across Iowa and reopen doors families once thought were closed. The potential is truly amazing, and I firmly believe this is only the beginning.

I thank my colleagues for coming to the floor today. I thank Senator SCOTT for his wonderful innovation. We look forward to seeing many more wonderful years of opportunity presented to the Americans who need it the most.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I would like to join my colleague from Iowa and my colleague from South Carolina, Senator SCOTT, to talk about opportunity zones.

Senator SCOTT has shown incredible leadership on this issue. He has a big heart, and he has a passion for dealing with communities that have been left behind.

The tax reform bill we passed is doing a great job in growing the economy. If you look at the numbers, they are unbelievable. In the first quarter, there was a 3.2-percent economic growth. That is exactly twice what was projected by the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan group in Con-

gress, before tax reform was passed. Now tax reform has passed, and growth is twice as fast.

By the way, the same is true with job creation. Over the last year, we have created twice as many jobs as was projected before tax reform was passed. There is no question but that tax reform has helped stimulate development, helped stimulate economic growth, and helped stimulate jobs. Actually, what is most exciting to me is that it has also increased wages for people in Ohio and around the country.

Wages have increased higher in the last year than they have in the previous decade. You have to go back to before the great recession to find wage growth like we have seen. Wage growth is great across the board, but it is particularly encouraging that there is slightly more wage growth among what is called nonsupervisory jobs—think about middle-class jobs and blue-collar jobs. So this thing is working, and it is working well.

However, the fact is, the prosperity we are seeing is not evenly spread. There are some communities that haven't recovered since the great recession, and those are the communities—low-income communities that have been stubbornly poverty stricken—that the enterprise zones and opportunity zones are meant to focus on. It is a critical tool, and it is in the tax legislation. It is designed to help encourage investment and therefore job creation in these communities.

As I was listening to others talk earlier, they talked about States that are identifying urban communities and rural communities that are most in need. I will tell you that in my State of Ohio, we now have 320—320—census tracts that have been identified. When I am traveling around the State, it doesn't take me long to find one of these census tracts and to talk with people who are excited about it.

It allows investors and companies to defer paying these capital gains taxes, and, in some cases, if they make a commitment for long enough to invest additional money, they can avoid the capital gains tax altogether. This is working, and over time it is going to create more investment in these communities.

Throughout the past year, I have been traveling to Ohio and talking to people about this. In Youngstown, OH, and in Cleveland, OH, we had roundtable meetings with investors, businesses, and community leaders, and what I have heard is that people are excited about it. They think there is great potential here. To ensure that it works like it is supposed to work, we have to make sure everybody is involved, and that does include economic developers and all levels of government, not just the businesses and investors who are interested in getting the tax incentives. We have to work together to make sure these programs work and do expand opportunities in these communities.

By the way, I want to highlight the promising work Ohio has done to bring everyone to the table to ensure that happens. Specifically, last week, Governor DeWine announced the creation of a new website to serve as a one-stop shop for businesses, investors, and economic development officials who are looking to invest in Ohio's opportunity zones. The website includes an interactive map that shows investors where the projects are around the State, streamlining the flow of capital into these areas that need it most. These are the kinds of things we need to be able to ensure that this works properly.

I am also encouraged by the ongoing implementation of this program by Secretary Mnuchin and the Department of Treasury. Since the implementation process began, I have been urging the Secretary to issue taxpayer-friendly regulations and rules with regard to this. In other words, look at our intent—what we intended to do—which is, again, to create more jobs and economic opportunities in these zones. This includes a letter we sent, which was bicameral—meaning both the House and the Senate—and bipartisan to Treasury that named a number of concerns we had about where we were up to that point in terms of the regulations. We asked for some further guidance on a number of threshold questions that investors were asking about, including clarifying an onerous proposal that was out there that opportunity zone businesses have to make 50 percent of their revenues within their specific zones. That doesn't make sense for some businesses. I mean, think about a restaurant that is going to be built in an opportunity zone. If they don't get 50 percent of the revenue from people who live in that community, that is not necessarily a bad thing. We want to be sure they are hiring people from that community, but it may be that this 50-percent rule does not work for all of these businesses, including the ones that are going to sell to the outside or maybe even sell to other countries from an opportunity zone.

A few weeks ago, Treasury issued a second set of regulations that took important steps to responding to each of the requests we laid out in our January letter. I am pleased to see that, specifically, they addressed the 50-percent revenue requirement, providing safe harbors that seem to allow operating businesses to generate revenue outside of their opportunity zones without the risk of losing those tax incentives. Again, I commend the Secretary and the Department for taking these steps. We need that kind of certainty in order to ensure we take full advantage of this great opportunity. With the release of these new regulations, many more investors are going to have certainty to start making these investments in struggling communities throughout Ohio.

Overall, I am excited about the benefits of this new tax incentive, and I am

committed to doing everything I can do to make sure Ohio communities benefit from it.

Thank you.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I appreciate the words my colleague from Ohio has started with and shared and the work done by this Chamber not only to cut taxes and grow our economy for businesses and entrepreneurs around the country but for individuals, small towns, and families.

I live in a town of about 3,000 people. It is a little, tiny town. Growing up, we had two stoplights, and thanks to some of the oil and gas development that took place around our town several years back, we now have a third stoplight. It is big time now. The reason it is, is because we allowed innovation to flourish. We allowed technology to develop new ways to develop our energy resources, but while the policies in the field and in commerce have advanced, sometimes the policies in this place have grown stale. That is why I was excited to support the tax cuts of last Congress that have energized our economy, that have created new opportunity for American workers and families, and that have led to billions of dollars being brought back into the United States from overseas.

Of course, one of the provisions many of my colleagues have talked about today is the Opportunity Zones Program that was established in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. When we were getting the Opportunity Zones Program up and running, as a cosponsor of that legislation, my office heard complaints that there might not be enough money for the investments that would be utilized within these opportunity zones. In fact, we heard from people who were saying that no one would be interested in starting a business in struggling American communities. Other critics complained it would be too tempting to pick only census tracts that were already well-positioned for growth. What I am hearing and seeing in Colorado have proven both of those criticisms wrong.

Clarity is the compass to navigating any new venture. Treasury has been actively working to make sure its regulations best position the Opportunity Zones Program for success.

Real estate investments have experienced early success with this program; however, we need more than just real estate investments to make all of America and all of Colorado prosperous. Operational businesses and other entities will support the long-term successes of these communities as well—not just real estate, the operational side.

With its second round of regulations recently released, operating businesses received much awaited, positive news from the Treasury. Industries like clean energy, new breweries, or other capital-heavy businesses received the

clarification they need for opportunity zones to succeed. These critical tax provisions—those for accelerated depreciation—will encourage money to come off the sidelines and will translate into large investments in our communities.

While we are still in the infancy of the Opportunity Zones Program, Colorado already has roughly 40 projects in the works. The Office of Economic Development and International Trade, which is the office tasked with implementing opportunity zones in Colorado, has been working alongside local and State entities to maximize its programs for Coloradans. It is in an effort to ensure that the 126 opportunity zones—of which about 60 percent are in rural areas—are successful.

I am going to make sure we continue to fight to leave no part of Colorado behind, and the Investing in Opportunity Act will promote growth in all four corners of our great State.

That little tiny town that I talked about is going to benefit from the opportunity zones that take place. Whether it is a new manufacturing plant, a pizza shop, or a movie theater, investments like these will make a world of difference to small communities. It is the difference between people staying in the town they love versus being forced to leave and find a different job.

Let me give an example. There is a jewelry store in Wray, CO, Amos Jewelry. It is on the main street of this little town. My guess is that when this jewelry store leaves, if there is nobody to take over the business, maybe that will be just one more empty storefront in that town. Nobody will come in to take it over. There is no Zales or Kay Jewelers that is going to come in and replace this smalltown jewelry store. But through an opportunity zone and the chances we are giving people to invest in rural areas and underinvested areas, maybe there can be new life breathed into these small communities—that business, that jewelry store and others like it—to make sure that we don't lose businesses and to make sure that we grow active businesses and that we start new businesses as well.

It is the difference between having access to services on our local Main Street—like that jewelry store; like fixing a watch—and being forced to travel to the next town over and taking the dollars out of that town and bringing them to a different city. It is the difference between going out at all and staying home. A boarded-up storefront tells people to go somewhere else; it is not a "Welcome Home" sign. When those boards are taken down, the town comes back to life—new spirit, new opportunity. Opportunity zones have the potential to take those boards down and to revive our Main Streets.

Whether it is small towns, big cities, or mid-sized economies and communities, the zone shares one common trait: They are communities across

America that have been left behind. These opportunity zones can unlock investment, rebuild infrastructure, and rebuild hope for so many struggling families who no longer feel they have the ability to climb America's economic ladder—those opportunities that were in reach for America's previous generations.

Looking ahead, it will be important to ensure that these real estate and commercial developments are benefiting community members. We know that with new businesses comes new job opportunities, which in turn provide investments in struggling education systems and housing markets. It is a tide that lifts all ships. In the end, these investments are aimed to help all families who are working to pay rent, to become homeowners, and to pay down a mortgage.

We need to work together through the aisle to ensure that we develop a pipeline for the next generation of workers to enter these new job markets, because each and every person in Colorado and everyone across our great Nation should have access to the American dream.

I was pleased that not too long ago, at a White House conference hosted over at the White House, the mayor of Silt, CO, was able to join in the discussion at the Opportunity Zones Conference. Mayor Keith Richel and other officials from Colorado met in Washington, DC, to discuss opportunities, and I am very pleased they were able to do this.

I hope my colleagues, instead of fighting to repeal the tax law, which included opportunity zones, will instead embrace the opportunity to invest, to grow, and to create more prosperous communities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I have worked to secure tax policies to help spur entrepreneurship, competition, and innovation. Opportunity zones are a perfect example of the type of tax policy that creates that kind of growth in our economy.

Opportunity zones were created under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act signed by the President in December 2017. That bill stimulates economic development and job creation across the country by incentivizing long-term investments in economically distressed neighborhoods. Last year, more than 8,700 census tracts were identified as opportunity zones by the Governors of each of the 50 States. These zones are home to approximately 31 million Americans, or roughly 10 percent of the population.

Even in just this short period, we are already seeing wage increases within these economically distressed areas after their having been designated as opportunity zones. For example, during the second and third quarters of last year, our counties with a large pres-

ence of opportunity zones experienced an annualized wage growth of 8 percent. That is compared to other economically distressed counties that were not designated as zones, which did not see a significant spike in wages.

We are also seeing States across the country showing an interest in opportunity zones, with at least 17 State legislators considering their own opportunity zone measures at the State level.

Although States can't make direct investments into the Federal opportunity zone projects, many are considering measures to encourage initiatives such as solar energy or affordable housing. Even in my home State of Iowa, cities such as Iowa City and Coralville have made local investments in their economically distressed communities and are actively recruiting investors for development projects in their opportunity zone areas.

I also want to applaud the efforts of the Treasury Department to provide much needed clarity for community leaders and investors. These include two packages of proposed regulations dedicated to implementing opportunity zone rules.

As the Treasury Department works to finalize these regulations and provide other guidance, I will continue working with Secretary Mnuchin, States and cities, and the investment community to ensure that opportunity zones succeed in driving new business investment and activity to America's low-income communities.

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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, for the leader, I ask unanimous consent that following disposition of the Wolson nomination, the Senate proceed to legislative session and resume consideration of the veto message on S.J. Res. 7, and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, with no intervening action or debate, at 1:45 p.m., Thursday, May 2, and with 5 minutes of debate prior to the vote under the control of Senator MENENDEZ.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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. UDALL. 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.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 87 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Jones	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Harris	Reed	

NOT VOTING—1

Young

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes in this series be 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, all votes will be 10 minutes each.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Rodolfo Armando Ruiz II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Mitch McConnell, Deb Fischer, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, John Thune, Rick Scott, James M. Inhofe, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, Pat Roberts, Tim Scott, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, John Boozman, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, John Barrasso.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Rodolfo Armando Ruiz II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

This is a 10-minute vote.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 89, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 88 Ex.]

YEAS—89

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

NAYS—10

Cardin	Markey	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Peters	Warren
Hirono	Sanders	
Klobuchar	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—1

Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 89, the nays are 10.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Raul M. Arias-Marxuach, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

Mitch McConnell, Deb Fischer, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, John Thune,

Rick Scott, James M. Inhofe, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, Pat Roberts, Tim Scott, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, John Boozman, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, John Barrasso.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Raul M. Arias-Marxuach, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

I will remind the Senate this is a 10-minute vote, and we got the last vote done in an excellent 20 minutes. Let's see if we can do better.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 94, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 89 Ex.]

YEAS—94

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

NAYS—5

Gillibrand	Markey	Warren
Hirono	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—1

Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 94 and the nays are 5.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby

move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Joshua Wolson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Shelley Moore Capito, John Barrasso, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, Richard C. Shelby, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, John Thune, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt, Marco Rubio, Tim Scott, Kevin Cramer.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Joshua Wolson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 64, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 90 Ex.]

YEAS—64

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rosen
Burr	Inhofe	Rounds
Capito	Isakson	Rubio
Carper	Johnson	Sasse
Casey	Jones	Schatz
Cassidy	Kennedy	Schumer
Collins	King	Scott (FL)
Coons	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Leahy	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Lee	Shelby
Cotton	Manchin	Sinema
Cramer	McConnell	Sullivan
Crapo	McSally	Tester
Cruz	Moran	Thune
Daines	Murkowski	Tillis
Enzi	Murphy	Toomey
Ernst	Murray	Udall
Fischer	Paul	Van Hollen

NAYS—35

Baldwin	Harris	Sanders
Bennet	Hassan	Schatz
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schumer
Booker	Hirono	Smith
Brown	Kaine	Stabenow
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Udall
Cardin	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	

NOT VOTING—1

Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 64, the nays are 35.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Joshua Wolson,

of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

BARR HEARING

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, we have now had a day where the Attorney General testified before the Judiciary Committee, and many issues are not resolved because there are great discrepancies based on Mr. Mueller's letter that has been made public—two letters, in fact, that have been made public between what Mr. Barr has been saying and what Mr. Mueller believes.

The cloud that hangs over our country because of Russian interference in our elections—and, frankly, that hangs over the President because of the actions Mr. Mueller outlined in his report—remains. There is a great need to clear all of that up and to clear all of it up with no ands, ifs, or buts.

I was shocked when I heard the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, my friend and colleague whom I have traveled with, LINDSEY GRAHAM, come out of the hearing and say that he was not going to call Mueller for a hearing. The fact that he on his own, despite the desires of many other members of the committee, would simply say that Mueller is not going to testify was so outrageous and wrong. So I went to my colleague here on the floor—my friend LINDSEY GRAHAM. I said to him: How can you do this? This is outrageous.

He said: I am just going to ask Mr. Mueller in a letter if Barr said anything misleading or inaccurate but not have the hearing.

I was appalled.

Now I see on a tweet by a reporter, Emma Dumain, that LINDSEY GRAHAM has slightly modified what he has said. He said that if Mueller tells GRAHAM in the letter that Barr said anything misleading or inaccurate today, he would have the hearing. That is not good enough. That is a game. He should not put the onus on Mr. Mueller, a straight arrow, somebody who believes in a chain of command, to publicly state that in a letter.

Mueller should come testify—no ands, ifs, or buts. Mueller should come testify—no games as to what he answers in a letter.

What are our colleagues so afraid of on the other side of the aisle? Are they afraid Mueller might say things that are different than what Attorney General Barr said? Are they afraid for the country to discuss the kinds of things the President has done, which nobody much seems to like? Are they afraid that we talk about foreign interference in our elections?

I would plead with my colleague LINDSEY GRAHAM to reconsider. I would plead with my colleague LINDSEY GRAHAM to say: Mueller is coming; no ands, ifs, or buts so we can question him, including our side of the aisle. That is what Congressional oversight is about. It is not about the chairman of the Judiciary Committee deciding what

should be heard and what should not be heard. That is not the job of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, no matter who he or she is.

Special Counsel Mueller just concluded one of the most important investigations in our Nation's history. The Senate and the American people have a right to hear from the special counsel directly about the threat of foreign interference in our elections and, yes, the conduct of the President. It is one of the biggest takeaways from the hearing; that we need the special counsel here to testify, to clarify the discrepancies between what he and the Attorney General are saying. We don't need a letter. We don't need conditions. That seems like a game, a dodge, a ruse, a way to prevent Mr. Mueller from testifying.

In my view, Attorney General Barr routinely mischaracterizes the special counsel's words, his intentions, his reasoning. We know, from the special counsel's letter that was publicly released, that to be true. It is likely that Attorney General Barr did so again in the hearings. We need to hear from the special counsel himself to sort this out and get the truth, not at the discretion of the Judiciary Committee chairman but because America, our system of government, our rule of law, demands it.

Congress has always had, from the days of the Founding Fathers, a duty to provide oversight for the executive branch. Just because one party doesn't feel like doing it because the President is from the same party doesn't measure up to the grandness of our Constitution.

My dear friend from South Carolina, please rethink your position. Back off of this idea that Mueller shouldn't testify or should only testify if he meets certain conditions only set by you and call Special Counsel Mueller in to testify.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

MISSOURI FLOODING

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, we have been stuck for some time now on having an appropriations bill that meets the disasters that have occurred recently in Missouri and, before that, in the Carolinas and Georgia, and other places. I want to continue to work hard to get that done, but I want to talk a little bit about the effects of what has happened in the State of Missouri as part of what has happened with floods this spring.

We have seen catastrophic and, in some cases, historic flooding both on the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers over the last couple of months. Along the Missouri, there was this unusual thing, and I actually never heard the term before, a "bomb cyclone." It is a wind event that also produced lots of rain in Nebraska in the Northern Plains on frozen ground. All of that water had no place to go except run off, and it was the equivalent of 8 inches of

rain in a place from which we usually don't get water. There had been significant rain over the last few days of March. That created another flood. On the Mississippi, we have seen significant rains there. While they haven't set a record, they have certainly consistently ranked the Mississippi crests among the seventh highest flood levels that river has ever been from some of the locks. There are locks north of St. Louis. You can navigate the river without locks south of St. Louis, but in the area from the Canton Lock and Dam to the Winfield Lock and Dam on the Mississippi, there are significant problems waiting to happen over the next few weeks.

After the rains occurred in Northwest Missouri and in Iowa and Nebraska, in our State and Kansas, much of the water is still there. The floods have stayed up so high for so long that it is difficult to really evaluate the damage that has been done. Unlike a tornado, which we have some familiarity with, where you can go in quickly and evaluate what happened, you can't do that nearly as quickly with a flood.

We do know there has been at least \$25 million in damages to public infrastructure and costs of emergency measures experienced statewide. There have been 215 road closures statewide, with 46 roads that continue to be closed as late as the third week in April. Interstate 29, north of St. Joseph, has been closed since March and is expected to stay closed until probably June.

This is obviously a very disruptive set of circumstances for people who would normally use those roads and bridges all the time. One of the major class 1 roadways has been damaged. That roadway was just raised in 2011 to deal with the flood in 2011. An ethanol plant was knocked offline. Electric substations have been damaged. Grains stored in bins from last year's harvest have been destroyed. Livestock have been lost. Many farmers will not be able to get crops in the ground this year because it will be too wet once the water goes down—until it is too late to successfully plant the crops. So thousands of acres and hundreds of farms just simply will not be able to do what they do because of the flood.

The scale and scope of these events has clearly overwhelmed local governments, overwhelmed county governments, and stretched the State government in a significant way. Most effectively, and most importantly, it has impacted families and individuals. If your home is underwater, if it takes 2 more hours to get to school, if you have no chance of planting your crop or if you are in a business that relates to the family who is going to plant the crop, if you have nobody buying the seed or paying the repairs for their equipment, paying for the gasoline—the things you do to stay in business—that has all kinds of impact as well.

The Governor of Missouri has requested a Presidential disaster declaration. I am certainly for that, and every

Member of the Missouri delegation signed the letter asking the President to grant that declaration. The assistance that would be impacted by this would be vital. It is important. We need that kind of assistance now.

I am going to continue to work—and I hope all our colleagues continue to work—to make this year's disasters and last fall's disasters eligible for the funds we appropriate for disaster coverage.

During the flood, a lot has been said about the Corps of Engineer's management of the Missouri River, and what, if anything, they could have done that might have prevented the flood this time. I think probably not. This is such an unusual flood that the locks on the Missouri were north of where the flood occurred. There was a dam that broke that would not normally have broken, and that would normally not even be part of the Missouri River management system.

The Corps has been out there trying to help figure out how to recover rather than figure out what caused this particular flood. In fact, the Corps and the permanent staff in places like the Kansas City office of the Corps understand the Missouri River better than anybody, in my view, and are helpful when they can be.

That doesn't mean the Corps, in a greater sense, isn't responsible for what has become the new normal on the Missouri River. We have had recurrent historic flooding on the river now for 15 years. Ever since the Corps asked for a new management plan in 2004 and got the new management plan, it just simply doesn't work.

At least 6 of the top 10 river crests in recorded history have occurred in the last 15 years. Floods in 2007, 2008, 2009, 2011—you see the pattern here—2013, and 2019. The only reason we didn't have dramatic floods every year was we had a couple of drought years in 2009 and 2012.

This all goes back to that 2004 management plan. What changed in 2004? In 2004, the Corps started to implement the Missouri River Recovery Program in response to a Biological Opinion—"opinion" may be the key word here—Biological Opinion from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which took the position that the existing management of the river was impacting one species of fish and two species of birds.

The ultimate result was prioritizing the management of the entire river to benefit that fish and those birds. It was above flood control. It was above navigation. It didn't consider what was detrimental to families, to farms, or the local infrastructure and was not necessary. Saving wildlife is a worthy goal, but for that goal to truly be worthy, it has to also include how it impacts families, how it impacts people, and how it impacts the economy.

We had management plans on the Mississippi River as well, but the wildlife management plans didn't become the plan that substituted for all other plans.

The Corps' management plan brought out changes to the lower river. There are six locks and there are six dams, rather, and reservoirs above the Lower Missouri that starts roughly in the place where Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, and Missouri all come together. What happened was they began to destabilize the banks, constructing pallid sturgeon chutes that impacted how the water ran into the river. They no longer dredged the river like they had before. Just to understand why that matters, a 9-foot channel of the river carries a lot more water than a 6- or 7-foot channel of the river. If you are channeling the river so you can still navigate the river, they had interception rearing complexes, none of which appears to have made much of a difference, except they made it hard to control the river at flood stage.

Modifying or eliminating the river control systems eliminate the normal things in a river, such as revetments, wing dikes, and chevrons that control the river and send the water in the direction it needs to be for flood protection, and that just didn't happen.

Fish and Wildlife and the Corps of Engineers actually now know that some of the actions they were carrying out caused direct negative impacts on the river and didn't do any good. There is a high level of certainty that when you notch a dike in the river—which means you cut a hole in a structure that is designed to channel the water—that when you do that, bad things happen. That is why that structure was put there in the first place for a reason.

One of the most disappointing parts of what has happened is a relatively low level of certainty that any of these things do any good. In fact, the Corps and the Fish and Wildlife people have already abandoned the pursuit of what they constructed, pallid sturgeon chutes, which they thought would encourage the pallid sturgeon to multiply. By the way, this is a fish we happen to multiply ourselves at the Neosho National Fish Hatchery, which I believe is the oldest fish hatchery in the United States. The U.S. hatchery system is in Neosho. Pallid sturgeon is one of the things they do. They didn't work, but they did encourage more flood risk.

I would have one suggestion for the Corps: If you know an action will increase flood control and you know it will harm people and harm property and you don't know whether it will help save a species, don't do it. There has to be a way you figure out first whether this is going to work, and then you might evaluate if it is so important that we are going to impact people and property.

What we had is a big experiment that turned out to be the wrong thing to do to start with. It didn't serve the purpose, and it did harm the river and people who live on the river. Flood control and navigation needs to be, once again, elevated to the top two priorities of managing the river. I look forward to

working with my colleagues to figure out how to do this in a better way.

There is no question that the Mississippi River is about to be more important than it has been in 100 years. There is also no reason that the Missouri River, as an avenue of commerce and as an avenue that people can get near and enjoy from a tourist's and traveler's perspective, can't be there, and there is no reason it can't continue to be managed in a way that benefits families, that benefits us economically, and that doesn't repeat year after year after year the flooding that did not occur under the original management plan.

We need to look at that plan. We need to have a management plan that meets the commonsense standard. The current plan does not, and we have had now 15 years to prove that the current plan does not meet it. I am going to be working hard with both the Corps, the Department of the Interior, and Fish and Wildlife to see if we can't have a plan that meets that commonsense standard.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, first of all, I thank the Senator from Missouri for his comments about the disaster. We are having a disaster in the U.S. Senate because we haven't been able to solve our emergency problem yet. It is not because of Senator BLUNT. He has done a great job, as have many Members of the Senate. We are close now, and there is a meeting this afternoon with important Senators. We are close on Hawaii, on Alaska, on Georgia, on South Carolina, on Tennessee, on Alabama, on Florida, and on the other States that have had disasters in the past year to which we have still been late on getting disaster emergency funds.

In fact, in Georgia, this is the 222nd day, in the case of one emergency, that those funds have been held up. In the agricultural season, 222 days is 1½ plants. It is one planting, one picking, and a second planting. So it is a significant part of the agriculture year. We are getting killed in Georgia. Our farmers are getting hurt badly because of the ineptitude, in part and sometimes in whole, of the U.S. Senate.

Finally, cool heads are coming together. We are getting over some arguments, and we are getting some things solved. Thanks to the help of Senator BLUNT and others in the U.S. Senate, we are going to get help to our farmers in Georgia, to those in Alabama, and to those in Alaska from the earthquake and to those in Hawaii from the lava flow and the eruptions they have had there and from all of the other disasters we have had. Finally, that money is going to start flowing.

REMEMBERING BETTY JO WILLIAMS

Mr. President, I lost two great friends in the last week—one of them a Georgian. Nobody in this room knew her. Her name was Betty Jo Williams, who was 90 years old.

Betty Jo was elected to the Georgia Legislature in 1978, which was 2 years after I was elected in 1976 to that same body. We were two scrawny Republicans in a world of Democrats in Georgia. I was one of the first people to get elected from Cobb County, which is the suburban county of Atlanta, and she was the first woman to get elected to anything in Georgia. She was one of the first to break the glass ceiling. A lot of people may ask: Where is this glass ceiling? Well, I will tell you where it is. A lot of people tried to make their way, but they were always held back by laws or custom or whatever.

Betty Jo fought for women's rights, and she fought for women's rights in the right way. She saw to it that women were equally represented and that they had an opportunity to represent themselves. She fought hard to see to it that there was no glass ceiling to hold back anybody who was trying to do the right things for the right reasons and had the right qualifications.

I loved Betty Jo. She was great. In fact, she helped me to get elected as the minority leader, as the Republican leader, of the Georgia House of Representatives in 1983. I won by one vote. It was 7 to 6. That shows you how small a caucus we had. She was one of those seven who voted for me, and I have never forgotten it. I am sure, when I have a funeral one day, somebody will come and remember on that day something I did for him. It is something you never take away.

Betty Jo was a unique person. She had a husband and three wonderful children. Her husband passed on, and she spent the rest of her 25 years of life living with another gentleman. They had his children. Between the two of them, they raised 12 grandchildren, 6 great-grandchildren—wonderful kids with wonderful opportunities. They helped those kids grow up to understand the great promise America had.

When Betty Jo served in the legislative body, even though she was outnumbered by men by 20 to 1, she was a woman who broke the glass ceiling. She also broke custom. In the Georgia Legislature back in the sixties and seventies, you didn't find people putting their numbers in the phonebook. Betty Jo was the first one. She paid extra to have her number put in there in big, bold, black letters. She started the custom by which, all of a sudden, all who were in the State legislature got the Betty Jo Williams rule applied to them. If they didn't have their numbers in the book, they weren't in touch with their constituents. She did little things like that to make a difference.

She was the first woman to be appointed to the Judiciary Committee. It was a great compliment to her, too, for she was not a lawyer. Even though she was not a lawyer, she was well respected, even by the speaker of the house, so she was appointed to the Judiciary Committee.

Speaking of the speaker of the house in Georgia, his name was Tom Murphy.

I am sure, somewhere in the walls of this room, his name has been used before. He was the toughest, most ornery, hardest working speaker of the house who ever was. He served as the speaker of the house in Georgia longer than any speaker in any house in the United States of America.

He also didn't like women representatives, and he let everybody know it. Yet he couldn't handle Betty Jo because she was sweet, kind, and she was smart, and she always got the best of him. He would be tough, but she would be sweet, and she got a lot of things done that other women couldn't do because they would cry. Betty Jo didn't cry. She just worked a little harder to get it done. Tom Murphy finally broke down and did some things for the women in the caucus and the women of the Georgia State Legislature that hadn't been done for years—they were treated more like equals in the legislative body.

Betty Jo was just one of those special, unique individuals who made my life better by my having known her. I thank her tonight for the vote she cast for me a long time ago as minority leader. I thank her for those children they raised and great-grandchildren and children. I thank her for all of the things she did in her community, for all of the things she did for women, and for all of the things she did to make everybody more equal and more served.

Most importantly of all, I thank her for breaking that glass ceiling because there are a lot of women in office today in this Senate—20 percent of our body—who wouldn't be here today if it had not been for the Betty Jo Williams of 50 years ago who broke the habits we had in America that didn't allow women to do a lot of things.

I pay tribute to her, and I pay honor to her for her service and for the great time I had in knowing her in life. I will miss her greatly, but I will always be a better man for knowing Betty Jo Williams and what she taught me about life and success.

REMEMBERING RICHARD LUGAR

Mr. President, everybody in this room, everybody in this Capitol, and everybody in this country knows who Dick Lugar was. We lost Dick earlier this week. Dick Lugar was and is an American icon.

When I got elected to the U.S. Senate in 2004, I came here and was put on the Foreign Relations Committee in 2006, primarily because we were one Republican short and because nobody else would take the seat. So I wasn't the unanimous choice; I was the only choice.

Dick Lugar came to me and said: Johnny, would you take this seat? I have to have somebody take this seat, and I have to have somebody be the chairman of the Africa Subcommittee.

I said: Well, Dick, I will be happy to take the seat, but I don't know a damned thing about Africa. I have never been there. I would be a bad chairman.

He said: No, you wouldn't. I will take you over there with me. We will study it, and you will be great.

Today, 15 years later, I am still on the Africa Subcommittee. I have been the chairman of it for half that time. I fell in love with it because of Dick Lugar. I have learned more about it, and America is a better country today for its being able to open doors in Africa.

I worked with Dick Lugar on the New START treaty. Dick Lugar was a quiet gentleman, but he was a giant when it came to his ability to solve problems. He was elected as the mayor of Indianapolis, IN, at a time when racial tensions were at their height. He was one of the most successful mayors in the history of the country. At the particular time that he was elected mayor, he was the most respected mayor in the country. He received awards that designated him the best mayor in America.

He was a man who held on to hope, who held on to opportunity, and fought for equality at whatever risk there was to him to see to it that it happened in his city. Later, he went on to be elected to the Indiana Legislature and then was elected to the U.S. Senate. He was the longest serving Senator from Indiana in the history of the U.S. Senate.

As I said, I served on his committee with him, Foreign Relations, but I also served at the time that Dick got beaten. You wouldn't think a guy who had served six terms in the Senate and who had been a Republican would get beaten in his own primary by the Republican Party, but it happened to us. I know the Acting President pro tempore remembers those times a few years ago when our party kind of got divided. We had tea parties and other types of parties, and people started picking on folks. All of a sudden, it was a bad thing to have served for a long time. It was a bad thing to have been a gentle giant. It was a bad thing to have been a guy like Dick Lugar. So they got some new blood in to shake the place up, and they beat Dick in the primary. It was one of the saddest days I ever had to see. A man who had accomplished so much and who was so great got beaten over things that were really inconsequential—over political rhetoric. It was just to win a point of view, not to win a case.

I went to Dick after it was over, and I said: Dick, I am so sorry you lost.

He said: Don't worry about it. I have lots to do. I have The Lugar Center. I have the Lugar-Nunn initiative.

Sam Nunn was the great Senator from the State of Georgia who, many years ago, held the seat I have. He and Dick Lugar did more for nuclear nonproliferation than any two men in the history of our country. Dick's fingerprints are on every positive nuclear deal we have ever made in this country. President Barack Obama gave him the Congressional Medal of Honor because of his efforts on behalf of peace. His efforts were on behalf of the country and nuclear nonproliferation.

Sam Nunn and Dick Lugar dismantled most of the loose nukes that were lying on the floor of the Soviet Union when the wall fell in Berlin. In the years after that time, he saw to it that they were disposed of properly rather than their having gotten into the hands of some terrorist who would have made a dirty bomb later on. Dick Lugar did all of that for his country.

He loved his 604-acre farm back home in Indiana—his family home—which he still ran until the day he died. It was where he served as not a visiting professor but as a real professor and not as an adjunct professor but as a real professor. It was where he talked about peace, love, hope, and humanity. Most importantly of all, he talked about people solving the problems of the world by working together and not against each other.

I don't know that I will ever know a better man than Dick Lugar. I am a little younger than Dick, although not by that much. I haven't served nearly as long in this body as he had. Yet, in all of the time I have been here and from all of the things I have read about great Members of the Senate and of the ones I have known, like Sam Nunn from Georgia, I have never known one better than Dick Lugar.

As a tribute to Dick—and just so you will know, the New START treaty is coming up for renewal in the next couple of years. The New START treaty is the treaty by which we broke the ice on inspecting and verifying nuclear warheads. Because of what Dick Lugar and Sam Nunn did and because of what we did in the Foreign Relations Committee in the negotiations for that, along with John Kerry and others, we saw to it that we got no notice of inspections in the Soviet Union and no notice of inspections in America of our nuclear warheads.

In 12 hours, we can get somebody to Moscow. We can knock on the door of the nuclear storage facility and say: We are coming in. When we go in, we can scan the hologram on the nuclear warhead—it is part of the treaty—which is embedded so you can count the warheads. A lot of these nuclear warheads are not comprised of just 1 bomb—they have 12 or 15. It is so we will know exactly what they have and so they will know exactly what we have.

Knowledge is power. Dick saw to it that we had the knowledge of what we had and what they had before we got in trouble rather than to have an altercation and then a threat and have to say that we really didn't know what they had or what we had and then to have to start overcompensating. The next thing you know, we would be overcompensating with war when we start living the lies unnecessarily—when we do the wrong thing.

When I go down my checklist one of these days of all of those great people I had the chance to know, of the people I learned so much from, of the people I appreciated were around when I got to

live so my kids could grow up in a world that was freer and more prosperous and more safe than any world possible, I will know Dick Lugar was my friend. I will know I had the honor of serving with him.

To Dick's family, to his many friends in Washington, to the people of the State of Indiana who felt blessed just by having him so long, Dick lived a great life.

God bless you. Thank you for your service.

God bless the United States of America and Dick Lugar.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Georgia, who just gave us some great memories about Dick Lugar—one of the truly great Senators who served here in the last half century. He was a friend and was someone whom so many of us looked up to.

One of the things he did that was special to Ohio was that he became totally devoted to his college, Denison University. He served on the board until his death. He was the longest serving board member ever, I am sure. He not only served on the board, but he showed up. Denison University, which is in my State of Ohio, is very grateful for his service, and as a neighbor from Indiana, again, I miss him, and I appreciate him.

REMEMBERING JOSEPH H. HEAD, JR.

Mr. President, I am here to take a moment to pay honor to a mentor of mine who was also one of the great Ohioans, Joseph H. Head, Jr., who was known for his leadership, for his unwavering loyalty to his city of Cincinnati, OH—my hometown—for his vision, and for all of his contributions. He was a tireless contributor to our community. In fact, I would describe Joe as a kind of one-person chamber of commerce for Greater Cincinnati. He loved his city, and he loved to help young people. I was a beneficiary of that.

I first met Joe when I was either in junior high school or just getting into high school. As usual, he was very direct. He came up to me and asked me about my future. I had no idea what my future was going to be.

He asked: Have you ever been to a law firm?

I said: No, I have not.

None of my family had been lawyers, and I hadn't had any experience with that.

He said: Why don't you borrow a tie from your father and come down to my law firm.

What do you say to that?

So I said: Yes, I will do that.

I remember I was a little intimidated, but I went downtown with my tie on—it was a little bit long for me—and I had an interesting visit with Joe Head.

Then, when I was in college, Joe Head gave me my first job in politics. It was an internship with then-Congressman Bill Gradison. Joe Head had been the chairman of his efforts and suggested that I work for him.

Bill Gradison was a Republican from my hometown, and 16 years later, I succeeded him in Congress. Trust me, I had no clue that I was going to do that at the time I interned for him, but that door was opened by Joe Head.

I went on to practice international trade law after going to law school. Again, a lot of that was because of Joe Head, being exposed to the law through him. I then came back to Cincinnati and worked in his law firm, Graydon Head & Ritchey, where he was managing partner.

Lo and behold, George H.W. Bush got elected President and asked me to come to Washington to work in the White House as Associate Counsel to the President. Joe Head encouraged me to do that, but he also encouraged me to come home when I was done. In fact, at the farewell party sending me off to Washington from the law firm, there was a large card that was presented to me, and Joe Head wrote on that card: "Come home when you are done." That was great advice, maybe some of the best advice I ever took, because I did go home, went back to the law firm, and became a partner in that law firm.

I had not expected to run for Congress, but, again, Bill Gradison had resigned unexpectedly, and Joe Head, of course, chaired my campaign.

He was a guy who didn't just benefit people like me; he benefited everybody in Greater Cincinnati because he was so involved throughout his life.

In 2016, he and his wife Louise were honored with the Jake Davis Award from the Greater Cincinnati Foundation. That is a big deal. It is an annual award given to only one community-minded citizen or couple who volunteer their time and leadership skills to make Greater Cincinnati a better place to live and to work. Joe certainly lived up to that.

Just a couple months ago, Joe also received another big honor, and that was the highest honor of the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce called the Great Living Cincinnati Award. I had the honor of being there to watch him receive that award. He received it for his community service, his leadership, and his lifetime of helping others in the community—all of his distinguished accomplishments.

Joe also served his country. Prior to his service to our community, he served in Germany with the U.S. Army's artillery division for a couple of years. He also had the Midas touch in law and in business, both as the

managing partner at the Graydon Head & Ritchey law firm and then as CEO and chairman of the Atkins & Pearce company, an industrial textile business.

His active service on area boards was where he really distinguished himself. I got into the habit of just calling him Chairman because he chaired everything. He chaired the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, the Children's Home of Greater Cincinnati, the Christ Hospital Board, the Fine Arts Fund for Cincinnati, and the Cincinnati Business Committee. I know I have missed a number of entities, institutions, and nonprofits he chaired. The point is, no one was a bigger booster or bigger contributor to our community.

I think I can speak for a lot of people when I say that we are going to miss his dedication, his humor, his wisdom, and his uncanny ability to articulate and define issues. He was an impressive leader, a dear friend, and a truly great Cincinnatian.

To his extraordinary wife, Louise, of 60 years; to his children, Lisa, Jeb, and Andy, and their spouses, Nirvani, Jack, and Melanie; to his grandchildren and his one great-grandchild, Jane and I send our condolences. We are thinking about you. Joe was so proud of each and every one of you.

May we all endeavor to embrace Joe's extraordinary commitment to his community and carry on his profound legacy.

Godspeed, Joe Head.

Mr. President, I would now like to yield to my colleague from Delaware who has just come to the floor, and I would like to speak after him.

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

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

STAFF SERGEANT CHRISTOPHER A. SLUTMAN

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend and colleague from Ohio for his kindness in yielding to me today.

I rise this afternoon to pay tribute to an American hero—this man right here—an American hero and patriot who was taken away from us far too soon.

Earlier last month, I was standing on the flight line at Dover Air Force Base alongside Congresswoman LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER; our colleague in the Senate, CHRIS COONS; and our Governor, John Carney. We were there to join the members of three families who had come to receive the remains of their loved ones, all marines who had been killed in action on April 8—a couple weeks earlier—when a roadside bomb went off in Afghanistan near Kabul as their convey was passing through.

Two of the servicemembers killed were Active Duty: Cpl Robert A. Hendriks of Long Island, NY, and SSgt Benjamin S. Hines of York County, PA, which is not too far from my State of Delaware.

There was a third marine, SSgt Christopher Slutman. Christopher was a reservist, a 15-year member of the

New York City Fire Department, and a Delawarean. The 43-year-old U.S. marine was also a loving husband to his wife, Shannon, and the father of three girls: McKenna, age 10; Kenley, age 8; and Weslynn, age 4.

In life and in death, Staff Sergeant Slutman epitomized the best of this country. He selflessly put his life on the line to protect and serve his country and his community.

We read in the New Testament these words, and I will paraphrase them: No greater love hath a man than his willingness to lay down his life for a friend.

These three marines laid down their lives for our country, and they also laid down their lives for a nation we are allied with, the government and the people of Afghanistan.

Winston Churchill said a lot of memorable things, but one of the most memorable to me, a retired Navy captain, is that a reservist is twice a citizen. A reservist is twice a citizen.

By that measure, Christopher Slutman was three times a citizen. He wore two uniforms in service to our Nation. One of them was this uniform, the fire department—a 15-year, decorated veteran of the New York City Fire Department—and also that of a staff sergeant of the U.S. Marines, serving in the 25th Marine Regiment, 4th Marine Division in the Marine Forces Reserve, which is based in Harrisburg, PA.

Christopher's family calls him Chris. Chris had always dreamed of being a firefighter. He grew up in Maryland. He graduated from Frederick Douglass High School, where he played football, basketball, wrestled, and achieved Eagle Scout status. As a father of two Eagle Scouts, that is quite an achievement. Eventually, he volunteered with fire departments in Maryland and in Washington, DC. Most recently, he spent his time between the Bronx and Wilmington, DE, where his wife and three daughters lived full time.

As my colleagues know, I live in Delaware, and I commute to work here by train almost every day—3, maybe 4 days a week. Christopher Slutman had a similar kind of commute. His family was in Delaware, and instead of coming this way, he would go north to work as a firefighter in New York City. He took the train in the opposite direction to do his job. He so wanted to serve that he would travel from his home in Delaware to Ladder Company 27 in New York City almost every day. In fact, he was on military leave from Ladder Company 27 and nearing the end of his most recent deployment with the Marine Reserves in Afghanistan when he and his two comrades lost their lives.

It was for Chris Slutman's work in the Bronx that in 2014 he won the Fire Chiefs Association Memorial Medal for rescuing an unconscious woman from the 11th floor of a high-rise apartment building. I heard a firsthand account of that rescue, and it tells the story of a hero and a woman who could easily have died, and she didn't, and it was

because of his actions. Staff Sergeant Slutman lived that kind of profound love. He dedicated his life to serving others even at his own peril.

It seems that this kind of selflessness and devotion to service was a hallmark of the Slutman household. Staff Sergeant Slutman is survived by three brothers. One of his brothers is in the Marines, another is in the Army, and the third is a firefighter in Washington, DC—right here. Their father was an Army veteran and was also a volunteer firefighter, as was Chris Slutman's mother. What a family—Marines, Army, volunteer firefighters, firefighters up in New York City. I like to say leadership is leading by example. Leaders lead by example. It is not do as we say, but do as we do. They provide an incredible example for all of us.

Last Friday, I was honored to have been able to join our Governor, John Carney, and Staff Sergeant Slutman's family, friends, and fellow servicemembers in New York City to pay our respects, along with the mayor of New York City and many other dignitaries who were there to pay their respects to a man who gave his life for this country.

The first speaker at his funeral was Marine SgtMaj Christopher Armstrong—another Christopher—who served alongside his friend Chris for 8 years. Marine Sergeant Major Armstrong remembered Chris Slutman with these words. Here is what Christopher Armstrong had to say:

Upon joining the unit, I began observing the Marines; who they watched, how they looked at their leaders, and what they said. There were a small number of men that when they spoke, silence fell; when they issued an order, the response was immediate; and when they were looked upon, it was with reverence. Christopher Slutman immediately stood out as a leader who was both respected and admired. He didn't pound his chest, he didn't try to impress or go on about what he was going to do. He just did it.

He just did it.

Sergeant Major Armstrong continued:

Chris Slutman placed his Marines' welfare before his own. Chris never sought credit, but he always gave it.

Think about that. That is a good lesson for all of us, even here. Chris Slutman never sought credit; he always gave it to others.

Fire Department New York Commissioner Dan Nigro also spoke. He described Chris Slutman as "the type of American we can all be proud of." He continued: "Chris was a protector of those in danger and a defender to those who needed him, a rescuer to those who needed saving, and a leader who demonstrated his valor on every tour of duty, both here and abroad." Those are the words of the Commissioner of the New York City Fire Department.

I believe there was a poet named Edgar Guest—like a house guest—Edgar Guest. I think he spent most of his life in Detroit, MI. He was often-times referred as a people's poet. He

used to say: "I'd rather see a sermon than hear one any day." Think about that. "I'd rather see a sermon than hear one any day."

Chris Slutman, your life was better than any sermon.

Chris demonstrated the absolute best of our country every day with his heroism and his service to others. The way he lived his life and the way he give his life is a language that is clear to one and all.

It is with a heavy heart that I, along with the entire First State—that is the State of Delaware—and the people of this country, offer our sincere condolences to Chris's wife, Shannon, and their three girls. Their dad is an American hero.

Our congressional delegation and our Governor promise that he will not soon be forgotten.

I know that his legacy lives on in his daughters and in his wife Shannon.

A friend of mine was married to a Navy SEAL a number of years ago. That marriage produced a daughter who is 18 years old and who will graduate from high school later this month. Her dad died of complications of PTSD. He served in Iraq and Afghanistan, as I recall. He later came down with ALS, Lou Gehrig's disease. He succumbed to that about a year ago. Members of my staff in Delaware—constituent service staff—have worked for months trying to make sure that his 18-year-old daughter would be eligible for the benefits of her Navy SEAL dad, now deceased. We learned last month that she will be eligible.

One of the things our congressional delegation will work hard to do is to make sure that to the extent that Chris Slutman was eligible for the GI bill—and our guess is that he was—those benefits, under the law, if not used by the veteran, by the soldier, by the sailor, or by the airman, could be used by the spouse, and if not used by the spouse, could be used by a dependent child.

There are three dependent children here—three daughters who are beautiful girls, who anyone would be proud to claim as their own child, grandchild, or niece. We are going to work hard to make sure that those GI bill benefits—if there is any way to do this legally—accrue to Chris and Shannon and Shannon's three daughters.

I, again, thank my friend Senator PORTMAN for his kindness in yielding tonight.

To Chris Slutman: God bless you, Chris.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, first, I say thanks to my colleague from Delaware for the touching tribute to Chris and his service in the U.S. Navy.

I am here to talk about our economy, what is going on out there, and how we can do a better job of bringing people

off the sidelines and into work. They are needed.

Right now we have an incredibly strong economy. We just learned in the first quarter of this year that the economy grew by 3.2 percent. That is strong and way above expectations. In fact, when you look at the expectations that were set by the Congressional Budget Office, which is a nonpartisan group that analyzes what is going to happen in the economy going forward, prior to the tax bill being signed into law—that is, the tax reform and tax cuts from the end of 2017—they said this first quarter growth would be 1.6 percent. It is interesting. It was exactly twice the economic growth than was projected before the tax bill.

By the way, before the tax bill, they also made a projection on jobs. Over the last year, we have produced just about exactly twice as many jobs—a little more than that—than was projected. The tax cuts and the tax reform have worked, along with regulatory relief, to give this economy a shot in the arm. That is so important.

I will say that when you look at what happened in the first quarter of this year, the 3.2 percent is great, but it would have been even better had we not shut down the government. I say that because we have some new numbers from the Congressional Budget Office that say that the level of GDP this first quarter would have been 0.2 percent more if we had not had the government shutdown late last year, which was the longest government shutdown in the history of our country. So it would have been 3.6 percent instead of 3.2 percent. Wow, that would be terrific. I guess I bring that up only because I think it is time for us, again, to prepare for the potential of our having another impasse year at the end of this fiscal year on September 30. I hope we will avoid going into another government shutdown. It just doesn't make sense. It is shooting ourselves in the foot.

There is legislation called the End Government Shutdowns Act. Almost all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have now sponsored that legislation. It just avoids our going into a shutdown but still allows us to continue to move forward on our spending and, over time, reduce that spending until we get our act together and do the appropriations bills here. Again, there is good news in terms of job growth in the first quarter.

The other thing I think is really important and may be the most important statistic of all is the fact that wages are going up for the first time in a decade. Really, in Ohio, for a decade and a half, we have had flat wages—higher expenses but flat wages. It is really frustrating to the families who are working hard and doing everything right but can't get ahead. Over the last year now, we have seen wage increases. A 3.4-percent wage increase is the strongest we have seen since the great recession. I love the fact that this wage

growth is happening not just among higher paid individuals but, actually, primarily among what is called non-supervisory employees. That is how the Department of Labor terms it. These are blue-collar jobs. These are middle-class jobs. These are jobs of people who, again, have had a tough time making ends meet. I know in my State most people work paycheck to paycheck, and it is great to have that higher wage come in.

We passed tax reform because we believed it is the right thing to do for our economy, for employers, for investment, and we have seen that positive impact. I have had over two dozen townhall meetings and roundtable discussions in my State, talking to employers, usually smaller businesses, about what happened to them with regard to tax reform. Every single one of them said the same thing: We have reinvested in the business. We have invested in technology, in new equipment, and we have invested in our people. In some cases, that means better benefits. In two cases, small businesses acknowledged to me that they weren't providing healthcare before the tax cuts, and now they are because of the savings from the tax cut. They have also invested in people's 401(k)s and other benefits. That is what is happening out there in terms of the business side of the tax reform and tax cuts.

In addition to that, there are also a lot of Americans who now have more of their hard-earned money coming home. Their paychecks are better because of the middle-class tax cuts that are in the legislation. For Ohio, this amounted to \$2,000 per year, on average, for a median-income family. I know there has been a lot of discussion by others saying: Well, really, these tax cuts didn't happen. Yes, they did. They did. That is a fact. Most people I represent have seen a tax cut, and a lot of those individuals saw their overall tax liability go down—not just that the monthly checks were better, but on April 15 they had better news. Let me give you some facts about that.

According to H&R Block, which is probably the firm that handles more middle-class tax returns than any other firm in the country, the average Ohioan saw a 23.3-percent decrease in their overall tax bill in 2018. This is from H&R Block. They also said that there is a 2.3-percent increase in the average refund in Ohio. I know there has been a lot of discussion about this back and forth, and early on people were concerned about their refunds. These are the numbers. These are the facts from H&R Block. Overall, about 90 percent of middle-class Americans received a tax cut in 2018, which means more money in their pockets to pay down student debt, to save for retirement, to take a long-awaited family vacation, and to be able to, again, achieve whatever their dream is in life.

The economy is growing, creating jobs, and wages are rising. That is all

good news. But with more jobs there is a problem that has developed, and that is a lack of workers. I can't go anywhere in Ohio—and I just had a bunch of meetings in Ohio, talking about this—where people don't tell me: We don't have enough qualified workers to fill the jobs that we have. Some people call it the skills gap, and that is true in Ohio. We have a mismatch between the skills that are out there—the skills that people who are looking for jobs have—and the jobs that are available. If you go on the OhioMeansJobs website right now, you will see about 145,000 jobs being offered. When you look at them, these are good jobs. A lot of them, though, require a certain level of skill. Some are information technology jobs, coding jobs. Some are skilled manufacturing jobs, like machining or welding. Some of the jobs are in bioscience, healthcare jobs, technicians. The problem is we don't have the people who have the skills to fill those jobs. That is a shame for those individuals who aren't achieving their hopes in life because they aren't getting those good jobs and certainly for our economy, which would be even stronger if we had more people to fill those jobs.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics at the Department of Labor, 7.3 million U.S. jobs are currently vacant, again, largely because of the shortage of qualified workers. The National Skills Coalition estimates that nearly half of all job openings between now and 2022 will be what they call middle-skill jobs. This means jobs that require education beyond high school, like a certificate program, but not a 4-year degree. The supply of skilled workers in this category—students pursuing post high school certifications—still falls way short of what the industry demand is.

This is why career and technical education is important. CTE is part of the answer to this. If you are in high school and looking for an opportunity, check out your career and technical academy. In many high schools, it is combined in one CTE program. It is a great opportunity. It will give you the knowledge and training necessary to succeed in your career.

I am the cofounder and the cochair of what is called the Senate CTE Caucus. We have been working to raise awareness of this issue, so many of my colleagues have now joined this caucus because they go home and see the same thing. How do we connect our hard-working Ohioans to good-paying jobs, and how do we strengthen these CTE programs to make them more affordable and more accessible?

One answer is legislation recently introduced by Senator TIM KAINE and me. It is called the JOBS Act. It is really very simple. It says we should be allowed to use Pell grants not just to pay for college but to pay for shorter term certificate programs. These have to be qualified programs, programs that provide real credentials to people.

Right now, with the Pell grant, if it is a program of less than 15 weeks, you can't use it. So low-income students all over the country are told: You can go to college. That is great. We are going to encourage you to do that, incentivize you to do that, but you can't get this short-term training program that can get you the job right away.

In Ohio, if those students graduate—and most don't—their average debt is \$27,000 compared, again, to the opportunity to go through the short-term training program, get the job, and begin to make money to buy the car, to be able to buy a small home or at least to rent an apartment and not be in your parents' basement, and to be able to move ahead with your life and your family. So career and technical education is a great opportunity, and the JOBS Act would make it much more likely that people would take that opportunity.

By the way, the community colleges around the country love the JOBS Act. I believe it is their top priority this year. Why? Because so many of them are now offering these certificate-based programs because they are responding to the needs of the community and what the businesses are telling them they need.

It is going to be different in every community, by the way, and that is good. There is no "one size fits all." In some communities in Ohio, because we are a big manufacturing State, it is welding, and it is machining. In other places around the country, it might be something else. It might be for the fishing industry, the oil and gas industry, or bioscience. All across Ohio I have seen how these programs are working and could work even better if we had the JOBS Act.

Last week I toured Venture Products. It is a family-owned company that designs and makes tractors. They make an incredible product called the Ventrac. They have a really impressive facility, and it was great to see them and their success. The company has benefited from tax reform and has made additional investments in its business and its workers with their tax savings, just like all of these companies that I have gone to visit all over our State.

After the tour of the company, we had a roundtable discussion. It was with educators—people from the local community college and career and technical education folks who came in—also business people and people from the area who were involved in economic development because they are very concerned that without the workforce they can't expand the businesses in this community in Ohio. We talked about the need to strengthen CTE programs, and we talked about the JOBS Act. All of them agreed that this would be really helpful and helpful right now.

I also had a visit at the Central Ohio Technical College. The investiture

ceremony took place last Thursday, and I had the chance to meet the new president, Dr. John Berry. There are a lot of exciting things happening at this career and technical college.

They work pretty closely with Ohio State, which is terrific. So you have Ohio State, a 4-year college, and a great series of graduate programs, working directly with these community colleges that focus on skills training. They are expanding their programming, which will help to meet the needs of today's workforce. The JOBS Act, according to them, will greatly benefit the students who are using these shorter term programs to put them on a path to a good-paying job.

In Walnut Creek, OH, I spoke at the Eastern Ohio Development Alliance's annual meeting in Hockley County. This meeting represented counties from all over eastern and southeastern Ohio. We talked about a lot of things, including the shortage of skilled workers, because it comes up again and again. In this case, Ohio has this wonderful opportunity with the Marcellus and the Utica Shale finds to develop our natural gas and our wet gas and our oil industry, but they need workers. We don't want to have workers coming in from out of State, frankly. We want to develop our own Ohio workforce, and we can only do that with skills training because a lot of these jobs require skills that are not available in Ohio today.

In Columbus, last week I spoke at a reentry conference. This is an annual conference talking about how to get people going from prison into our communities with the job skills they need and the mental health and drug treatment they need to be successful. Again, it all came down to this issue of workforce training being so important, both because it helps people to get a job and not go back into the prison system and also because getting a job is an essential part of so many successful recovery programs for people who have drug and alcohol addiction and want to be able to participate in our economy. This gives them meaning and purpose in life and helps with their recovery.

I was in Knox County at a roundtable discussion. Again, in this case, it was with first responders, local elected officials, and the leadership of their mental health and recovery organization there. Their board there is focused on dealing with the crystal meth problem. It has almost pushed the opioid problem to the second most troubling drug problem in the community. They still have overdoses from opioids. They are still concerned about that. Crystal meth has now come in with a vengeance—pure crystal meth from Mexico. Their big issue is how to get people in recovery and successful recovery. Again, the issue of job training came up. How do you give people the skills they need to get a job, and how do you incorporate job skills in a recovery program, again, so people have a reason to turn their life around to get

back with their family. That purpose and meaning come from a job, so often.

So it was an opportunity to talk about the need for us to develop the workforce to meet the needs of our communities and the opportunity to talk about the need for the JOBS Act. I am really pleased that the JOBS Act is in the President's budget this year. I thank President Trump and his administration for including that. It makes all the sense in the world. The higher education bill will be reauthorized this year, we all hope. That is certainly the plan. If that happens, it is the perfect place for having the JOBS Act included.

Senator KAINE of Virginia and I are the coauthors of this legislation. We are hopeful that our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in this legislation and help us to get it in the Higher Education Act. I know that it is a priority of many members of that committee, and Chairman ALEXANDER, in particular, has a passion for ensuring that we have the training we need out there to get people the jobs to let them achieve their dreams in life.

Passing the JOBS Act will give us an opportunity to help so many Americans have better opportunities, and, just as importantly, it would enable us to help our economy right now because the biggest concern I hear is no longer the taxes. People love the tax cuts and tax reform, and they love the regulatory relief, but they are looking for skilled workers. This is an opportunity. Let's seize it. Let's keep growing our economy and help Americans fulfill their God-given potential.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES
SPECIALIST BLAKE KELLY

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to continue my tribute to Nebraska heroes—the men and women who have given their lives defending our freedom in Iraq and Afghanistan. Each of these Nebraskans has a powerful story to tell.

Today I will reflect upon the life of Nebraska Army National Guard SPC Blake Kelly. Blake was a typical smalltown Nebraska boy. Born and raised in Shelby, NE, which has a population of just over 700, Blake lived next to the city park. His parents, Randy and Patty, have lived in the same house for 44 years.

Blake's early life was filled with football, track, lifeguarding at the local swimming pool in the summer, band major duties, and playing the drums. In fact, he met his future wife, Christina, at band practice in 1997. He loved to play the drums, and the neighborhood, well, always knew when he was practicing.

When he was old enough to cruise around Shelby, his dad, Randy, bought him a 1976 Dodge Charger. Every smalltown Nebraska boy needs a car. Blake knew everyone around town and everyone knew him. He was always

happy and eager to help someone solve a problem.

In high school, one of his teachers encouraged him to join the National Guard. For Blake, this was an opportunity to spread his wings and go to college using the Guard's tuition assistance program.

In 2000, between his junior and senior years in high school, he went through Army basic training at Fort Jackson, SC. Before graduation in 2001, he asked Christina to marry him. After becoming engaged and graduating from high school, Blake attended advanced training at Fort Knox, in Kentucky, that included Ranger training. He returned home in September 2001 just as life in the United States was changing forever following the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

Shortly after, Blake enrolled at Southeast Community College in Beatrice to study animal science. There he became interested in rodeo and joined the school's rodeo team. The year 2002 was a busy one for Blake, filled with school, National Guard training with the 1st Squadron, 167th Cavalry, known as the Cav, and wedding planning. He and Christina tied the knot on September 7, 2002, just as the Cav was preparing to deploy to Bosnia.

At that time, early Active-Duty Army resources were devoted to fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq, but the United States still had significant commitments to peacekeeping operations in the Balkans. The Cav's mission was an ideal one for the National Guard and a critical element in our national security.

The Cav arrived in Bosnia in January 2003, and just before Blake left Nebraska with the unit, Christina learned that she was pregnant. In Bosnia, Blake delved into the mission at hand. He was always ready and eager to serve, and he connected well with the local population. Unit chaplains needed help, and so he embraced his Catholic faith even more deeply by becoming a Eucharistic minister and actively supporting chapel programs.

On July 29, 2003, Blake was killed in an accident involving his convoy and a local vehicle. The loss of Blake was the first casualty of a deployed Nebraska Army National Guard member in over a decade. His community and the entire State were shocked.

He was buried at St. Mary's Catholic Church in rural Nebraska on August 6, 2003. The entire town turned out for the funeral, as did freedom riders from throughout Nebraska. Blake's son Simon was born in September 2003, the month the Cav returned home from their deployment.

Today, Simon is a freshman in high school, and Christina maintains a tight relationship with Blake's family. Randy and Patty, his parents, still live in the same house in Shelby.

In 2014, the town of Shelby dedicated a veterans' memorial, and Blake's family played a prominent role in the dedication ceremony. Blake's spirit lives on, and he is remembered in so many ways.

SPC Blake Kelly embodied the pride of his small town and his State. He served his country with distinction, and he loved his family. I am honored to tell his story.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

YEMEN

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a true humanitarian crisis. This is a crisis that is close to my heart, and that is because it is close to the hearts of so many wonderful people in the State of Michigan.

Michigan is home to a large and welcoming Yemeni American community—one of the Nation's largest—and we are so proud and happy that they are part of our community. Right now these Michigan residents are horrified to watch what is happening to a country where many of them have family members and friends.

More than 4 years ago, war broke out in Yemen. Imagine 4 years of going to bed every night, wondering if this will be the night that a bomb or rocket will hit your home and destroy everything you have, including your family; 4 years of being unable to send your children to school because it is simply not safe for them to be outside; 4 years of deadly disease outbreaks with little access to medical care or even safe drinking water; perhaps worst of all, 4 years of sending your children to bed hungry every night because there is simply not enough food.

It is bad enough to think about being a parent under those circumstances. Imagine what it is like to be a child. You are 4 years old. You don't understand what is going on. You just know that you can't go outside, you can't sleep at night, and you are hungry all the time. There are 4-year-olds in Yemen today who have never lived in a country that wasn't at war.

Sadly, there are 4-year-olds in Yemen today who will never see their fifth birthday. About 1.2 million children are living in active conflict zones, meaning that a stray bullet or rocket could end their life at any moment. It is estimated that a child in Yemen dies every 10 minutes—the length of my speaking today on the floor, every 10 minutes—from a lack of food or diseases that can be prevented with adequate medical care, including vaccinations.

Overall, the United Nations estimates that no matter what we do at this moment—no matter what we do—250,000 Yemeni people will die within the next year due to malnutrition, dehydration, and by diseases like cholera.

That is astounding and horrible—250,000 people in addition to the estimated 60,000 people whose lives have been cut short due to bombings and violence.

If you are having trouble picturing 250,000 people, it is as if a fully loaded jumbo jet crashed every day for a year and then kept crashing, one per day, until late August.

If these dire circumstances don't change soon, that number could reach 10 million people by this time next year—10 million people. It is astounding. We should all feel a sense of urgency about the United States playing a positive, not a negative, role in stopping this.

I want to say again that 10 million people could die from a combination of famine, dehydration, and disease. That is like the entire populations of New York City and San Antonio being wiped off the map.

We simply cannot sit by and let this humanitarian disaster continue. I was passed back in March when the Senate passed the bipartisan resolution to direct the U.S. Armed Forces be removed from hostilities in Yemen. I have supported this resolution since the very beginning, the first time it was on the floor. It has been gaining momentum, gaining more and more support from the Senate, and I am thankful that it finally got to the Senate.

Unfortunately, the administration chose to veto the resolution and allow the suffering to continue.

Taking action to end this suffering is more than just the right thing to do; it is our moral obligation as fellow human beings. That is why I am calling on all of the Members in the Chamber, all of the Members in the Senate to stand together to override the veto and end the U.S. support for this conflict. We need a clear strategy on how to take an active role in deescalating the conflict and addressing the accompanying humanitarian crisis.

We should be leading the international response—leading the international response and working with international partners to find a solution, not contributing to the problem.

We should be supporting peace talks that involve all parties, all of which are contributing to this horrible, horrible humanitarian crisis.

We know who not to blame for all of this—those scared and hungry 4-year-olds who have spent every day of their lives just trying to stay alive. Can you imagine how their parents are feeling about this situation that their children are in as well?

Ending this conflict and humanitarian crisis is where we should be focusing our policies and our political might.

I will be voting to override this Presidential veto, and I encourage every Member of the Chamber to join me—join us, together, in doing the right thing. It is time to do the right thing for those 4-year-olds, for all of the people in Yemen who just want to be able

to feed their families, send their children to school, have a safe home, and be able to carry on with their lives.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING DOMINIC DiFRISCO

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in 1962, the airline Alitalia sent a young man named Dominic DiFrisco to Chicago to help with publicity for its inaugural flight between the city and Rome. What was a temporary assignment became a life decision for my friend Dominic. He found a home in Chicago and, in the decades following, became a champion for Chicago's Italian community.

On Sunday, he passed away at the age of 85 after a life of celebration, stories, and love. There are so many stories of Dominic helping people that they are too numerous to count here. If you grew up in Chicago, you knew Dominic.

For decades, Dominic was the most recognized and vocal supporter of Italian Americans. Dominic was born in 1933 in the Bronx of New York City to Leoluca and Antonina, immigrants from Sicily. He graduated from Fordham University in 1955 and began his career in public relations. His career was defined by building bridges between the public and private sectors.

His color commentary, with his vast knowledge of Chicago-Italian history, was a staple during the broadcast of Columbus Day parades. He helped make sure other ethnic groups and Jewish Holocaust victims had roles in the Chicago Columbus Day parade. He was a man of stories. He always had one for any situation, and Columbus Day will not be the same without him.

If you travel a few blocks north of Taylor Street's Little Italy in Chicago, you will find Our Lady of Pompeii, the oldest surviving Italian-American Catholic Church in Chicago. It has been an anchor to the community since 1910, but in 1993, the archdiocese announced

it would close Our Lady of Pompeii. That didn't sit well with the locals, especially Dominic. He joined the effort to resurrect the church, which continues to serve the community today. Our Lady of Pompeii calls him a founding father.

Dominic was president emeritus of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans, and he created and hosted the annual Dante Awards. More than 40 journalists have won Dante Awards for their work answering Dante Alighieri's call to be "no timid friend to truth." Dominic was no timid friend to anyone he knew.

Dominic was a great friend. He was always helping people whether it was a smile, a kind word, or his latest recommendation for an Italian restaurant. His stories were legendary, but his whole life was an extraordinary story. A few years ago, Dominic accepted my invitation to attend a joint session of Congress featuring the Prime Minister of Italy. It is fair to say that many of those in the Capitol that day were as impressed with Dominic's passion for life, his stories, and his hopefulness for the U.S.-Italian relationship as the speech itself.

In a Chicago restaurant called Gene and Georgetti's, there is a table that was Dominic's. It was his court, and now, sadly, it is quiet. To his wife Carol and the DiFrisco family, Loretta and I send our sincere condolences.

CHOOSE MEDICARE ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Choose Medicare Act, which would strengthen the Affordable Care Act and help reduce healthcare costs for all Americans.

This commonsense bill would create a public healthcare option based on Medicare that would increase choice and competition in the Affordable Care Act marketplaces, including California's state exchange, Covered California.

I would also allow the Secretary of Health Human Services to negotiate drug prices under Medicare, increase healthcare subsidies for middle-income Americans, and allow the federal government to block unreasonable health insurance rate increases.

The majority of Americans support expanding healthcare choices to achieve universal coverage and lower costs for everyone. However, too many Americans are still unable to afford a private plan that covers the care they need. The Choose Medicare Act would fix this by creating a public health insurance plan that would compete alongside private insurers in the individual and group insurance marketplaces.

Known as Medicare Part E, the public option health plan would offer comprehensive coverage and all of the benefits covered under traditional Medicare. Every doctor that accepts traditional Medicare would also be enrolled as a provider for the public health plan,

giving patients access to a large network of doctors across the country. It would also benefit employers. Around half of Californians receive their health insurance through their work. The Choose Medicare Act would give them more options, allowing large employers to choose a plan modeled on traditional Medicare for their workers. Just as they do now, employers would cover a portion of the cost of their employees' coverage.

Having access to this new public option would increase competition and choice in the employer market, and the public plan's negotiating power would help reduce health costs for employers, not just individuals. Moreover, our bill would ensure that people who receive their health coverage through the public option would be able to keep their health insurance when they change employers. Americans would no longer feel stuck in low-paying jobs because they are worried about losing their health insurance.

The Choose Medicare Act would also provide funding for a new reinsurance program to partially offset the high healthcare costs paid by insurers for the sickest individuals. This reinsurance program would improve insurer participation in the Affordable Care Act exchanges and lower premiums for everyone. It would also give States the option to use this funding to address high out-of-pocket costs, such as copayments, coinsurance, premiums, and deductibles.

I am proud to note that this bill includes rate review legislation I have previously introduced to help keep insurance premiums down. Rather than allowing American workers to suffer under excessive premium increases, our bill would give the Secretary of Health and Human Services the authority to review, modify, and reject unjustified premium increases in States where the insurance commissioner does not have that authority.

This review process has already been successful in States where it was implemented. Our bill would ensure that everyone, regardless of where they live, is protected from unreasonable premium increases.

The rising cost of drug pricing is also a huge problem in our healthcare system. Our bill would give the Secretary of Health and Human Services the authority to negotiate lower drug prices with manufacturers, reducing the amount patients pay at the pharmacy.

After 1 year of negotiations, if the Secretary and drug manufacturers are unable to agree on a fair price, the Secretary will then be able to use the price that the Department of Veterans Affairs or other Federal agencies that purchase prescription drugs already use.

Finally, our bill would protect America's seniors enrolled in traditional Medicare from unlimited out-of-pocket costs by adding an annual out-of-pocket maximum for what they can pay. Seniors would no longer be burdened

with mounting medical costs because they are enrolled in Medicare instead of private insurance.

I want to thank Senator MERKLEY and Senator MURPHY for leading our efforts on this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this much-needed, common-sense bill to strengthen the Affordable Care Act, give consumers more choices when picking their healthcare plan, and make healthcare more affordable for all.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, on April 30, 2019, the Joint Committee on Printing organized, elected a chair, a vice chair, and adopted committee rules for the 116th Congress. Members of the Joint Committee on Printing elected Representative ZOE LOFGREN as chair and Senator ROY BLUNT as vice chair.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING—116TH CONGRESS

RULE I.—COMMITTEE RULES

(a) The rules of the Senate and House insofar as they are applicable, shall govern the Committee.

(b) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record as soon as possible following the Committee's organizational meeting in each odd-numbered year.

(c) Where these rules require a vote of the members of the Committee, polling of members either in writing or by telephone shall not be permitted to substitute for a vote taken at a Committee meeting, unless the ranking minority member assents to waiver of this requirement.

(d) Proposals for amending Committee rules shall be sent to all members at least one week before final action is taken thereon, unless the amendment is made by unanimous consent.

RULE 2.—REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of every month when the House and Senate are in session. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered and after appropriate notification is made to the ranking minority member. Additional meetings may be called by the Chair, as the Chair may deem necessary or at the request of the majority of the members of the Committee.

(b) If the Chair of the Committee is not present at any meeting of the Committee, the Vice-Chair or Ranking Member of the majority party on the Committee who is present shall preside at the meeting.

RULE 3.—QUORUM

(a) Five members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum, which is required for the purpose of closing meetings, promulgating Committee orders or changing the rules of the Committee.

(b) Three members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE 4.—PROXIES

(a) Written or telegraphic proxies of Committee members will be received and re-

corded on any vote taken by the Committee, except for the purpose of creating a quorum.

(b) Proxies will be allowed on any such votes for the purpose of recording a member's position on a question only when the absentee Committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that the vote be recorded.

RULE 5.—OPEN AND CLOSED MEETINGS

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of business of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call I vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. No such vote shall be required to close a meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(b) No person other than members of the Committee, and such congressional staff and other representatives as they may authorize, shall be present in any business session that has been closed to the public.

RULE 6.—ALTERNATING CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR BY CONGRESSES

(a) The Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee shall alternate between the House and the Senate by Congresses: The senior member of the minority party in the House of Congress opposite of that of the Chair shall be the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(b) In the event the House and Senate are under different party control, the Chair and Vice-Chair shall represent the majority party in their respective Houses. When the Chair and Vice Chair represent different parties, the Vice Chair shall also fulfill the responsibilities of the Ranking Minority Member as prescribed by these rules.

RULE 7.—PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Questions as to the order of business and the procedures of the Committee shall in the first instance be decided by the Chair; subject always to an appeal to the Committee.

RULE 8.—HEARINGS: PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS AND WITNESSES

(a) The Chair, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the Committee, shall make public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the Committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the Chair shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The staff director of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, all witnesses appearing before the Committee shall file advance written statements of their proposed testimony at least 48 hours in advance of their appearance and their oral testimony shall be limited to brief summaries. Limited insertions or additional germane material will be received for the record, subject to the approval of the Chair.

RULE 9.—OFFICIAL HEARING RECORD

(a) An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all Committee proceedings and actions. Brief supplemental materials when required to clarify the transcript may be inserted in the record subject to the approval of the Chair.

(b) Each member of the Committee shall be provided with a copy of the hearing transcript for the purpose of correcting errors of transcription and grammar, and clarifying questions or remarks. If any other person is authorized by a Committee Member to make

his corrections, the staff director shall be so notified.

(c) Members who have received unanimous consent to submit written questions to witnesses shall be allowed two days within which to submit these to the staff director for transmission to the witnesses. The record may be held open for a period not to exceed two weeks awaiting the responses by witnesses.

(d) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee. Testimony received in closed hearings shall not be released or included in any report without the approval of the Committee.

RULE 10.—WITNESSES FOR COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(a) Selection of witnesses for Committee hearings shall be made by the Committee staff under the direction of the Chair. A list of proposed witnesses shall be submitted to the members of the Committee for review sufficiently in advance of the hearings to permit suggestions by the Committee members to receive appropriate consideration.

(b) The Chair shall provide adequate time for questioning of witnesses by all members, including minority Members and the rule of germaneness shall be enforced in all hearings notified.

(c) Whenever a hearing is conducted by the Committee upon any measure or matter, the minority on the Committee shall be entitled, upon unanimous request to the Chair before the completion of such hearings, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

RULE 11.—CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION FURNISHED TO THE COMMITTEE

The information contained in any books, papers or documents furnished to the Committee by any individual, partnership, corporation or other legal entity shall, upon the request of the individual, partnership, corporation or entity furnishing the same, be maintained in strict confidence by the members and staff of the Committee, except that any such information may be released outside of executive session of the Committee if the release thereof is effected in a manner which will not reveal the identity of such individual, partnership, corporation or entity in connection with any pending hearing or as a part of a duly authorized report of the Committee if such release is deemed essential to the performance of the functions of the Committee and is in the public interest.

RULE 12.—BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The rule for broadcasting of Committee hearings shall be the same as Rule XI, clause 4, of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 13.—COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) No Committee report shall be made public or transmitted to the Congress without the approval of a majority of the Committee except when Congress has adjourned: provided that any member of the Committee may make a report supplementary to or dissenting from the majority report. Such supplementary or dissenting reports should be as brief as possible.

(b) Factual reports by the Committee staff may be printed for distribution to Committee members and the public only upon authorization of the Chair either with the approval of a majority of the Committee or with the consent of the Ranking Minority Member.

RULE 14.—CONFIDENTIALITY OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

No summary of a Committee report, prediction of the contents of a report, or state-

ment of conclusions concerning any investigation shall be made by a member of the Committee or by any staff member of the Committee prior to the issuance of a report of the Committee.

RULE 15.—COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The Committee shall have a staff director, selected by the Chair. The staff director shall be an employee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate.

(b) The Ranking Minority Member may designate an employee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate as the minority staff director.

(c) The staff director, under the general supervision of the Chair, is authorized to deal directly with agencies of the Government and with non-Government groups and individuals on behalf of the Committee.

(d) The Chair or staff director shall timely notify the Ranking Minority Member or the minority staff director of decisions made on behalf of the Committee.

RULE 16.—COMMITTEE CHAIR

The Chair of the Committee may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee. Specifically, the Chair is authorized, during the interim periods between meetings of the Committee, to act on all requests submitted by any executive department, independent agency, temporary or permanent commissions and committees of the Federal Government, the Government Publishing Office and any other Federal entity, pursuant to the requirements of applicable Federal law and regulations.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BLUNT, Mr. President, on April 30, 2019, the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library organized, elected a chair, a vice chair, and adopted committee rules for the 116th Congress. Members of the Joint Committee on the Library elected Senator Roy Blunt as chair and Representative Zoe Lofgren as vice chair.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY—116TH CONGRESS

TITLE I—MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. Regular meetings may be called by the Chair, with the concurrence of the Vice Chair, as may be deemed necessary or pursuant to the provision of paragraph 3 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2. Meetings of the committee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by the committee on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in subparagraphs (A) through (F) would require the meeting to be closed followed immediately by a recorded vote in open session by a majority of the members of the committee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(A) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(B) will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedures;

(C) will tend to charge an individual with a crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy of an individual;

(D) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interest of effective law enforcement;

(E) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(1) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(F) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under the provisions of law or Government regulation. (Paragraph 5(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.)

3. Written notices of committee meetings will normally be sent by the committee's staff director to all members at least 3 days in advance. In addition, the committee staff will email or telephone reminders of committee meetings to all members of the committee or to the appropriate staff assistants in their offices.

4. A copy of the committee's intended agenda enumerating separate items of committee business will normally be sent to all members of the committee by the staff director at least 1 day in advance of all meetings. This does not preclude any member of the committee from raising appropriate non-agenda topics.

5. Any witness who is to appear before the committee in any hearing shall file with the clerk of the committee at least 3 business days before the date of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and an executive summary thereof, in such form as the Chair may direct, unless the Chair waived such a requirement for good cause.

TITLE II—QUORUMS

1. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(1) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 4 members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

2. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(2) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 2 members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony; provided, however, once a quorum is established, any one member can continue to take such testimony.

3. Under no circumstance may proxies be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

TITLE III—VOTING

1. Voting in the committee on any issue will normally be by voice vote.

2. If a third of the members present so demand, a recorded vote will be taken on any question by roll call.

3. The results of the roll call votes taken in any meeting upon a measure, or any amendment thereto, shall be stated in the committee report on that measure unless previously announced by the committee, and such report or announcement shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor and the votes cast in opposition to each measure and amendment by each member of the committee. (Paragraph 7(b) and (c) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

4. Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures and matters before the committee. However, the vote of the committee to report a measure or matters shall require the concurrence of a majority of the members of the committee who are physically present at the time of the vote. Proxies will be allowed in such cases solely for the purpose of recording a member's position on the question and then only in those instances when the absentee committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that the vote be recorded. (Paragraph 7(a)(3) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

TITLE IV—DELEGATION AND AUTHORITY TO THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

1. The Chair and Vice Chair are authorized to sign all necessary vouchers and routine papers for which the committee's approval is required and to decide in the committee's behalf on all routine business.

2. The Chair is authorized to engage commercial reporters for the preparation of transcripts of committee meetings and hearings.

3. The Chair is authorized to issue, on behalf of the committee, regulations normally promulgated by the committee at the beginning of each session.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION BUDGET REQUEST

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my opening statement at the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development be printed in the RECORD.

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

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION BUDGET REQUEST

Mr. ALEXANDER. We run a real risk of losing our best source of carbon-free power just at a time when most Americans are increasingly worried about climate change. Nuclear power must be part of our energy future if we want clean, cheap, and reliable energy that can create good jobs and keep America competitive in a global economy.

Today 98 nuclear reactors provide about 20 percent of electricity in the United States, and 60 percent of all carbon-free electricity in the United States. But nuclear plants are closing because they cost too much to build and cannot compete with natural gas. Two reactors have announced they will retire later this year, and ten more have announced retirements by 2025.

Let's do a little math here. If we closed those 12 reactors, that would mean a 17 percent decline in carbon-free nuclear power by 2025, which is 10 percent of carbon-free electricity. Today, solar power—despite impressive reductions in cost—provides 4 percent and wind provides 20 percent of carbon-free electricity despite billions of dollars in subsidies. To replace those 12 reactors that have announced they will close with other carbon-free electricity, we would have to almost triple the entirety of U.S. solar power or increase wind power by another 50 percent. If

half of our existing nuclear reactors were to close, we would have to double the amount of wind energy produced and or increase the amount of solar energy produced by as much as 10 times.

Nuclear power is much more reliable than solar or wind power. It is available when the sun doesn't shine and the wind doesn't blow. The bottom line is, we can't replace nuclear power with just wind and solar. We would have to use natural gas to replace nuclear power, which would increase emissions in our country.

Unfortunately, we do not need to speculate about what happens when a major industrialized country eliminates nuclear power. We have seen what happened in Japan and Germany for different reasons. Major industrialized economies similar to ours lost their emission-free, low-cost, reliable electricity. Prices went up, pollution went up, and manufacturing became less competitive in the global marketplace. And that is where we are headed in the next 10 years if we do not do something. Stakes are high.

In Japan, the cost of generating electricity increased 56 percent after the Fukushima accident in 2011 when Japan went from obtaining 30 percent of its power from nuclear to less than 2 percent.

Before 2011, Germany obtained one quarter of its electricity from nuclear. Now that number is down to 12 percent. Now Germany has among the highest household electricity rates in the European Union after replacing nuclear power with wind and solar as part of an expensive cap-and-trade policy. Germany also had to build new coal plants to meet demand, which increased emissions.

In late March, I proposed that the United States should launch a New Manhattan Project for Clean Energy, a five-year project with Ten Grand Challenges that will use American research and technology to put our country and the world firmly on a path toward cleaner, cheaper energy.

These Grand Challenges call for breakthroughs in advanced nuclear reactors, natural gas, carbon capture, better batteries, greener buildings, electric vehicles, cheaper solar, and fusion.

I put advanced reactors first on the list for a reason. To make sure nuclear power has a future in this country, we need to develop advanced reactors that have the potential to be smaller, cost less, produce less waste, and be safer than today's reactors.

We need to stop talking about advanced reactors and actually build something. Within the next five years, we need to build one or more advanced reactors to demonstrate the capabilities they may bring.

As we review the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's fiscal year 2020 budget request we need to make sure the Commission has the staff and resources it needs to respond to the changing industry.

First, I would like to thank our witnesses for being here today, and also Senator FEINSTEIN, with whom I have the pleasure to work again this year to draft the Energy and Water Appropriations bill. Our witnesses today include: Kristine Svinicki, Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; Commissioner Jeff Baran; Commissioner Annie Caputo; and Commissioner David Wright.

Commissioner Stephen Burns retired yesterday after forty years of distinguished service at the NRC. He started as an attorney in 1978, rose to General Counsel, and then retired from the agency to head Legal Affairs at the Nuclear Energy Agency in Paris. He returned to the NRC in 2014 as a Commissioner and Chairman. He was well respected in every position he held. I would like to thank him for his many years of service.

We're here today to review the administration's fiscal year 2020 budget request for the

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the independent federal agency responsible for regulating the safety of our nation's 98 commercial nuclear power plants and other civilian uses of nuclear material.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission's budget request this fiscal year is \$921 million, which is about \$10 million less than Congress provided last year. The request includes \$38.5 million for the Yucca Mountain licensing process.

It has become increasingly difficult for the nuclear industry to compete with other sources of electricity, especially natural gas. One of the concerns the industry had was the amount of regulatory fees charged by the Commission—currently, \$760 million of the Commission's budget comes from fees paid by utilities and other facilities that are licensed to possess and use nuclear materials.

So over the last five fiscal years, we have worked with the Commission to reduce its overall budget by about \$100 million, which represents about a 10 percent reduction in budget—which means a roughly 10 percent reduction in fees—and more closely reflects its actual workload while maintaining its gold standard of safety.

These savings are important because they lower the fees utilities must pay the Commission, and these savings can be passed on to utilities' customers. These reductions have not been arbitrary and represent the type of oversight the Senate is supposed to do. Our subcommittee has only reduced the Commission's budget in areas that the Commission has identified as unnecessary to its important safety mission.

To ensure nuclear power will continue to play a significant role in our nation's electricity generation, I'd like to focus my remarks on four main areas:

- (1) Licensing small modular and advanced reactors;
- (2) Solving the nuclear waste stalemate;
- (3) Safely extending licenses for existing reactors; and
- (4) Maintaining adequate staffing at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Advanced reactors and small modular reactors represent the future of nuclear power. The Commission needs to be ready to review applications for new these new reactors. In fiscal year 2017, we provided enough funding to complete the Small Modular Reactor Licensing Technical Support program at the Department of Energy. NuScale, which was one of the technologies selected in that program, filed an application for design certification of a small modular reactor with the Commission in December of 2016. A utility group has been working with NuScale and Idaho National Laboratory to build and demonstrate a small modular reactor in Idaho. TVA also has an application under review for a permit to build and demonstrate a small modular reactor at the Clinch River site in Tennessee.

Licenses to build and demonstrate small modular reactors is an important step, and we need to make sure the Commission has the resources it needs to review the applications. I also understand that the Commission expects to receive an application in fiscal year 2020 for a construction and operating license for an advanced, non-light water reactor.

The fiscal year 2019 appropriations bill included \$10 million for the Commission to prepare to review advanced reactor designs, and the current budget request includes \$15.5 million for fiscal year 2020. I'd like to know what the Commission plans to do with the funding Congress provided for advanced reactors so that we can make sure the development of advanced reactors stays on track.

To ensure that nuclear power has a strong future in this country, we must solve the

decades' long stalemate over what to do with used fuel from our nuclear reactors. Senator FEINSTEIN and I have been working on solving the nuclear waste stalemate for years, and I'd like to take the opportunity to compliment Senator Feinstein on her leadership and her insistence that we find a solution to this problem. The only way to break the stalemate is to get a final decision on whether Yucca Mountain is safe or not.

And this year's budget request for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission includes \$38.5 million to begin to answer that questions by restarting the licensing process for the Yucca Mountain repository. This is the next step the Department of Energy must follow to determine whether it can begin construction of Yucca Mountain. After a public hearing where all parties, including the State of Nevada, can provide expert testimony and evidence, the Commission will make a final determination whether it is safe to build Yucca Mountain.

I strongly believe that Yucca Mountain can and should be part of the solution to the nuclear waste stalemate. Federal law designates Yucca Mountain as the nation's repository for used nuclear fuel, and the Commission's own scientists have told us that we can safely store nuclear waste there for up to one million years.

But even if we had Yucca Mountain open today, we would still need to look for another permanent repository. We already have more than enough used fuel to fill Yucca Mountain to its legal capacity.

The quickest, and probably the least expensive, way for the federal government to start to meet its used nuclear fuel obligations is for the Department of Energy to contract with a private storage facility for used nuclear fuel.

I understand that two private companies have submitted license applications to the NRC for private consolidated storage facilities, one in Texas and one in New Mexico, and that the NRC's review is well underway. I'll be asking some questions about that today. I want to make sure that the Commission has all the resources it needs in fiscal year 2020 to review the applications for consolidated storage facilities because we have to start working together to solve the nuclear waste stalemate if we want a strong nuclear industry.

Senator MURKOWSKI, along with Senator FEINSTEIN and I, introduced a bill this week to implement the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future, which include using temporary private storage facilities. The legislation complements Yucca Mountain, and would create a new federal agency to find additional permanent repositories and temporary facilities for used nuclear fuel.

Instead of building more windmills, which only produce 20 percent of our carbon-free electricity, or solar farms, which only produce 4 percent of our carbon-free electricity, the best way to make sure the United States has a reliable source of inexpensive, efficient, carbon-free electricity is to extend the licenses of our existing nuclear plants—which produce 60 percent of our carbon-free electricity—if it is safe to do so.

Most of our 98 reactors have already extended their operating licenses from 40 to 60 years (although many have decided to close prematurely for economic reasons), and some utilities are beginning the process to extend their licenses from 60 to 80 years.

The Commission has spent the past several years developing the framework to review these types of license renewal applications to make sure the reactors can continue to operate safely from 60 to 80 years.

This year's budget request includes funding to review what the Commission calls

"subsequent" license renewal applications for six reactors in Florida, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. Just those 6 reactor extensions would equal about what solar power currently produces and a fourth of what wind power currently produces. That is just accounting for the 6 reactors that have applied to extend their licenses rather than shut down. If even half of the remaining 92 reactors decide to extend their licenses another 20 years, it would produce almost double the amount of wind power that is currently produced and as much as 10 times the amount of solar power produced.

So if you care about carbon free emissions, the short term solution for the next 20 years is, where safely, to extend the licenses for these reactors. I want to make sure that the Commission has the resources it needs to review those applications in fiscal year 2020, because I think it is important to maintain our existing nuclear power when it is safe to do so.

The Commission's budget reduction has been steep over the past five fiscal years. As part of its effort to reduce its budget, the Commission has limited hiring, especially entry-level hiring. We have heard from the Commission that of its 2,900 current employees, 24 percent are currently eligible for retirement. Four years from now, 42 percent will be eligible for retirement. Those numbers are not a concern as long as the NRC has younger staff ready to take over the important work of the agency. But I understand that only 2 percent of NRC employees are under 30 years old. To have nuclear power in the future, we need to have a nuclear regulator. I would like to understand how the Commission is ensuring that the next generation is in place.

I look forward to working with the Commission as we begin putting together our Energy and Water Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2020, and also with Senator FEINSTEIN, who I will now recognize for her opening statement.

104TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on Sunday, I had the opportunity to attend the 104th anniversary commemoration of the Armenian genocide, hosted at the Armenian Martyrs Memorial in Providence, RI. I was pleased to be able to join with so many in the Armenian community in my home State for this solemn event.

Over a century ago, one of the greatest tragedies of the 20th century began when the Young Turk leaders of the Ottoman Empire executed more than 200 prominent Armenians. What followed was an 8-year campaign of oppression and massacre. By 1923, an estimated 1 and a half million Armenians were killed and over a half a million survivors were exiled. These atrocities affected the lives of every Armenian living in Asia Minor and throughout the world.

The U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire during this dark time, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., unsuccessfully pleaded with President Wilson to take action, and later remembered the events of the genocide, saying, "I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem al-

most insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915."

Those who survived the Armenian genocide, however, persevered due to their unbreakable spirit and steadfast resolve, going on to greatly contribute to the lands in which they established new homes and communities, including the United States. That is why we not only commemorate this grave tragedy each year, but also take the time to celebrate the traditions, the contributions, and the bright future of the Armenian people. Indeed, my home State of Rhode Island continues to be enriched by our strong and vibrant Armenian-American community.

To honor the memory of this tragedy, I have once again joined with several of my colleagues on a resolution to encourage the U.S. to officially recognize the Armenian genocide. We must find a way to come together to recognize the truth of what happened and support and assist those facing persecution today.

As ranking member on the Senate Armed Services Committee, I also remain committed to supporting assistance to Armenia to strengthen security, promote economic growth, and foster democratic reforms and development.

As we remember the past, we remain committed to forging a brighter future. We must continue to guard against hatred and oppression so that we can prevent such crimes against humanity from happening again.

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT COLONEL DICK COLE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here on the floor to talk about an American hero.

General Douglas MacArthur once said, "Duty, Honor, Country. Those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be." Those words—duty, honor, country—are exemplified through the life and legacy of Lieutenant Colonel Richard Cole.

Lt. Col. Cole, who went by Dick, was born and raised in my grandfather's hometown, Dayton, OH. He graduated from Steele High School and completed 2 years of college at Ohio University before enlisting in the Aviation Cadet Program of the U.S. Army Air Corps in November 1940. He commissioned as a second lieutenant in July 1941 and received his pilot wings at Randolph Field in Texas. From there, he joined the ranks of the 34th Bombardment Squadron of the 17th Bombardment Group.

Soon after, Lt. Col. Cole became one of the 80 volunteers who signed up for the Doolittle Mission, which was to become the first offensive strike on mainland Japan during World War II. In a turn of fate, a Japanese vessel spotted the USS *Hornet*, forcing the mission to commence a day early. Therefore, what was originally planned

as a 400-mile trip to mainland Japan turned into a 645-mile journey to the target, putting the pilots in grave danger because the planes did not have enough fuel to reach their destination.

Lt. Col. Cole served valiantly as Lt. Col. James Doolittle's co-pilot, and together, they led the squadron of 16 Army Air Force bombers from the Hornet to Tokyo. The squadron succeeded in bombing their target, but as predicted, his plane ran low on fuel and they were forced to bail out over China. His parachute worked, and he landed in a tree, where he spent the night and climbed down in the morning. He ultimately found some Chinese students who took him to Doolittle. After the raid, Cole went to India, helped establish the dangerous Hump flying route and flew more than 100 missions carrying cargo, earning three Distinguished Flying Crosses. The Doolittle Raiders received the Congressional Gold Medal in 2015 and donated it to the National Museum of the U.S. Air Force in Ohio.

The raid provided a psychological lift back home and marked a turning point in the Pacific theater of the war. He was humble about his role in this mission and chalked it up to duty. In 2016, when remembering the raid, he said: "We were the only B-25 crew operating for months. We were going on that mission whether we wanted to or not. That straightens out that fairy tale." He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for heroism for this mission.

Cole remained in China to continue flying bombing and transport missions through the end of the war. He is the only American serviceman of the 16 million who served in World War II to have flown in three elite groups: the Doolittle Raiders, the Himalayan Hump Route pilots, and the 1st Air Commandos.

After retiring from a distinguished 26-year long career in the U.S. Air Force, he spent much of his time as an ambassador for the Air Force and Doolittle Raiders. He traveled the country to keep the history and legacy of the Doolittle Raiders alive and honor those who served beside him.

On April 9, Lt. Col. Cole passed away at the age of 103 years old. What an incredible life. He captured the hearts of everyone who met him, and he will forever be remembered as a hero who faithfully executed his duty for our Country.

Godspeed, Lt. Col. Dick Cole.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO TREY CAMPBELL

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Trey for his hard work as an intern in my Cheyenne office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Trey is a native of Casper. He is a student at the University of Wyoming,

where he is studying economics and political science. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Trey for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO JEFFERSON CHA

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Jefferson for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Jefferson is a native of California. He is a graduate of UCLA, where he studied history. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Jefferson for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO IAN DEVALLIERE

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Ian for his hard work as an intern in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Ian is a native of Nevada. He is a student at George Washington University, where he is studying business economics and public policy. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Ian for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO DAVID GARDNER

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to David for his hard work as an intern in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

David is a native of Massachusetts. He is a student at American University, where he is studying interdisciplinary studies. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank David for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO TYLER JORDON

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Tyler for his hard work as an intern in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Tyler is a native of West Virginia. He is a graduate student at American University, where he is studying political communication. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Tyler for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO BRENDYN LUPE

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Brendyn for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Brendyn is a native of New York. He is a student at American University, where he is studying international relations and French. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Brendyn for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

TRIBUTE TO ANNIE MCKINNEY

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Annie for her hard work as an intern in the Senate Republican Conference. I recognize

her efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Annie is a native of Ohio. She is a student at Marymount University, where she is studying politics. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Annie for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her journey.●

TRIBUTE TO JORDAN PAKULA

● Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Jordan for his hard work as an intern in the Environment and Public Works Committee. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Jordan is a native of Georgia. He is a graduate of Kenyon College, where he studied political science and French. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Jordan for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all of his future endeavors. I wish him all my best on his journey.●

REMEMBERING WILLIAM M. DETWEILER

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today I rise to honor the life and legacy of William M. Detweiler who passed away on March 27, 2019, at age 79. Mr. Detweiler was a lifelong advocate for veterans and a former national commander of the American Legion. His commitment to our country stands as a shining example for every American. He leaves behind a legacy of compassion for his fellow servicemembers that touched everyone who knew him.

Mr. Detweiler was born in New Orleans, LA, on January 28, 1940. He was a graduate of St. Aloysius High School and Loyola University, where he earned both his undergraduate and law degrees.

Mr. Detweiler served as a captain in the U.S. Army Intelligence Corps and, later, as assistant chief of staff for the U.S. Army Defense Center at Fort Bliss, TX. He then joined the U.S. Army Reserve and returned home to New Orleans to practice law.

During his law career, Mr. Detweiler served on various local, State, and national veterans committees. In 1973, President Nixon appointed him to serve on the Veterans Administration's Na-

tional Rehabilitation and Education Advisory Committee, which he later went on to chair.

As a member of the American Legion, Mr. Detweiler served in a number of capacities including Department of Louisiana judge advocate, chairman of the National Public Relations Commission, chairman of the National Foreign Relations Commission, national vice commander, and national commander.

While serving as national commander of the American Legion, he fought for the extension of service-connected disability benefits for Vietnam veterans exposed to Agent Orange. He was also involved in the planning and development of the National D-Day Museum in the heart of New Orleans, which later became the National WWII Museum.

In his most recent leadership role with the American Legion, Mr. Detweiler served as the chairman of the organization's traumatic brain injury—TBI—and posttraumatic stress disorder—PTSD—committee. He was serving as chairman of that committee on March 27, 2019, when his final battle, with pancreatic cancer, came to an end.

William M. Detweiler was a tireless advocate for the veterans community, and we thank him for his lifetime of service to our country.●

REMEMBERING EUGENIA "GENIE" ZAVALETA

● Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of Eugenia "Genie" Zavaleta, a community leader who passed away in Tempe, AZ, on April 6, 2019, at the age of 92. Genie Zavaleta was a fighter for immigration reform, advocate for the DREAM Act, and a dedicated voice for DACA recipients. Our State will miss her dearly.

Genie Zavaleta described her life's concerns as "her family, education, health care, family planning, the environment, poverty and injustice, the Presbyterian Church and the Democratic Party." Throughout her life, she served these issues through educator and advocacy roles within the Presbyterian Church, the Migrant Ministry of the National Council of Churches, Planned Parenthood of Arizona, and the Maricopa County Health Department.

Her immense advocacy work within the migrant community began in 1958, when she and her husband Hector took on roles to serve migrant farm laborers known as braceros. In 1965, Genie Zavaleta and her family moved to Arizona, where she focused on helping migrant workers acquire new skills to adjust to Arizona's rapid industrialization. Eventually, Genie Zavaleta became a fierce advocate for DACA recipients and the DREAM Act.

Genie Zavaleta is survived by her husband Hector, her sons Dan and David, and their wives Nori and Linda. She will be dearly missed by other family members, friends, and the hundreds of people whose lives she touched.

Please join me in honoring her memory.●

TRIBUTE TO ANTONIO MIGUEL BEATTY

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Antonio "Tony" Miguel Beatty, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several months.

Tony is a graduate of Stevens High School in Rapid City, SD. Currently, he is attending the University of South Dakota in Vermillion, SD, where he is majoring in political science and criminal justice. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Tony for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY CONCEPCION

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Anthony Concepcion, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several months.

Anthony will be graduating later this week from the Mason LIFE Program with a comprehensive concentration in music appreciation and a minor concentration in recreation and leisure education. Anthony is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Anthony for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO AINE CRINION

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Aine Crinion, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several months.

Aine is a graduate of Brookings High School in Brookings, SD. Currently, she is attending Georgetown University in Washington, DC, where she is majoring in international political economy and Spanish. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Aine for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KATHLYNN SHORT

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Kathlynn Short, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my

staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several months.

Kathlynn is a graduate of Stevens High School in Rapid City, SD. Currently, she is attending Wichita State University in Wichita, KS, where she is majoring in international studies. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Kathlynn for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:20 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 828. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 Route 111 in Smithtown, New York, as the "Congressman Bill Carney Post Office".

H.R. 1198. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 404 South Boulder Highway in Henderson, Nevada, as the "Henderson Veterans Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 1449. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3033 203rd Street in Olympia Fields, Illinois, as the "Captain Robert L. Martin Post Office".

H.R. 1876. An act to create an interdivisional taskforce at the Securities and Exchange Commission for senior investors.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 828. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 Route 111 in Smithtown, New York, as the "Congressman Bill Carney Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1198. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 404 South Boulder Highway in Henderson, Nevada, as the "Henderson Veterans Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1449. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3033 203rd Street in Olympia Fields, Illinois, as the "Captain Robert L. Martin Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1876. An act to create an interdivisional taskforce at the Securities and Exchange Commission for senior investors; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1076. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Bacteriophage active against *Xylella fastidiosa*; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9991-86-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1077. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violation of the Antideficiency Act that involved fiscal year 2010 Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Air Force funds and was assigned case number 16-02; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1078. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Yemen that was declared in Executive Order 13611 of May 16, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1079. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval and Designation of Areas; FL; Redesignation of the Nassau County 2010 1-Hour Sulfur Dioxide Non-attainment Area to Attainment" (FRL No. 9992-53-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1080. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Restrictions on Discontinued Uses of Asbestos; Significant New Use Rule" (FRL No. 9991-33-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1081. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Consolidated Guidance About Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance About Commercial Radiopharmacy Licenses" (NUREG-1556) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1082. A communication from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's 2019 Annual Report; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1083. A communication from the Deputy Commissioner for Retirement and Disability Policy, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports entitled "Annual Report of the Board of the Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1084. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions Lists of rifles and submachine guns to Thailand for end use by the Royal Thai Police in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-085); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1085. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regu-

latory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 24, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1086. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety and Effectiveness of Consumer Antiseptic Rubs; Topical Antimicrobial Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use" (RIN0910-AH97) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1087. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Listing of Color Additives Exempt from Certification; Synthetic Iron Oxide; Confirmation of Effective Date" (Docket No. FDA-2017-C-6238) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1088. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1089. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission for the period from April 1, 2017, through September 30, 2017; to the Committees on the Judiciary; Select Committee on Intelligence; and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1090. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission for the period from October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017; to the Committees on the Judiciary; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; and Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-1091. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission for the period from October 1, 2018, through March 31, 2018; to the Committees on the Judiciary; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; and Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC-1092. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on the Department's activities during calendar year 2016 relative to prison rape abatement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1093. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's activities under the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act during fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1094. A communication from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an opinion of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan (United States v. Jumana Nagarwala et al.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1095. A communication from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit (United States v. Solis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1096. A communication from the Solicitor General, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, an opinion of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (Miller v. Barr); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1097. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Victims Compensation Fund established by the Witness Security Reform Act of 1984; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1098. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting proposed legislation that would add a jurisdictional element tied to the Commerce Clause to the statute criminalizing female genital mutilation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1099. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports entitled "Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act: Report to Congress" and "Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Programs: Eleven Case Studies"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1100. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Emergency Interim Report: CBP Families and Children Care Panel"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1101. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary/Director, United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 18, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1102. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Expired Regulations Concerning Commerce in Firearms and Ammunition and Machine Guns, Destructive Devices, and Certain Other Firearms" (Docket No. ATF 2014R-42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1103. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Expired Regulations" (Docket No. ATF 2017R-21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1104. A joint communication from the General Counsel of Veterans Affairs and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense Joint Executive

Committee Fiscal Year 2018 Annual Report"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1105. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Uninformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; First Quarter of Fiscal Year 2019"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1259. A bill to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1260. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for grants to enable States to carry out activities to reduce administrative costs and burdens in health care; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1261. A bill to provide for the establishment of Medicare part E public health plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1262. A bill to designate certain land administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service in the State of Oregon as wilderness and national recreation areas, to withdraw certain land located in Curry County and Josephine County, Oregon, from all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws, location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and operation under the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1263. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish an interagency task force on the use of public lands to provide medical treatment and therapy to veterans through outdoor recreation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1264. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to deny Federal retirement benefits to individuals convicted of child sex abuse; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1265. A bill to amend the Oil Region National Heritage Area Act to reauthorize the Oil Region National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 1266. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to protect patients from surprise medical bills; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. MCSALLY):

S. 1267. A bill to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the National Museum of the American Latino, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 1268. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure that hospitals receive adequate payment for the acquisition of hematopoietic stem cells under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1269. A bill to address the threat to national security from illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing and associated illegal activity, to prevent the illegal trade of seafood and seafood products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1270. A bill to provide standards for physical condition and management of housing receiving assistance payments under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 1271. A bill to provide for pilot programs to streamline decision-making process for weapon systems; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1272. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 575 Dexter Street in Central Falls, Rhode Island, as the "Elizabeth Buffum Chace Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1273. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 1274. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act to provide for public financing for Federal elections through vouchers directed by eligible voters to the candidates of their choice; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1275. A bill to require the collection of voluntary feedback on services provided by agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1276. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out a pilot program to enhance the mapping of urban flooding and associated property damage and the availability of that mapped data to homeowners, businesses, and localities to help understand and mitigate the risk of such flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1277. A bill to approve the settlement of water rights claims of the Hualapai Tribe and certain allottees in the State of Arizona, to authorize construction of a water project

relating to those water rights claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian 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. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 179. A resolution recognizing widening threats to freedoms of the press and expression around the world, reaffirming the centrality of a free and independent press to the health of democracy, and reaffirming freedom of the press as a priority of the United States in promoting democracy, human rights, and good governance in commemoration of World Press Freedom Day on May 3, 2019; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CARPER, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. Res. 180. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that, during Public Service Recognition Week, public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. SMITH):

S. Res. 181. A resolution supporting the designation of the week of April 8 through April 12, 2019, as "National Specialized Instructional Support Personnel Appreciation Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. Res. 182. A resolution recognizing the duty of the Senate to condemn Modern Monetary Theory and recognizing Modern Monetary Theory would lead to higher deficits and higher inflation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. Con. Res. 15. A concurrent resolution expressing support for the designation of October 28, 2019, as "Honoring the Nation's First Responders Day"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 92

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 92, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 143

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 143, a bill to authorize the

Department of Energy to conduct collaborative research with the Department of Veterans Affairs in order to improve healthcare services for veterans in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 151

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 151, a bill to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research, and for other purposes.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 164, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on eligibility for TRICARE Reserve Select of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

S. 358

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 358, a bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Commerce to provide advance notice to Congress before changing any questions on the decennial census, and for other purposes.

S. 457

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 457, a bill to require that \$1 coins issued during 2019 honor President George H.W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush.

S. 496

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 496, a bill to preserve United States fishing heritage through a national program dedicated to training and assisting the next generation of commercial fishermen, and for other purposes.

S. 511

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 511, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 520

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Ms.

ERNST) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 520, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy efficiency materials pilot program.

S. 659

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to provide for certain additional requirements with respect to patent disclosures.

S. 703

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 703, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to address health, safety, and environmental hazards at private military housing units, to prohibit the payment by members of the Armed Forces of deposits or other fees relating to such housing units, and for other purposes.

S. 749

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 749, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make fully refundable the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit, to increase the maximum amount excludable from gross income for employer-provided dependent care assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 755

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 755, a bill to require carbon monoxide detectors in certain federally assisted housing, and for other purposes.

S. 758

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 758, a bill to ensure affordable abortion coverage and care for every woman, and for other purposes.

S. 760

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 760, a bill to enable registered apprenticeship programs to better serve veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 867

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 867, a bill to protect students of institutions of higher education and the taxpayer investment in institutions of higher education by improving oversight and accountability of institutions of higher education, particularly for-profit colleges, improving protections for students and borrowers, and ensuring the integrity of postsecondary education programs, and for other purposes.

S. 877

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms.

HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 877, a bill to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes.

S. 879

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 879, a bill to provide a process for granting lawful permanent resident status to aliens from certain countries who meet specified eligibility requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to support individuals with younger onset Alzheimer's disease.

S. 905

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 905, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize a national network of Statewide senior legal hotlines, and for other purposes.

S. 980

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 988

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 988, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prohibit prescription drug plan sponsors and MA-PD organizations under the Medicare program from retroactively reducing payment on clean claims submitted by pharmacies.

S. 997

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 997, a bill to recognize and honor the service of individuals who served in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 998

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 998, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to expand support for police officer family services, stress reduction, and suicide prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 1025

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1025, a bill to provide humanitarian relief to the Venezuelan people and Venezuelan migrants, to advance a constitutional and democratic solution to Venezuela's political crisis, to address Venezuela's economic recon-

struction, to combat public corruption, narcotics trafficking, and money laundering, and for other purposes.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1081, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1106

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1106, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for a credit against tax for rent paid on the personal residence of the taxpayer.

S. 1118

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1118, a bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to authorize spouses of servicemembers who incur a catastrophic injury or illness or die while in military service to terminate leases of premises and motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 1150

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1150, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a child tax credit for pregnant moms with respect to their unborn children.

S. 1154

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1154, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish an advisory committee on the implementation by the Department of Veterans Affairs of an electronic health record.

S. 1186

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1186, a bill to promote democracy and human rights in Burma, and for other purposes.

S. 1195

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1195, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumption relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 1208

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1208, a bill to amend the

Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 with respect to payments to certain public safety officers who have become permanently and totally disabled as a result of personal injuries sustained in the line of duty, and for other purposes.

S. 1241

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1241, a bill to expand the private right of action under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act for calls in violation of the Do Not Call rules.

S. 1246

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1246, a bill to extend the protections of the Fair Housing Act to persons suffering discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 80

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 80, a resolution establishing the John S. McCain III Human Rights Commission.

S. RES. 99

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) 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.

S. RES. 102

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 102, a resolution designating April 2019 as "Second Chance Month".

S. RES. 112

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 112, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States condemns all forms of violence against children globally and recognizes the harmful impacts of violence against children.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1276. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out a pilot program to enhance the mapping of urban flooding and associated property damage and the availability of that mapped data to homeowners, businesses, and localities to help understand and mitigate the risk of such flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1276

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 “Flood Mapping Modernization and Homeowner Empowerment Pilot Program Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FLOOD MAPPING MODERNIZATION AND HOMEOWNER EMPOWERMENT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(2) COASTAL.—The term “coastal” means, with respect to a unit of general local government, that the unit borders a body of water that—

(A) is more than 2,000 square miles in size; and

(B) is not a river.

(3) PELAGIC.—The term “pelagic” means, with respect to a unit of general local government, that—

(A) the unit is a coastal unit; and

(B) the body of water that the unit borders is—

(i) an ocean; or

(ii) a large, open body of water, including a bay or a gulf, that empties into an ocean.

(4) PILOT PROGRAM.—The term “pilot program” means the pilot program carried out by the Administrator under this section.

(5) URBAN FLOODING.—The term “urban flooding” means—

(A) the inundation, by water, of property in a built environment, particularly in a densely populated area, that—

(i) is caused by falling rain—

(I) collecting on an impervious surface; or
(II) increasing the level of a body of water that is located near that built environment; and

(ii) overwhelms the capacity of drainage systems in the built environment, such as storm sewers;

(B) includes—

(i) a situation in which stormwater enters a building through a window, door, or other opening;

(ii) the backup of water through a sewer pipe, shower, toilet, sink, or floor drain;

(iii) the seepage of water through a wall or a floor;

(iv) the accumulation of water on property or a public right-of-way; and

(v) the overflow from a body of water, such as a river, lake, or ocean; and

(C) does not include flooding in an undeveloped or agricultural area.

(6) URBANIZED AREA.—The term “urbanized area” means an area that has been defined and designated as an urbanized area by the Bureau of the Census during the most recently completed decennial census.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator shall carry out a pilot program to make grants to units of local government to—

(1) enhance the production of maps relating to urban flooding and associated property damage; and

(2) increase the availability of the maps described in paragraph (1) to homeowners, businesses, and units of local government to enable those entities to minimize the risk of urban flooding.

(c) OBJECTIVES.—Amounts from grants made under the pilot program may be used only to carry out activities that meet the following objectives:

(1) Developing a methodology for assessing the risk of urban flooding through the deployment of technology-based mapping tools that—

(A) are easily understandable by the public; and

(B) effectively convey information regarding the level of flood risk.

(2) Providing structure-specific projections of annual chance flood frequency.

(3) Providing structure-based flood risk assessments.

(4) Providing program design for the mitigation of the risk of urban flooding.

(5) Incorporating information regarding climate trends into urban flooding risk assessments.

(6) Making the information described in this subsection publicly available on the internet through a web-based portal so as to increase transparency regarding homeowner flood risks.

(d) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant under the pilot program may be made only to—

(A) a unit of general local government that is located in an urbanized area with a population of more than 50,000 individuals; or

(B) a stormwater management authority of a unit of general local government described in subparagraph (A).

(2) ONE-TIME GRANTS.—A grant under the pilot program may not be made to—

(A) any unit of general local governmental, or the stormwater management authority of a unit of general local government, that previously received a grant under the pilot program;

(B) any unit of general local government if the stormwater management agency for that unit previously received a grant under the pilot program; or

(C) any stormwater management agency of a unit of general local government if that unit previously received a grant under the pilot program.

(3) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a stormwater management authority that operates with respect to more than 1 unit of general local government, the application of that authority shall be considered for purposes of paragraph (2) of this subsection and subsections (f), (g), and (h)(1) to be made for the largest unit of general local government with respect to which that authority operates.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) may be construed to limit the ability of a stormwater management authority described in that subparagraph to carry out activities under a demonstration project in any other jurisdiction in, or with respect to any other unit of local government with, which that authority operates.

(e) APPLICATIONS.—To be eligible for a grant under the pilot program, a unit of general local government or a stormwater management agency shall submit to the Administrator an application in such form and containing such information as the Administrator shall require.

(f) SELECTION OF RECIPIENTS.—

(1) ANNUAL SELECTION.—Subject to paragraph (2), and to the submission of approvable applications, in each fiscal year for which amounts are made available for grants under the pilot program, the Administrator shall select, from among applications submitted under subsection (e) for that fiscal year, 3 units of general government or stormwater management authorities to receive grants under the pilot program.

(2) AGGREGATE LIMIT.—Subject only to the submission of approvable applications, the Administrator shall select, in the aggregate over the entire duration of the pilot pro-

gram, 12 units of general government or stormwater management authorities to receive grants under the pilot program, as follows:

(A) TIER 1.—Three of the applicants selected shall be units of general local government, or stormwater management authorities for those units, each of which has a population of more than 800,000 individuals, as follows:

(i) PELAGIC COASTAL CITY.—One shall be—
(I) a unit of general local government that is a pelagic unit; or

(II) a stormwater authority for a unit described in subclause (I).

(ii) NON-PELAGIC COASTAL CITY.—One shall be—

(I) a unit of general local government that—

(aa) is a coastal unit; and

(bb) is not a pelagic unit; or

(II) a stormwater authority for a unit described in subclause (I).

(iii) NON-COASTAL CITY.—One shall be—

(I) a unit of general local government that is not a coastal unit; or

(II) a stormwater authority for a unit described in subclause (I).

(B) TIER 2.—Six of the applicants selected shall be units of general local government, or stormwater management authorities for those units, each of which has a population of more than 200,000 individuals and not more than 800,000 individuals, as follows:

(i) COASTAL CITIES.—Three shall be—

(I) units of general local government that are coastal units; or

(II) stormwater management authorities for units described in subclause (I).

(ii) NON-COASTAL CITIES.—Three shall be—

(I) units of general local government that are not coastal units; or

(II) stormwater management authorities for units described in subclause (I).

(C) TIER 3.—Three of the applicants selected shall be—

(i) units of general local government, each of which has a population of more than 50,000 individuals and not more than 200,000 individuals; or

(ii) stormwater management authorities for units described in clause (i).

(g) PRIORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall select applicants for grants under the pilot program based on the extent to which the applications of those applicants shall achieve the objectives described in subsection (c).

(2) TIERS 2 AND 3.—In selecting applicants to receive grants under the pilot program under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (f)(2), the Administrator shall give priority to applicants—

(A) that are highly vulnerable to sea level rise;

(B) within which are located a military installation or another facility relating to national security concerns; or

(C) that have—

(i) populations that are highly vulnerable to urban flooding; and

(ii) an uneven capacity for flood mitigation and response efforts resulting from socioeconomic factors.

(h) AMOUNT.—

(1) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining the amount of a grant under the pilot program, the Administrator shall consider the population of the grant recipient, which may be considered in terms of the tier under subsection (f)(2) with respect to the recipient.

(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The amount of a grant under the pilot program may not exceed 75 percent of the total cost incurred in carrying out the activities described in subsection (c).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

(i) DURATION.—The Administrator shall require each recipient of a grant under the pilot program to complete the activities described in subsection (c), which shall be, subject to subsection (h)(2), carried out using the grant amounts, not later than 18 months after the date on which the recipient initially receives the grant amounts under the pilot program.

(j) USE OF CENSUS DATA.—The Administrator shall make all determinations regarding population under the pilot program by using data from the most recently completed decennial census by the Bureau of the Census.

(k) GRANTEE REPORTS TO FEMA.—Each recipient of a grant under the pilot program shall, not later than 30 months after the date on which the recipient initially receives the grant amounts, submit to the Administrator a report that describes—

(1) the activities carried out with the grant amounts;

(2) how the activities carried out with the grant amounts have met the objectives described in subsection (c);

(3) any lessons learned in carrying out the activities described in paragraph (2); and

(4) any recommendations for future mapping modernization efforts by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(l) BIENNIAL REPORTS BY FEMA.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter until the date on which all activities carried out with amounts from grants under the pilot program are completed, the Administrator shall submit to Congress and make available to the public on an internet website a report that—

(1) describes—

(A) the progress of the activities carried out with amounts from those grants; and

(B) the effectiveness of technology-based mapping tools used in carrying out the activities described in subparagraph (A); and

(2) with respect to the final report that the Administrator is required to submit under this subsection, includes recommendations to Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government for implementing strategies, practices, and technologies to mitigate the effects of urban flooding.

(m) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, because the pilot program is limited with respect to scope and resources, communities that participate in the pilot program should acknowledge that the most successful efforts to mitigate the effects of urban flooding—

(1) take a structural-based mitigation approach with respect to construction, which includes—

(A) recognizing any post-storm damage that may occur; and

(B) pursuing designs that proactively minimize future flood damage;

(2) make individuals in the community aware, through any cost-effective and available means of education, of the best approaches regarding the construction of properties that are able to survive floods, which reduces the cost of future repairs; and

(3) encourage home and property owners to consider the measures described in paragraphs (1) and (2), which are the most cost-effective and prudent ways to reduce the impact of flooding, when constructing or renovating building components.

(n) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under the pilot program—

(1) \$1,200,000 for fiscal year 2020; and

(2) \$4,300,000 for fiscal year 2021, to remain available through 2023.

SENATE RESOLUTION 179—RECOGNIZING WIDENING THREATS TO FREEDOMS OF THE PRESS AND EXPRESSION AROUND THE WORLD, REAFFIRMING THE CENTRALITY OF A FREE AND INDEPENDENT PRESS TO THE HEALTH OF DEMOCRACY, AND REAFFIRMING FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AS A PRIORITY OF THE UNITED STATES IN PROMOTING DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND GOOD GOVERNANCE IN COMMEMORATION OF WORLD PRESS FREEDOM DAY ON MAY 3, 2019

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 179

Whereas Article 19 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted at Paris December 10, 1948, states, “Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”;

Whereas, in 1993, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed May 3 of each year as “World Press Freedom Day”—

(1) to celebrate the fundamental principles of freedom of the press;

(2) to evaluate freedom of the press around the world;

(3) to defend the media against attacks on its independence; and

(4) to pay tribute to journalists who have lost their lives while working in their profession;

Whereas, on December 18, 2013, the United Nations General Assembly adopted Resolution 68/163 on the safety of journalists and the problem of impunity, which unequivocally condemns all attacks on, and violence against, journalists and media workers, including torture, extrajudicial killing, enforced disappearance, arbitrary detention, and intimidation and harassment in conflict and nonconflict situations;

Whereas the theme for World Press Freedom Day on May 3, 2019 is “Media for Democracy: Journalism and Democracy in Times of Disinformation”;

Whereas Thomas Jefferson, who recognized the importance of the press in a constitutional republic, wisely declared, “... were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.”;

Whereas the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-166; 22 U.S.C. 2151 note), which the Senate passed by unanimous consent and President Barack Obama signed into law in 2010, expanded the examination of the freedom of the press around the world in the annual country reports on human rights practices of the Department of State;

Whereas the 2019 World Press Freedom Index, published by Reporters Without Borders, warns “The number of countries regarded as safe, where journalists can work in complete security, continues to decline, while authoritarian regimes tighten their grip on the media.”;

Whereas, Freedom House’s publication “Freedom in the World 2019” noted that global freedom of expression has declined each year for the past 13 years;

Whereas, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, in 2018—

(1) at least 54 journalists were killed around the world for their work, of which at least 34 were singled out for murder;

(2) the 2 deadliest countries for journalists on assignment were Afghanistan and Syria;

(3) the most dangerous subject for a journalist to report on was politics, followed by war;

(4) 251 journalists worldwide were in prison, with Turkey, China, and Egypt responsible for more than ½ of the jailed journalists;

(5) 13 percent of the journalists in jail were female, an increase from 8 percent in 2017;

(6) 70 percent of the journalists who were imprisoned around the world faced anti-state charges, such as belonging to or aiding groups deemed by authorities as terrorist organizations; and

(7) the number of journalists imprisoned on charges of false news rose to 28 globally, compared with 9 such imprisonments in 2016;

Whereas, Reuters journalists Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo, recipients of the 2018 PEN/Barbey Freedom to Write Award—

(1) were arrested in December 2017 for investigating the murder by the Burmese military of 10 Rohingya men in the village of Inn Dinn in Rakhine State; and

(2) were sentenced in September 2018 to 7 years in prison on fraudulent charges of breaching the colonial-era Official Secrets Act, and remain unjustly imprisoned;

Whereas freedom of the press has been under considerable pressure in recent years throughout Southeast Asia, including in the Philippines, where the government has waged a campaign of judicial harassment against the news website Rappler and its editor, Maria Ressa;

Whereas, Nouf Abdulaziz, Loujain Al-Hathloul, and Eman Al-Nafjan, recipients of the 2019 PEN/Barbey Freedom to Write Award, who wrote in opposition to Saudi Arabia’s repressive Guardianship system, have been subjected to imprisonment, solitary confinement, and torture by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia since May 2018 in an apparent effort to suppress dissent and silence the voices of women;

Whereas, Washington Post journalist and United States resident Jamal Khashoggi was murdered by a team of Saudi operatives while visiting the Saudi Arabian consulate in Istanbul, Turkey;

Whereas the Central Intelligence Agency concluded with high confidence, and the Senate unanimously approved a resolution stating, that Mr. Khashoggi’s murder was carried out at the behest of Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman;

Whereas journalist Mimi Mefo Takambou was jailed for 4 days in Cameroon in November 2018 on charges of spreading false news while investigating the death of an American missionary, where 4 out of the 7 total journalists imprisoned in Cameroon were jailed for spreading false news, which is a rising trend in Cameroon and elsewhere around the world;

Whereas according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, at least 26 journalists were killed in Honduras since 2007, making it one of the most deadly countries for journalists in the Americas, and where journalist Leonardo Gabriel Hernandez was murdered in March 2019 after receiving threats related to his work;

Whereas in Nicaragua, Miguel Mora and Lucia Pineda Ubau, the directors of the country’s only 24-hour cable news network,

have been jailed since December 2018 on charges of fomenting hate, spreading fake news, and terrorism, and prominent journalist Carlos Fernando Chamorro has fled the country as President Daniel Ortega cracks down on free expression in a bid to silence dissent and end the protests against him;

Whereas in Mexico, which remains the most dangerous country in the Western Hemisphere for journalists—

(1) murders, death threats, and legal impunity cause journalists to self censor their reporting out of fear; and

(2) Rafael Murúa Manríquez was abducted and murdered in January 2019 after reporting threats from an official in the municipal government for critical reporting;

Whereas Slovakian journalist Ján Kuciak and his partner Martina Kušnírová were murdered in February 2018, allegedly in retaliation for his investigative reporting of tax fraud in connection to a businessman with close ties to Slovakia's ruling party, where the perpetrator awaits trial, just 4 months after the murder of another European journalist, Malta's Daphne Caruana Galizia, for her reporting on corruption;

Whereas the world's growing cadre of ethical and hard-hitting investigative journalists, including those contributing to the Organized Crime and Corruption Reporting Project—

(1) adhere to the highest professional standards;

(2) uncover abuses and corruption being committed in their own countries; and

(3) deserve the international community's support and praise for taking on the risky job of fostering accountability and transparency in their respective countries;

Whereas, under the auspices of the United States Agency for Global Media, the United States Government provides financial assistance to several editorially independent media outlets, including Voice of America, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Radio Free Asia, Radio y Television Marti, and the Middle East Broadcast Networks—

(1) which report and broadcast news, information, and analysis in critical regions around the world; and

(2) whose journalists regularly face harassment, fines, and imprisonment for their work;

Whereas freedom of the press—

(1) is a key component of democratic governance, activism in civil society, and socioeconomic development; and

(2) enhances public accountability, transparency, and participation in civil society and democratic governance:

Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses concern about threats to freedom of the press and free expression around the world on the occasion of World Press Freedom Day on May 3, 2019;

(2) commends journalists and media workers around the world, despite threats to their safety, for their essential role in—

(A) promoting government accountability;

(B) defending democratic activity; and

(C) strengthening civil society;

(3) pays tribute to journalists who have lost their lives carrying out their work;

(4) calls on governments abroad to implement United Nations General Assembly Resolution 163 (2013) by thoroughly investigating and seeking to resolve outstanding cases of violence against journalists, including murders and kidnappings, while ensuring the protection of witnesses;

(5) condemns all actions around the world that suppress freedom of the press;

(6) reaffirms the centrality of freedom of the press to efforts of the United States Government to support democracy, mitigate

conflict, and promote good governance domestically and around the world; and

(7) calls on the President and the Secretary of State—

(A) to preserve and build upon the leadership of the United States on issues relating to freedom of the press, on the basis of the protections afforded the American people under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

(B) to improve the rapid identification, publication, and response by the United States Government to threats against freedom of the press around the world;

(C) to urge foreign governments to transparently investigate and bring to justice the perpetrators of attacks against journalists; and

(D) to highlight the issue of threats against freedom of the press in the annual country reports on human rights practices of the Department of State and through diplomatic channels.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, freedom of the press is a fundamental human right, a foundational pillar of democracy, and an indispensable check on authoritarian overreach. Today, press freedom is under assault across the globe—including in the United States. As journalists fight to advance truth and objectivity, far too many governments and non-state actors are targeting them, seeking to thwart their efforts to promote transparency and accountability and expose abuses of power. Their focus on attacking journalists indeed serves to highlight their critical work.

Since 2009, 659 journalists and media workers have been killed in connection with their efforts to report and disseminate news and information. Stories of abuses of government power, of human suffering, of environmental disasters, and stories of the remarkable resilience of people abused and oppressed. 2018 marked the worst year on record for deadly violence and abuse toward journalists, with murders, imprisonment, hostage-taking, and enforced disappearances all on the rise.

Slovak journalist Jan Kuciak and his partner Martina Kusnirova were gunned down in their home after investigating organized crime in his country and in alleged retaliation for his reporting of tax fraud on a businessman with close ties to Slovakia's ruling party, a stark reminder of the danger reporters sometimes face when investigating corruption at the highest levels.

Just over a year ago, in the deadliest day for Afghanistan's media since the start of the war, nine journalists were killed in a second-wave suicide bombing in Kabul, and another was shot dead in the eastern city of Khost, a sign of the constant threat against the fundamental elements of a free, secure, and democratic Afghanistan.

Last October, at the Saudi Arabian consulate in Istanbul, Washington Post columnist and U.S. resident Jamal Khashoggi was brutally murdered by a group of Saudi operatives at the behest of Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman, showing the reach of political oppression and the silencing of dissent.

In many cases, crimes carried out against the media go unpunished—this includes murder, the ultimate form of censorship. According to the Committee to Protect Journalists, in nine out of 10 cases where a journalist has been targeted for murder, the perpetrator goes free, reflecting widespread impunity in this space.

In 2018, across the world 251 journalists remained imprisoned on charges related to their reporting. Last month, Burma's Supreme Court upheld the conviction and prison sentence of Pulitzer Prize-winning reporters Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo, who were arrested after exposing the massacre of ten Rohingya men in a village in Rakhine State. In Nicaragua, Miguel Mora and Lucía Pineda Ubau, directors of the country's only 24-hour cable news network, were jailed on charges of fomenting hate, spreading fake news, and terrorism, falling victim to President Daniel Ortega's widespread crackdown on dissent and freedom of expression. While in different countries, these ongoing imprisonments are in countries with degrading records on human rights and fundamental freedoms more broadly.

In the last year, governments have ramped up similar attempts to silence the press in places like Turkey and the Philippines. Beyond threats to journalists themselves, governments across the world from Poland to Sudan continue to pursue legislative efforts to restrict media freedom and free expression, ultimately weakening the ability of citizens to hold their governments accountable. In Bangladesh, photojournalist and human rights advocate Shahidul Alam faced torture and spent 107 days in prison for violating a law that forbids criticism of the government on digital platforms in his native Bangladesh. One of several journalists who were named Time's Person of the Year in 2018 for being one of "the guardians" in the face of the "war on truth," he expressed, "The world over, journalism is under threat. Whether you're a teacher, a dancer, a painter, or a journalist, each one of us needs to be constantly fighting."

But the threat to press freedom isn't limited to foreign lands—it is something we've had to increasingly contend with here at home in the United States. President Trump continues to employ dangerous rhetoric in targeting the media, referring to the free press as the "enemy of the people," and fostering an environment of hostility toward journalists. Moreover, he refuses to hold autocratic world leaders accountable as they attack press freedom in brazen ways, including targeting American journalists in places like Egypt. This only adds to the deterioration in free expression throughout the world. As a recent report from Reporters Without Borders highlights, "The number of countries regarded as safe, where journalists can work in complete security, continues to decline, while authoritarian regimes continue to tighten their grip on the media."

In spite of the unprecedented assault on the free press, journalists continue to take significant risks in the pursuit of truth and transparency. Journalists from Radio Free Asia have relentlessly covered the Chinese government's gross human rights abuses against the country's Uyghur minority, including mass internment and surveillance in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region (XUAR). If not for the work of these courageous reporters—many of whom are Uyghurs themselves, having to report on abuses exacted against their families and friends—Chinese authorities would be able to commit such abuses largely in secrecy. Instead, those who champion human rights will be able to use the reporting in order to hold this repressive government to account.

Over 200 years ago, our Founding Fathers had the foresight to recognize the importance of a free press to a fledgling democracy, enshrining it in our first amendment. Today, that importance cannot be overstated. Recognizing that societies where informed citizens can hold their governments accountable are more stable, secure, and prosperous, we have a responsibility to stand up for the fundamental right of free expression and free press. I join the international community in honoring and defending freedom of expression and the brave journalists seeking to tell a story that deserves to be told. In fact, the very fact the repressive governments, autocrats, and thugs continue to attack journalists is a tragic testament to the critical work they do. Just yesterday, the Maduro government in Venezuela took CNN off the air while the network was broadcasting live video of protestors being run over by military vehicles in Caracas, a transparent attempt by a criminal regime to silence journalists telling the story of brave Venezuelans standing up for their democratic aspirations.

This week, I introduced a resolution commemorating World Press Freedom Day. The resolution highlights increasing threats to freedoms of the press and expression worldwide, reaffirms the centrality of a free and independent press to the health of democracy, and reiterates freedom of the press as a priority of the United States in promoting democracy, human rights, and good governance. On this World Press Freedom Day, I call on the Trump administration to reverse course and recommit to advancing press freedom—both at home and abroad."

SENATE RESOLUTION 180—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT, DURING PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK, PUBLIC SERVANTS SHOULD BE COMMENDED FOR THEIR DEDICATION AND CONTINUED SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr.

RUBIO, Mr. CARPER, and Ms. HASSAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 180

Whereas the week of May 5 through May 11, 2019, has been designated as "Public Service Recognition Week" to honor employees of the Federal Government and State and local governments and members of the uniformed services;

Whereas Public Service Recognition Week provides an opportunity to recognize and promote the important contributions of public servants and to honor the diverse men and women who meet the needs of the United States through work at all levels of government and as members of the uniformed services;

Whereas millions of individuals work in government service and as members of the uniformed services, in every State, county, and city across the United States and in hundreds of cities abroad;

Whereas public service is a noble calling involving a variety of challenging and rewarding professions;

Whereas the ability of the Federal Government and State and local governments to be responsive, innovative, and effective depends on the outstanding performance of dedicated public servants;

Whereas the United States is a great and prosperous country, and public service employees contribute significantly to that greatness and prosperity;

Whereas the United States benefits daily from the knowledge and skills of the highly trained individuals who work in public service;

Whereas public servants—

(1) defend the freedom of the people of the United States and advance the interests of the United States around the world;

(2) provide vital strategic support functions to the Armed Forces and serve in the reserve components of the Armed Forces;

(3) fight crime and fires;

(4) ensure equal access to secure, efficient, and affordable mail service;

(5) deliver benefits under the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), including benefits under the Medicare program under title XVIII of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.);

(6) fight disease and promote better health;

(7) protect the environment and parks in the United States;

(8) enforce laws guaranteeing equal employment opportunity and healthy working conditions;

(9) defend and secure critical infrastructure;

(10) help the people of the United States recover from natural disasters and terrorist attacks;

(11) teach and work in schools and libraries;

(12) develop new technologies and explore the Earth, the Moon, and space to help improve knowledge on how the world changes;

(13) improve and secure transportation systems;

(14) promote economic growth; and

(15) assist veterans of the Armed Forces;

Whereas members of the uniformed services and civilian employees at all levels of government—

(1) make significant contributions to the general welfare of the United States; and

(2) are on the front lines in the fight to defeat terrorism and maintain homeland security;

Whereas public servants work in a professional manner to build relationships with other countries and cultures in order to better represent the interests and promote the ideals of the United States;

Whereas public servants alert Congress and the public to government waste, fraud, and abuse, and dangers to public health;

Whereas the individuals serving in the uniformed services, as well as the skilled trade and craft employees of the Federal Government who provide support to their efforts—

(1) are committed to doing their jobs regardless of the circumstances; and

(2) contribute greatly to the security of the United States and the world;

Whereas public servants have bravely fought in armed conflicts in the defense of the United States and its ideals and deserve the care and benefits they have earned through their honorable service;

Whereas public servants—

(1) have much to offer, as demonstrated by their expertise and innovative ideas; and

(2) serve as examples by passing on institutional knowledge to train the next generation of public servants; and

Whereas the week of May 5 through May 11, 2019, marks the 35th anniversary of Public Service Recognition Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of the week of May 5 through May 11, 2019, as "Public Service Recognition Week";

(2) commends public servants for their outstanding contributions to the United States during Public Service Recognition Week and throughout the year;

(3) salutes government employees and members of the uniformed services for their unyielding dedication to, and enthusiasm for, public service;

(4) honors government employees and members of the uniformed services who have given their lives in service to the United States;

(5) calls upon a new generation to consider a career in public service as an honorable profession;

(6) encourages efforts to promote public service careers at every level of government; and

(7) supports efforts to promote an efficient and effective public service that serves the people of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 181—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF APRIL 8 THROUGH APRIL 12, 2019, AS "NATIONAL SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL APPRECIATION WEEK"

Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. KAINÉ, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. SMITH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 181

Whereas there are more than 1,000,000 specialized instructional support personnel serving the schools and students of the United States, including—

(1) school counselors;

(2) school social workers;

(3) school psychologists; and

(4) other qualified professional personnel, such as—

(A) school nurses;

(B) psychologists;

(C) social workers;

(D) occupational therapists;

(E) physical therapists;

(F) art therapists;

(G) dance and movement therapists;

(H) music therapists;

(I) speech-language pathologists; and

(J) audiologists;

Whereas specialized instructional support personnel provide school-based prevention

and early intervention services to reduce barriers to learning;

Whereas specialized instructional support personnel work with teachers, school leaders, and parents to ensure that all students are successful in school;

Whereas specialized instructional support personnel encourage multidisciplinary collaboration to promote student and school success;

Whereas specialized instructional support personnel provide educational, social, emotional, and behavioral interventions and activities that support—

- (1) student learning; and
- (2) teaching;

Whereas specialized instructional support personnel help to create environments that are safe, supportive, and conducive to learning;

Whereas safe and supportive school environments are associated with improved academic performance;

Whereas specialized instructional support personnel support—

- (1) student communication;
- (2) the development of social skills by students;
- (3) the physical wellness of students;
- (4) the physical development of students; and
- (5) the behavioral, emotional, and mental health of students; and

Whereas specialized instructional support personnel serve all students who struggle with barriers to learning: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of April 8 through April 12, 2019, as “National Specialized Instructional Support Personnel Appreciation Week”;

(2) recognizes that specialized instructional support personnel implement evidence-based practices to improve student outcomes;

(3) commends—

(A) those individuals who work as specialized instructional support personnel; and

(B) the individuals and organizations that support the efforts made by specialized instructional support personnel to promote and improve the availability of specialized instructional support services;

(4) encourages Federal, State, and local policymakers to work together to raise awareness of the importance of specialized instructional support personnel in school climate and education efforts;

(5) recognizes the important role of specialized instructional support personnel in efforts to improve mental health, reduce drug use, and improve overall community safety for students; and

(6) encourages experts to share best practices so that others can replicate the success of those experts.

SENATE RESOLUTION 182—RECOGNIZING THE DUTY OF THE SENATE TO CONDEMN MODERN MONETARY THEORY AND RECOGNIZING MODERN MONETARY THEORY WOULD LEAD TO HIGHER DEFICITS AND HIGHER INFLATION

Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

S. RES. 182

Whereas noted economists from across the political spectrum have warned that the im-

plementation of Modern Monetary Theory (referred to in this preamble as “MMT”) would pose a clear danger to the economy of the United States;

Whereas, on March 4, 2019, former Secretary of the Treasury Lawrence H. Summers said that—

(1) MMT is fallacious at multiple levels;

(2) past a certain point, MMT leads to hyperinflation; and

(3) a policy of relying on a central bank to finance government deficits, as advocated by MMT theorists, would likely result in a col-lapsing exchange rate;

Whereas, on February 26, 2019, Jerome Powell, Chair of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, said: “The idea that deficits don’t matter for countries that can borrow in their own currency I think is just wrong”;

Whereas, on March 25, 2019, Janet Yellen, former Chair of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, disagreed with those individuals promoting MMT who suggest that “you don’t have to worry about interest-rate payments because the central bank can buy the debt”, stating: “That’s a very wrong-minded theory because that’s how you get hyper-inflation”;

Whereas the March 2019 report entitled “How Reliable is Modern Monetary Theory as a Guide to Policy?” by Scott Sumner and Patrick Horan of the Mercatus Center at George Mason University found that—

(1) MMT—

(A) has a flawed model of inflation, which overestimates the importance of economic slack;

(B) overestimates the revenue that can be earned from the creation of money;

(C) overestimates the potency of fiscal policy, while underestimating the effectiveness of monetary policy;

(D) overestimates the ability of fiscal authorities to control inflation; and

(E) contains too few safeguards against the risks of excessive public debt; and

(2) an MMT agenda of having fiscal authorities manage monetary policy would run the risk of—

(A) very high debts;

(B) very high inflation; or

(C) very high debts and very high inflation, each of which may be very harmful to the broader economy;

Whereas the January 2019 report entitled “Modern Monetary Theory and Policy” by Stan Veuger of the American Enterprise Institute warned that “hyperinflation becomes a real risk” when a government attempts to pay for massive spending by printing money; and

Whereas the September 2018 report entitled “On Empty Purses and MMT Rhetoric” by George Selgin of the Cato Institute warned that—

(1) when it comes to the ability of Congress to rely on the Treasury to cover expenditures, Congress is, in 1 crucial respect, more constrained than an ordinary household or business is when that household or business relies on a bank to cover expenditures because, if Congress is to avoid running out of money, Congress cannot write checks in amounts exceeding the balances in the general account of the Treasury; and

(2) MMT theorists succeed in turning otherwise banal truths about the workings of contemporary monetary systems into novel policy pronouncements that, although tantalizing, are false: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) realizes that deficits are unsustainable, irresponsible, and dangerous; and

(2) recognizes—

(A) that the implementation of Modern Monetary Theory would lead to higher deficits and higher inflation; and

(B) the duty of the Senate to condemn Modern Monetary Theory.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 28, 2019, AS “HONORING THE NATION’S FIRST RESPONDERS DAY”

Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 15

Whereas first responders include professional and volunteer fire, police, emergency medical technician, and paramedic workers in the United States;

Whereas, according to a 2017 compilation of data on the Emergency Services Sector in the United States by the Department of Homeland Security, “The first responder community comprises an estimated 4.6 million career and volunteer professionals within five primary disciplines: Law Enforcement, Fire and Rescue Services, Emergency Medical Services, Emergency Management, and Public Works.”;

Whereas first responders deserve to be recognized for their commitment to safety, defense, and honor; and

Whereas October 28, 2019, would be an appropriate day to establish as “Honoring the Nation’s First Responders Day”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) supports the designation of October 28, 2019, as “Honoring the Nation’s First Responders Day”;

(2) honors and recognizes the contributions of first responders; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe Honoring the Nation’s First Responders Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the contributions of first responders in the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN, Mr. President, I have 8 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, May 1, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Policy principles for a Federal data privacy framework.”

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, May 1, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 1, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Humanitarian impact in the Syrian war."

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 1, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 1, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 1, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 1, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Christopher Scolese, of New York, to be Director of the National Reconnaissance Office.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 1, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 180, submitted earlier today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 180) expressing the sense of the Senate that, during Public Service Recognition Week, public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the United States.

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. 180) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to. (The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL APPRECIATION WEEK

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 181, submitted earlier today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 181) supporting the designation of the week of April 8 through April 12, 2019, as "National Specialized Instructional Support Personnel Appreciation Week".

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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There being no further debate, the question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 181) was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pre-

amble be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 2, 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 2; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Ruiz nomination under the previous order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. 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 6:18 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 2, 2019, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

J. CAMPBELL BARKER, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

ANDREW LYNN BRASHER, OF ALABAMA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS AND AMERICAN SAMOA COLLEGE ACCESS ACT

HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the Northern Mariana Islands and American Samoa College Access Act, which would authorize tuition assistance grants to cover the difference between in-state and out-of-state tuition costs for Northern Marianas and American Samoa community college graduates seeking to attend a four-year public university.

The importance of having an educated citizenry is a bedrock principle of our nation and has been since our founding. And in today's competitive job market, a postsecondary education is increasingly becoming a critical necessity for obtaining a decent job with a decent wage.

The Northern Mariana Islands has only been part of America for forty years. We understand well that education is key to our continued growth, but the reality is that household incomes in the Northern Marianas are less than half the national median. The U.S. territory of American Samoa is in similar economic straits. Poverty and unemployment rates there are among the highest in the country.

I believe the best way to improve economic conditions in these territories is to improve the educational opportunities of our residents. Unfortunately, however, neither the Northern Marianas nor American Samoa has a four-year institution of higher education. In fact, they are the only two congressional districts in the country without a public four-year college or university. Each has an accredited community college, but academic offerings are substantially limited.

Students from these U.S. territories wanting the advantages of a four-year university in another state or territory face significant financial difficulty. Nonresident students spend an average of \$14,480 in out-of-state tuition and fees more per year than their resident peers at public four-year colleges, according to College Board. And many students in the Marianas and American Samoa wanting to attend a four-year university not only face the cost of nonresident tuition, but also the significant expense of travel. The Marianas are over 3,700 miles from the nearest state, Hawaii—a \$1,100 one-way trip by plane. American Samoa to Hawaii is over 2,500 miles, over \$800 one-way.

The bill follows the model of P.L. 106–98, the DC College Access Act, which allows students residing in the District of Columbia to apply for grants to help pay the cost of attending colleges outside D.C., but much smaller in scope and cost. It creates a program through which public four-year schools in the 50 states, D.C., and other U.S. territories may be

reimbursed for offering in-state tuition to undergraduate students from the Northern Mariana Islands and American Samoa.

The gentlelady from American Samoa, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, is an original cosponsor of the bill. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation and help give students from the Northern Marianas and American Samoa the means needed to make their educational dreams a reality.

HONORING ESSEX COUNTY COLLEGE'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I proudly honor Essex County College on the occasion of its 50th anniversary. Over the past half-century, Essex County College has helped educate and enlighten thousands of students from New Jersey and across the country.

Essex County College opened in 1968 to more than 3 thousand students. By 1970, the school needed a new campus and was relocated to what we now call University Heights in the Central Ward of Newark—across the street from my congressional district office. Essex County College has grown and expanded across the community in the decades since it opened. Today, Essex County College has more than 13 thousand students across its degree, certificate, and job training programs.

Throughout the 1970s and continuing today, Essex County College has invested in local communities. The school has opened and operated extension campuses throughout Essex County. It provides off-campus educational services like the popular Saturday Youth Programs. Essex County College helps students enter the workplace with marketable skills.

Essex County College has provided a foundation of education for generations of students. Through leadership and community investment, Essex County College is leading the way toward greater opportunity. Under President Anthony Munroe, I know that Essex County College will continue to flourish for years to come. I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating their 50th anniversary.

HONORING MAJOR CHRISTOPHER PETRANCOSTA

HON. LEE M. ZELDIN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize Major Christopher Vincent Petrancosta of the United States Army for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to our nation. Major Petrancosta will soon transi-

tion from his current assignment as an Army Congressional Liaison to the House of Representatives to attend Army Intermediate Level Education with follow on assignment at Fort Drum.

A native of Hot Springs, Arkansas, Chris is a third generation Army Soldier, continuing a proud family tradition of service to this nation. Chris attended the United States Military Academy at West Point and commissioned as an Infantry Officer in 2007. He has held numerous leadership and staff assignments in a variety of units, highlighted by operational and combat deployments to Haiti, Afghanistan, Iraq, Djibouti, and Niger during service with the 82nd Airborne Division and First Infantry Division. During his time in Washington, Chris earned a Masters in Policy Management from Georgetown University and worked as a Political Military Planner within the Joint Staff's Transregional Threats Coordination Cell.

In 2018, Major Petrancosta was selected to serve as a Congressional Liaison in the United States Army House Liaison Division. As the primary liaison between Members of the House of Representatives, their staffs, committees, and the Army, he provided insight and understanding of Army policies, actions, operations, and requirements. His first-hand knowledge of the military, its culture, and traditions has been a tremendous benefit to Congressional offices. This previous Christmas, I traveled with Chris to the Middle East to visit our servicemembers and better understand the region. Chris' extensive experience in the region enabled a productive visit for myself and other Members of Congress. I found him to be a thoughtful, intelligent, and dedicated Soldier in the best traditions of America's Armed Forces.

Madam Speaker, it has been a pleasure to work with Chris during his time as an Army Congressional Liaison Officer in the House of Representatives. On behalf of a grateful nation, it is my honor to recognize the selfless service and sacrifice of Major Christopher Petrancosta, his wife, Stacia, and their children, Tatum and Maryn. I wish them the very best as they continue their journey in the United States Army, and continue to dedicate their lives to the service of our nation.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT DAVID JOHN REZZO

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, our brave men and women of the Armed Forces continuously make sacrifices to keep our nation strong and free. Among the ranks is Lieutenant David John Rezzo, who I want to recognize today for his eight years of service in the United States Navy.

Lieutenant Rezzo currently serves as a Requirements Officer for Undersea Networks in the Pentagon. He entered the United States

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

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

Navy in 2011 and has served in numerous assignments and deployments throughout his distinguished career.

Lieutenant Rezzo has shown not only outstanding leadership skills, but also uncommon technical prowess. Over the course of six months as a Junior Officer on the USS Charlotte, he safely supervised the entire ship watch team during surface and submerged operations and managed the maintenance of an attack submarine's mechanical systems. He also achieved certification from the United States Department of Energy to assume overall responsibility of a US Naval Nuclear Power Plant.

Since November 2016, Lieutenant Rezzo has led a major revision of the Undersea Warfare Division's strategic plan, articulating future investment areas to industry, fleet users, program offices and other stakeholders with the aim of maintaining undersea dominance. He continues to coordinate plans to transition high-end asset programs that expand reliable communications throughout the maritime domain.

Most recently, Lieutenant Rezzo was also working on facilitating a \$150 million-dollar rapid acquisition effort to expand maritime surveillance worldwide in support of a critically important Chief of Naval Operations directive.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of Virginia's Eighth Congressional District I commend my constituent, Lieutenant David John Rezzo on his years of devoted service to the United States of America and ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing him.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF
DR. ALEXANDER P. STONE

HON. JERRY McNERNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. McNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating the life of Dr. Alexander P. Stone.

Dr. Stone was a patient teacher, a mathematical scholar and creator, and a true gentleman. Under his guidance, his students learned more than the fundamentals of calculus and how to solve differential equations on curved surfaces of arbitrary dimension—he also instilled in all of us a deep appreciation for the beauty of abstract mathematical thought.

Dr. Stone held the admiration and respect of all those around him. His breadth of knowledge was clear, and so was his determination as a mathematical mentor to make sure that his students had the instruction and personal attention they needed to excel. He never belittled anyone for asking what may have seemed like a trivial or obvious question and went out of his way to put students at ease during casual conversations as well as in high stakes exams. He celebrated with us as we made new mathematical discoveries that led to our growth and success.

Alex was also a devoted father, which was made clear during dinnertime at his home. His young son was always welcome to join the conversation, setting an example for how to teach children to be inquisitive and engaged without being disruptive.

Dr. Stone's empathy was boundless. He had a rare combination of great kindness in

addition to great knowledge. He touched the lives of all who entered his classroom, and he will be missed.

IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL
STUDENTS AND SCHOLARS IN
THE UNITED STATES

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, today is National Decision Day. It is an exciting time of year for students as they commit to colleges across the United States. I rise to speak in support of the international scholars who choose to attend our American academic institutions. Their presence in the U.S. is an asset to our country's culture and economy.

While the Department of State's annual Open Doors report states that the United States is still the top location for international students, a concerning statistic shows that new international student enrollment declined by 6.6 percent during the 2017–2018 school year.

The congressional district I represent greatly benefits from international student enrollment in our local colleges and universities. In addition to their intellectual and research contributions, these students make an annual financial contribution of \$52.2 million dollars and support the creation of several hundred jobs each year. We're at risk of losing this valuable talent and the benefits they bring to the residents of New York's 16th District.

But it's not just my district that will suffer—the entire country will. Although they only make up 5.5 percent of higher education enrollment in the United States, the economic value that international students have on our economy is significant. In the 2017–2018 academic year alone, international students studying at U.S. colleges and universities contributed \$39 billion to the U.S. economy and supported over 450,000 jobs. For every seven international students enrolled, three U.S. jobs are created and supported through spending in the higher education, health insurance, and transportation sectors, among others.

International education doesn't just foster economic benefits; it advances learning and scholarship. Students want to come to the United States because they know that this country has some of the world's greatest educational opportunities. However, as a result of delays in processing student visas in recent years, many international scholars have decided to study in other countries, such as Canada and Australia, which have more welcoming policies. As a result, our country is missing out on incredible talent, and students are foregoing the opportunity to study in one of the best education systems in the world.

As the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am grateful for the work international students are doing every day to strengthen ties with countries around the world. International education develops cultural understanding and respect among different peoples.

We need to send the message that international students and scholars who want to study in the United States are welcome. I urge my colleagues to work with me in ensuring

that the United States continues to be the world's best destination for academic study.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF DISCOUNT DRUG MART

HON. ANTHONY GONZALEZ

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an Ohio-based drug store chain, Discount Drug Mart on their 50th Anniversary. Small businesses are the heart of America. They not only create jobs and opportunities, but engineer vibrant communities to live and raise our families in.

Like many small businesses in our country, Discount Drug Mart was established after somebody took a risk and poured their heart and soul into a visionary product. In 1969, Parviz Boodjeh opened the first Discount Drug Mart in Elyria, Ohio, combining a retail store with the personal care of a Pharmacist's office. By integrating disease management and screening services with necessities and convenience items, Discount Drug Mart has influenced businesses around the globe and continues to support thousands of Ohioans today. Mr. Boodjeh's leadership and compassionate touch have helped his family expand to over 70 stores and operate in over 20 Ohio counties. Discount Drug Mart, Inc., serves as a model for the American Dream and an example of what hard work and dedication can accomplish.

I offer my sincerest congratulations to this valued business and celebrate with them for over a half-century of service to our communities.

ENCOURAGING GREATER PUBLIC-PRIVATE SECTOR COLLABORATION TO PROMOTE FINANCIAL LITERACY FOR STUDENTS AND YOUNG ADULTS

SPEECH OF

HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 2019

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD this article regarding H. Res. 327 Encouraging Greater Public-Private Sector Collaboration to Promote Financial Literacy for Students and Young Adults.

[From the Democrat-Gazette, April 8, 2019]

NO MONEY TREE

(By Robert Hopkins)

At an age when children are busy playing with their new Legos or asking for Happy Meals, they're also forming early and foundational ideas about earning, saving and spending that they may carry with them throughout their lives. April is Financial Literacy Month, so it's a good time to discuss why it is important that we teach personal finance and economics to young children.

Children often develop their financial behaviors as early as 7 years of age, according to research by David Whitebread and Sue Bingham of the University of Cambridge in England. So waiting until students are in

high school to teach personal finance and economics can mean missing valuable opportunities to help them learn and shape their habits. And it leaves children, during very impressionable years, more apt to construct their understanding of the economy and personal finance from what they observe around them.

This frequently results in misunderstandings.

For example, children who see their parents get money from an ATM may not have the context to understand that a bank account is directly connected to the use of the ATM. Without that context, a child hearing, "We can't afford that this month," is likely to think, "Just go get money out of the machine!"

Similarly, children may witness an adult paying for most items with a credit card or a mobile phone payment service without recognizing this as money being spent. And often children don't connect your work with income; they may not realize that adults work and are paid for that work.

At the St. Louis Fed, we have a team of educators, researchers and specialists who are making economic education more accessible and creating fun and memorable lessons and resources for teachers, parents and consumers around the country. In the spirit of Financial Literacy Month, that team has compiled six pertinent things we must teach children:

1. People work to earn income. Be explicit when explaining to children that you work to earn money to support your family. Give them opportunities to earn as well.

2. People spend some income, save some income, and donate some income. Give the children in your life opportunities to do this—spend, save, donate.

3. Saving is a good habit. Provide incentives for your children to save, such as offering to match a percentage of what they put in their piggy banks. Encourage them to save a set amount before considering purchasing a new toy.

4. Adults can't have everything they want—children can't, either. Teach them to prioritize and make careful choices.

5. Spending and saving decisions have consequences. Allow your children to live with—and talk to them about—those consequences.

6. Banks and credit unions are safe places to save your money. Tell children about them, including that those institutions pay interest on savings.

When they were younger, I tried to share such personal tips with my children, and still do today.

We believe, based on research, that children who are taught valuable lessons about spending, saving and other personal finance topics at a young age are more likely to become adults who are more financially responsible.

Share the personal finance tips in this article with your children, grandchildren, students and the other young people in your life. Research shows it may help them grow into teenagers and adults with a better grasp on their personal finances.

Robert Hopkins is senior vice president and regional executive of the Little Rock Branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

IN RECOGNITION OF IAN WARDROPPER

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the

CIVITAS 2019 honoree, Ian Wardropper. Mr. Wardropper is the Director and Chief Executive Officer of the Frick Collection, one of the great cultural institutions of the 12th Congressional District and one of the most renowned museums and research centers in the world.

The Frick Collection displays one of the premier assemblages of Old Master paintings and European sculpture and decorative arts begun by the American industrialist Henry Clay Frick in his former Fifth Avenue home. Additionally, the Frick Collection building is one of only a few extant Gilded Age mansions in New York City.

The museum opened in 1935 and has continued to expand its collection to the benefit of countless New Yorkers and visitors from around the world. In addition to hosting special exhibitions, educational programs, a concert series, and symposia, the Frick Collection is home to the Frick Art Reference Library, one of the leading institutions for art history research.

Ian Wardropper attended Brown University for his undergraduate studies with a major in Art History before completing MA and PhD studies at New York University. For his PhD, Mr. Wardropper wrote his dissertation on the Florentine artist Domenico del Barbiere. After completing his studies, Mr. Wardropper worked for 19 years as a curator in the European Decorative Arts and Sculpture, and Ancient Art departments at The Art Institute of Chicago, where he was promoted to head of department. In 2001, Mr. Wardropper returned to New York City to become the Iris and B. Gerald Cantor Chairman of the Department of European Sculpture and Decorative Arts at The Metropolitan Museum of Art.

In the fall of 2011, Mr. Wardropper began his tenure at the Director of the Frick Collection. Mr. Wardropper has distinguished himself by his leadership and his dedication to the long-term success of the Frick Collection. Mr. Wardropper has taught art history at six universities and is a prodigious author, publishing myriad books, catalogues, and articles including the recent Limoges Enamels at The Frick Collection and Director's Choice: The Frick Collection.

CIVITAS is a community based organization that focuses on quality of life for Upper East Side and East Harlem residents. Founded in 1981, CIVITAS is concerned with promoting contextual urban planning and land use policies, with a special emphasis on environmentally-conscious development and vibrant street level retail activity.

Madam Speaker, I ask my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing Ian Wardropper for his forward-thinking and dedicated leadership of one of the nation's pre-eminent cultural and research institutions, the Frick Collection.

IN RECOGNITION OF BRENDON JOHNS ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an out-

standing student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Brendon Johns of Archbold, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York.

Brendan's offer of appointment permits him to attend the United States Military Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2023. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country, but also guarantees a world-class education while undertaking one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Brendon brings a tremendous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2023. While attending Archbold High School in Archbold, Ohio, Brendon was a member of the National Honor Society, Class President, and member of the Student Council, while maintaining a 4.0 GPA and ranking first in his class.

Throughout high school, Brendon was involved with cross country and track among other extracurricular activities. I am confident that Brendon will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Military Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Brendon Johns on his offer of appointment to the United States Military Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Brendon will excel during his career at West Point, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to our Nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE WOMEN'S CLUB OF WEST PITTSSTON'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Women's Club of West Pittston on the 100th anniversary of their founding. The Women's Club, under current president George Anne Neff, meets the third Tuesday of the month, from September through May, at the First United Methodist Church of West Pittston.

Founded in 1919, the Women's Club of West Pittston provided a social opportunity for women in the community to gather and work toward the betterment of their community. Throughout their storied history, the Women's Club of West Pittston has been involved in many philanthropic and local endeavors. The Club famously rallied support behind the Iron Bridge over the Susquehanna River, which connects West Pittston and Pittston, and they are credited with helping save the historic structure.

The Women's Club focuses their mission on supporting four key local entities: fire companies, ambulance companies, Meals on Wheels, and the West Pittston Library. Each year, they raise funds and donate them to these groups. Members of the Women's Club are actively involved with the West Pittston Library, serving as volunteers and as board members, and donating money and books in honor of deceased members.

The Women's Club partners with local community organizations throughout the year, including the Salvation Army, Dress for Success, Blue Chip Animal Rescue, and the SPCA. Using funds raised from their annual clothing sale, the Club supports two \$500 scholarships for graduating female seniors from Wyoming Area Secondary Center, to help further their education.

For generations, the West Pittston Women's Club has provided an environment for women to gather and find their voices to give back to their community. It is a great honor to recognize this organization for the work they have done and will continue to do. I wish them the very best for another hundred years of growth and prosperity.

HONORING THE UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS FOR 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Union of Concerned Scientists' 50th anniversary.

For five decades, the Union of Concerned Scientists has been using the latest technological and scientific expertise to address the world's most pressing issues. Its team of nearly 250 experts in science, policy, and communications continues to introduce new and innovative solutions to the greatest questions of our time.

Among their many projects and initiatives, I have been particularly impressed with their work to address the looming threats posed by climate change and to contain the existential threat of nuclear war. I would like to thank the Union of Concerned Scientists for its commitment to our collective future and for its numerous projects that will help ensure a better world for our children.

IN RECOGNITION OF KEVIN HILEMAN ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Kevin Hileman of Toledo, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

Kevin's offer of appointment permits him to attend the United States Naval Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2023. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country, but also guarantees a world-class education while undertaking one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Kevin brings a tremendous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming

Class of 2023. While attending Ottawa Hills High School in Ottawa Hills, Ohio, Kevin was a member of the National Honor Society and Honor Roll.

Throughout high school, Kevin was involved with soccer, having achieved his varsity letter and served as team captain. I am confident that Kevin will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Naval Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kevin Hileman on his offer of appointment to the United States Naval Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Kevin will excel during his career at the Naval Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to our Nation.

SHAWN SHELTON TRIBUTE

HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Shawn Shelton of Pueblo, Colorado, who recently retired from the Pueblo Fire Department.

Shawn was born in 1962 in Quantico, Virginia to Doyle and Elizabeth Shelton. His father's service in the Marine Corps and the Air Force led to their family moving to various posts until they eventually settled in Pueblo in 1975. He married Mary Beth Erjavec in 1983 and they have two sons, Timothy and Joshua. Working odd-jobs as a ranch hand and a mechanic, Shawn found his career path in his early 20's after a friend's recommendation and never looked back. Shawn selflessly helped countless families in the Pueblo community by serving as a firefighter for over 30 years.

After three years on the job, Shawn was promoted as a medic, and a year later received another promotion to fire engineer. He continued to advance in the department when he was promoted again to captain and then to assistant fire chief in 2015. Shawn's dedication to faithfully serve his community and his leadership as a team member ultimately led to him becoming the chief of the Pueblo Fire Department, a position he held for the last three years of his career.

Firefighters are called to assist in some of the direst situations, yet their actions can be remembered for the lifetimes of the people they help. On one such occasion, while standing in line at a grocery store, Shawn was recognized by a woman whose baby he helped deliver nine years earlier. It's moments like that Shawn says he will miss the most.

Madam Speaker, I stand with the Pueblo Fire Department and the entire community of Pueblo in thanking Shawn for his service over the last three decades. I wish him a happy retirement and hope that he knows just how thankful we are for his remarkable career.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NO TAX SUBSIDIES FOR STADIUMS ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today I introduced the No Tax Subsidies for Stadiums Act of 2019. This bipartisan legislation returns hundreds of millions of dollars a year to American taxpayers by disallowing the tax-exemption for municipal bonds used to finance professional sports stadiums.

For more than a century, the federal government has supported state and local infrastructure projects by excluding the interest on municipal bonds from federal income taxes. Qualified projects eligible for a tax-exemption include roads, sewers and water systems, hospitals, schools, governmental buildings, and other projects for the public good. However, a loophole in the tax code allows billionaire owners of sports franchises to use public money to construct stadiums using tax-exempt municipal bonds.

For the first half of the twentieth century, professional sports franchises privately-funded the construction of most stadiums. But beginning in 1953, when the Boston Braves moved to Milwaukee, most professional sports franchises have used public financing to construct or rehabilitate their privately-owned stadiums. Since 2000, 36 professional sports stadiums have been constructed or rehabilitated under financing provided by federal tax-exempt municipal bonds, costing taxpayers nearly \$4 billion. While professional sports teams promise state and local governments that their stadiums will produce local economic development and job creation, there is no quantifiable evidence that they provide these benefits. Public financing creates a race to the bottom where teams worth hundreds of millions, or even billions, of dollars have all the leverage to exploit city budgets for their own gain. Too often, these subsidies also create budgetary constraints that result in offsetting cuts to critical public safety and economic security programs.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House and Senate to pass this legislation and end the practice of subsidizing billionaires' sports franchises.

IN RECOGNITION OF KAILYN GRANT ON HER OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Kailyn Grant of Northwood, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

Kailyn's offer of appointment permits her to attend the United States Naval Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2023. Attending

one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country, but also guarantees a world-class education while undertaking one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Kailyn brings a tremendous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2023. While attending St. Ursula Academy in Toledo, Ohio, Kailyn was a member of the National Honor Society, Student Council, and Dean's List.

Throughout high school, Kailyn was involved with soccer and track. I am confident that Kailyn will carry the lessons of her student and athletic leadership to the Naval Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kailyn Grant on her offer of appointment to the United States Naval Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Kailyn will excel during her career at the Naval Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to her as she begins her service to our Nation.

CONGRATULATING DR. REBECCA RICHARDS-KORTUM, DR. JAMES TRUCHARD AND JEFF KODOSKY, ON THEIR INDUCTION INTO THE NATIONAL INVENTOR HALL OF FAME

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Rebecca Richards-Kortum of Rice University in Houston and Dr. James Truchard and Jeff Kodosky of National Instruments in Austin for their induction into the National Inventors Hall of Fame on May 2, 2019.

Dr. Rebecca Richards-Kortum is the first woman and the youngest Rice faculty member to earn the rank of University Professor. Early in her career, as a biomedical engineering professor at the University of Texas at Austin, she learned that early screening programs for cancer were out of reach for many and began creating a low-cost imaging system to detect precancerous cells. This technology was further developed to detect oral cancer. Studies later showed that her system could improve early detection of cancer while drastically reducing costly and unnecessary biopsies. In her travels to Malawi, she witnessed an issue with under-equipped neonatal wards, and thus in 2005 after moving to Rice, Dr. Richards-Kortum cofounded the Rice 360° Institute for Global Health where she began working with students on low-cost, low-power devices to save newborn lives. Her work has improved medical care for millions of newborns and saved thousands of lives in low-income countries. Her and her team's successes to date include systems that help babies breathe and that help caregivers detect jaundice and accurately dose children's liquid medication. For this work, she was the first Houston scientist and first Houston woman to win a coveted "genius grant" from the MacArthur Foundation.

Dr. James Truchard and Jeff Kodosky, who will also be inducted into the National Inven-

tor's Hall of Fame, conceived a better method of high-end testing using computers instead of the inefficient data collection methods they employed as researchers at the University of Texas Applied Research Laboratories in the 1970s. With their colleague Bill Nowlin, they founded National Instruments to develop a concept called virtual instrumentation, where software and hardware combine to perform the functions of traditional instruments, through a product called LabVIEW. LabVIEW became the flagship product of National Instruments and is used today by engineers, scientists, academics and students around the world. Having been adopted across many industry sectors, its applications are as wide-ranging as controlling the CERN Large Hadron Collider to facilitating navigation of the FDA regulatory process. LabVIEW created a new paradigm for programming and has been honored with more than 100 national and international awards, while National Instruments—with its global headquarters in Austin—has grown to become a multinational, billion-dollar company.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating these outstanding Texas inventors. Their induction into the National Inventors Hall of Fame speaks volumes for the culture of invention, innovation, and entrepreneurship that exists in the great State of Texas.

RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA TIFTON CAMPUS' CENTENNIAL

HON. AUSTIN SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today I would like to recognize a century of contributions by the University of Georgia Tifton Campus to the science of agriculture, the advancement of agricultural technology, and the education of producers, students and the public to promote and protect the U.S. food supply and to help feed people in need around the world.

In August 1918, the Georgia General Assembly authorized the creation of a Georgia Coastal Plain Experiment Station. In May 1919, my hometown of Tifton was chosen as the location due in large part to the surrounding area's vital role in agriculture research, outreach, and education. Today, the Georgia Coastal Plain Experiment Station is known as the University of Georgia Tifton Campus. In its one hundred years, UGA-Tifton has fulfilled its duties to promote research and education. Through the years, UGA-Tifton scientists have developed grain varieties that helped save millions of lives from starvation in India and Africa; they have developed machinery and technology that made agriculture profitable and sustainable; they have contributed to the improvement of livestock genetics and production; they have created a body of scientific research that has helped realize a five-fold increase in peanut production per acre, bringing to life the now robust agricultural economy of the state of Georgia; and they have contributed to the development of forages and turfgrasses that continue to benefit ranchers, athletes and homeowners alike.

Just as it was in the early 1900's, UGA-Tifton continues to be a cornerstone of agri-

culture research, outreach, and education for not only South Georgia, but the state and Southeast region as a whole. The commitment to its mission and to the wellbeing of humanity over this century of service is admirable. As it celebrates this milestone, UGA-Tifton remains poised and eager to continue that legacy of excellence in the pursuit of the great discoveries that will bring economic prosperity to rural America, promote greater public health through better nutrition and a healthier environment, and prevent hunger in the world in the years to come.

On Friday, May 3, 2019, UGA-Tifton will celebrate and commemorate its impact and achievements at a showcase event on campus honoring one hundred years of commitment to the community and higher education. I congratulate the faculty, staff and greater UGA-Tifton community on their successes, thank them for their service, and look forward to seeing their continued growth and success for many more years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATHANIEL ERICKSON ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Nathaniel Erickson of Toledo, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

Nathaniel's offer of appointment permits him to attend the United States Naval Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2023. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country, but also guarantees a world-class education while undertaking one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Nathaniel brings a tremendous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2023. While attending Central Catholic High School in Toledo, Ohio, Nathaniel was a member of the National Honor Society, Honor Roll, and Student Body Council.

Throughout high school, Nathaniel was involved with football and track among other extracurricular activities. I am confident that Nathaniel will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Naval Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Nathaniel Erickson on his offer of appointment to the United States Naval Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Nathaniel will excel during his career at the Naval Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to our Nation.

ARAB AMERICAN HERITAGE
MONTH**HON. J. LUIS CORREA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate April as National Arab American Heritage Month to recognize the tremendous contributions Arab Americans have made to our great nation. Arab Americans have been, and continue to be, an invaluable part of our American life.

Arab American Heritage Month is a time to celebrate the accomplishments of people in the United States with Middle Eastern roots as well as for the public to become informed about the history of Arab Americans in the U.S.

Arab Americans are among the most loyal and patriotic Americans and have positively impacted communities throughout America with contributions to the medical field, agriculture sector, law, business, education, the entertainment industry, politics and beyond.

While celebrating their rich cultural heritage and embracing resilient family values, strong work ethic, dedication to education, and diversity in faith and creed, Arab Americans have added strength to our democracy.

While many unfairly perceive Arab Americans as unknown or unfamiliar, Arab Americans first began to arrive on American shores in the late 1800s. About half of the estimated 3,700,000 Arab Americans living in the United States were born in the U.S., according to the 2000 U.S. Census and the Arab American Institute.

Arab Americans join all citizens in the desire to see a peaceful and diverse society, where every individual is treated equally and feels safe. Celebrating Arab American Heritage Month allows us to promote public education, awareness, and policies that are culturally competent when describing, discussing, or addressing the impacts of being Arab American in all aspects of American society.

Madam Speaker, it is my honor to represent the Arab American constituents in my district, many of whom I call friends, and to recognize the incredible contributions and heritage of Arab Americans who have helped us build a better nation.

CELEBRATING 25 YEARS OF
CONCERNED MEN COOK**HON. JIM COSTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Concerned Men Cook on their 25th Anniversary. Since its founding by former Merced County Assistant Superintendent Denard Davis, Concerned Men Cook has provided an opportunity for members of the community to break bread while raising money for scholarship funds for local schools in Merced.

As an educator deeply involved in multiple community organizations, Mr. Davis started Concerned Men Cook after participating in the Men's Cook competition in Los Angeles. Using his connections from the multiple organiza-

tions he was involved with, Mr. Davis brought together educators, businesses, and community organizations to host a competition to fundraise money for scholarships for Merced County students.

Mr. Davis was also a founding member of the Black Businessmen and Black Educators of Merced County and president of an African-American investment group that provided affordable housing to the residents of South Merced. Though he passed away in 2015, the Concerned Men Cook competition is one of many ways his legacy continues to positively impact Merced County.

Since its founding 25 years ago, Concerned Men Cook has expanded to consist of five avenues in the competition, all of which are aligned with local men from throughout the community. It is now held on every fourth Sunday of April at the Merced Civic Center and continues to be a successful fundraiser for local scholarship funds.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Concerned Men Cook. It is both fitting and appropriate that we honor them as they celebrate their 25th year. I wish them the best as they continue to bring together members of the community to raise money for our students.

IN RECOGNITION OF DEVIN THIEL
ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT
TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES
AIR FORCE ACADEMY**HON. ROBERT E. LATTA**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Devin Thiel of Edgerton, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Devin's offer of appointment permits him to attend the United States Air Force Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2023. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country, but also guarantees a world-class education while undertaking one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Devin brings a tremendous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2023. While attending Edgerton High School in Edgerton, Ohio, Devin was a member of the National Honor Society, Scholar Athlete Award recipient, and All-A Honor Roll, while ranking second in his class.

Throughout high school, Devin was involved with wrestling, cross country, football and track among other extracurricular activities. I am confident that Devin will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Air Force Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Devin Thiel on his offer of appointment to the United States Air Force Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Devin will excel during his career at the Air Force Academy, and I ask my

colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to our Nation.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF ALFONSO MATANANE
PANGELINAN**HON. MICHAEL F. Q. SAN NICOLAS**

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. Alfonso Matanane Pangelinan. Alfonso was a proud son of Guam and faithful public servant who served honorably in the United States Army. Alfonso was born on October 22, 1927 and passed away on April 17, 2019 at the age of 91.

His legacy is highlighted through the various positions he held in public office. Alfonso served as Assistant Commissioner of the village of Sinajana from 1965 to 1967 and then as Commissioner of the Village from 1968 to 1973. Alfonso was a member of the Sinajana Civic Improvement Club in the 1960s and later served as Director of the Passport Office from 1983 to 1986.

After his retirement from public office, Alfonso remained active in the community. He was an early advocate for the return of Chamorro lands and federal excess lands to their original landowners. He remained a devoted son, father, and grandfather, passing down knowledge and traditions to the generations after him. He was the son of Vicente Santos and Ana Matanane Pangelinan of Machanao and Ritidian.

Alfonso was fondly known to play the bass guitar with other notable Guam musicians, playing at weddings, fiestas, and family gatherings across the island. He had since shared his talent and love of music by teaching several of his grandchildren and great-grandchildren the art of playing the instrument.

I am deeply saddened by the passing of Alfonso Matanane Pangelinan. I join the people of Guam in celebrating his life and the legacy he leaves behind. He was a dedicated public servant who worked tirelessly to improve the quality of life in his village of Sinajana and the broader island community during and after his time in office. My prayers are with his family, loved ones, and friends as they remember their lives with Alfonso and the memories they individually shared.

I extend my condolences to his children, Evangeline P. Flores, Janet P. Leon Guerrero, Michael C. Pangelinan, Donald C. Pangelinan, and Rosalyn P. Ochoco, and his grandchildren and great-grandchildren. He will be deeply missed, and his memory will live on in the hearts of the people of Guam.

IN HONOR OF THE RETIREMENT
OF SUZANNE GIRARD BURNETTE**HON. MIKE ROGERS**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I ask for the House's attention to recognize the retirement of Suzanne Girard Burnette.

Suzanne is retiring as the Executive Director of the Lee-Russell Council of Governments on May 1st after nearly 25 years with the organization.

Suzanne grew up in West, Texas before moving to Mayfield, Kentucky for her father's new job. She received her Bachelor of Science degree from Murray State University in Murray, Kentucky and her Master's in Public Affairs/Administration from Kentucky State University in Frankfort, Kentucky. She has over 30 years of experience in community and economic development in both the public and private sector.

In 1984, she wrote the State of Alabama's "Community Development Block Grant Program Management and Implementation Manual." Suzanne serves on various boards and committees including the Auburn Lions Club, the Alabama Association of Regional Councils, the National Association of Development Organizations Board, the Southeast Regional Director's Institute, Lee County Habitat for Humanity Board, Auburn and Opelika Chambers of Commerce, Alabama Council on Human Relations and others.

Suzanne is married to Wayne Burnette and lives in Auburn, Alabama. Suzanne and Wayne have two children, April and Miranda.

Madam Speaker, please join me in recognizing the retirement of Suzanne Girard Burnette.

RECOGNIZING BARBARA BOYD'S SERVICE TO OUR COMMUNITY ON HER 90TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor Barbara Boyd on her 90th birthday.

Barbara is a living legend in the Indianapolis community, and this milestone birthday is the perfect opportunity to recognize her distinguished career in journalism. A true trailblazer in the Indianapolis media market, Barbara was the first African-American female to report and anchor television news in our city. Her impressive career lasted twenty-five years at Channel 6 news, earning her a spot in both the National Association of Black Journalists Hall of Fame and the Indiana Journalism Hall of Fame.

She is famously known for a groundbreaking piece highlighting her own struggle with breast cancer in which she addressed the television audience from a hospital bed after undergoing a mastectomy. Barbara was a strong advocate in the fight against breast cancer. Her brave decision to share her personal journey helped educate many people about the disease and inspired people to seek medical care.

Beyond her work in communications, Barbara has long been involved with numerous community and civic groups, including the March of Dimes, the United Negro College Fund, NAACP, and a host of other organizations that helped her leave an indelible mark on our city.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Ms. Barbara Boyd a happy 90th birthday and thanking her for her years of dedi-

cated service. Her work has informed and inspired countless individuals in our community, and her legacy serves as an inspiration to many. She will be treasured for generations to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF MAXWELL RUTLEDGE ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Maxwell Rutledge of Findlay, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York.

Maxwell's offer of appointment permits him to attend the United States Military Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2023. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country, but also guarantees a world-class education while undertaking one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Maxwell brings a tremendous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2023. While attending Saint Francis de Sales High School in Toledo, Ohio, Maxwell excelled in several AP courses.

Throughout high school, Maxwell was involved with the varsity swim team. I am confident that Maxwell will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Military Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Maxwell Rutledge on his offer of appointment to the United States Military Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Maxwell will excel during his career at West Point, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to our Nation.

FORCED RELIGIOUS CONVERSIONS IN SINDH, PAKISTAN

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, as Chair of the Congressional Caucus on Sindh and Chairman of the Asia Subcommittee in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have repeatedly drawn attention to the issue of forced conversions and other human rights abuses in the Sindh province of Pakistan. Today, I reiterate my concerns about the forced conversions of young Sindhi Hindu girls.

On April 29, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom released its annual report on the world's most egregious violators of religious freedom. The report noted that religious freedom in Pakistan con-

tinued to decline in 2018. The Commission also reported that "Forced conversions of non-Muslims continued despite the passage of the Hindu Marriage Act, which recognizes Hindu family law."

While the numbers are unclear, estimates suggest that each year, several hundred or more girls and young women are abducted, forcibly married, and converted to Islam. There were at least 1,000 cases of forced conversions of Hindu and Christian girls just in Sindh Province in 2018, according to the Human Rights Commission of Pakistan. The actual number is estimated to be much larger as most cases go unreported.

Pakistan's Human Rights Commission also notes that the Sindh Child Marriage Restraint Act of 2013, intended to address the issue, has not been enforced effectively. The state's response to forced marriages has been mixed, especially because the police are insensitive and indifferent in most cases. When families report their daughters as missing, this is ignored by the police. Therefore, the abducted girls remain with their abductors, where they are often coerced into silence.

The role of some religious leaders adds to the problem. Mian Mitho, a religious leader and politician, has participated in numerous conversions of young Sindhi girls. He has close connections with the army and the Prime Minister, and this has allowed him to continue his activities.

I urge Pakistan's government to more effectively address the issue of forced abductions, forced marriages, and forced religious conversions in the Sindh province.

CELEBRATING THE AJC CINCINNATI'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I am honored to recognize the American Jewish Committee of Cincinnati's 75th anniversary on May 2nd.

For three-quarters of a century, the AJC Cincinnati has been a major support system for the Greater Cincinnati Jewish Community and worked to create lasting relationships with people of other faiths, races, and denominations.

I thank the AJC Cincinnati's leadership and members for making a positive interfaith impact on the Cincinnati community.

Congratulations to the AJC Cincinnati on this noteworthy anniversary.

IN RECOGNITION OF JAKE STRUCKER ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that

Jake Stucker of Bowling Green, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Jake's offer of appointment permits him to attend the United States Air Force Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2023. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country, but also guarantees a world-class education while undertaking one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Jake brings a tremendous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2023. While attending Bowling Green High School in Bowling Green, Ohio, Jake was a member of the National Honor Society, Scholar Athlete Award recipient, and 4.0 Honor Roll, while ranking second in his class.

Throughout high school, Jake was involved with cross country and track among other extracurricular activities. I am confident that Jake will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Air Force Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jake Stucker on his offer of appointment to the United States Air Force Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Jake will excel during his career at the Air Force Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to our Nation.

HONORING MILITARY ENLISTEES

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor 80 high school seniors in Florida's 21st District who have decided to enlist in the United States Armed Forces.

Of the eighty from my district, thirty-three have joined the Army; their names are the following: Jacob Alexis, Jayquan Amaker, Edwin Asenjo, Devon Barthelemy, Briana Bolivar, Ricky Borgela, Kamron Botelho, Ricky Casseus, Lanca Danastor, Jannifer Elie, Joaquin Flores, Zachary Forster, Shemoi Foster, Linear Gelpi, Naeshawn Goines, Hunter Hall, Jessica Harris, Ashlyne Janvier, Christopher Jean Louis, Halina Josama, Joshua Lee, Bentley Meide, Brandon Moore, Ronie Olibrisse, Miguel Perez Mendez, Angela Pintos Villca, Dedan Presendieu, Erika Santiago, Ritchy-Senat, Christel Stephon, Trevor Topete, Zulma Bonilla, and Jaqueissy Pena.

Nineteen have joined the Marines; their names are the following: Kenneth Allen, Ryan Altes, Huguenson Camy, Ralphy Dormeus, Jonathan Giron, Fernando Guerra Guzman, Michael Guillen, Valeria Manzano, Trevor Murtha, Collin Poerstel, Sebastian Rodoli, Kevin Aguilar-Agosto, Matthew Soares, Jesus Suarez, Jay Marine, Anthony Medina, Shiloh Robinson, Joseph Saavedra, and Alberto Velazquez.

Twenty-six have joined the Navy; their names are the following: Izabella Brunson,

Justin Rose, Jordan Sharpe, Maria Figueroa, Roseny Joseph, Adler Pierre, Xavier Lesueur Sierra, Danny Ortiz, Natali Tamayo, Jessica Gonzalez Rodriguez, Jessica Wagner, Leonardo Gandica Gonzalez, Flora Hill, Donald III Tuckwood, Jeali Vasquez, Summer Dobbs, Jacqueline Sierra, Rafael Perez Garcia, Isaiiah McGraw, Ian Giles, Roshell Almonte, Christopher Walsh, Gabriel Rinaldi, Brandon Granberg, Kaden Kennedy, and Alessandro Riccio.

Two have joined the Air Force; their names are Valeria Degrossi and Donovan Dowling.

It is in thanks to the dedication of patriots like these that we are able to meet here today, in the United States House of Representatives, and openly debate the best solutions to the diverse issues that confront our country. On behalf of myself and all of my constituents in Florida's 21st District, I thank them for their service, and best of luck as they pursue this challenging endeavor.

HONORING 100 YEARS OF GOODWILL-EASTER SEALS OF MINNESOTA

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor 100 years of outstanding community service and support from Goodwill-Easter Seals of Minnesota. Since 1919, Goodwill-Easter Seals of Minnesota has empowered some of our most vulnerable neighbors by providing services and support to overcome barriers to employment and pursue lives of independence and self-reliance.

Saint Paul Goodwill Industries began in 1919 with a store in the basement of the Church of the Good Shepherd in Saint Paul. Goodwill trained workers to repair and resell donated merchandise through its retail operation. During the Great Depression, the jobs created through this model became a critical lifeline for those who had them. Goodwill also operated a home for the elderly, a Community House for workers, and a vocational training program for young persons with physical disabilities.

As the organization grew and matured, it continued supporting Minnesota's workforce, this time, at the request of the federal government. Through WWII and afterwards, Goodwill Industries opened up its much sought after vocational programs to service members returning from their deployments. Some of those who carried the physical ravages of war with them were enrolled in new training programs, and a training center was built to accommodate them. This chapter in the history of Goodwill-Easter Seals is just another example of this organization rising to the challenge and equipping people with the tools to be successful in their communities.

Because of its century of expertise and accumulated knowledge, today Goodwill-Easter Seals is a leader in policy pertaining to workforce development for individuals with disabilities and other barriers to work. Now with 50 locations around the state, Goodwill-Easter

Seals Minnesota prevents 60 million pounds of second-hand items from ending up in landfills, all while guiding an average of four people per day into workplaces of their own.

For 100 years, Goodwill-Easter Seals has provided a pillar of economic stability in communities throughout Minnesota. The Goodwill-Easter Seals' model of giving items a second life, and using the revenue to support effective job training for members of our community is one that has stood the test-of-time. The positive benefits to our community that have accumulated over the years from this approach are seemingly incalculable. Our community would be poorer and less vibrant were it not for the work and diligence of 100 years of staff and supporters who kept Goodwill-Easter Seals of Minnesota running efficiently and continuing to strive for improvement.

Madam Speaker, please join me in celebrating 100 years of Goodwill-Easter Seals of Minnesota empowering and uplifting Minnesota's communities.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHRISTIAN LEE ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. Latta. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Christian Lee of Findlay, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York.

Christian's offer of appointment permits him to attend the United States Military Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2023. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country, but also guarantees a world-class education while undertaking one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Christian brings a tremendous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2023. While attending Findlay High School in Findlay, Ohio, Christian was a member of the National Honor Society, Distinguished Honor Roll, and Merit Honor Roll.

Throughout high school, Christian was involved with cross country and rugby, having served as captain of both his senior year, as well as participating in many other extracurricular activities. I am confident that Christian will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Military Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Christian Lee on his offer of appointment to the United States Military Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Christian will excel during his career at West Point, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to our Nation.

COMMEMORATING ROBERT MARTINEZ, 14TH PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINIST AND AEROSPACE WORKERS

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Robert Martinez, 14th President of the International Association of Machinist and Aerospace Workers.

Robert Martinez is a fighter for the working man. His current role as President of the IAM is just one of many titles he has carried over 36 years of fighting for union workers and working families.

After serving his country in the Navy, he began his IAM career as a member of Local 776A in Fort Worth, TX and was hired as an Aircraft Assembler at Lockheed Martin.

At the IAM, Robert has actively recruited and made a point to reach new generations of workers, all the while protecting its nearly 600,000 active and retired members. Throughout his career, Bob has held positions at the local level and worked his way up to become the General Vice President of the office of Southern Territory, where he oversaw training and education for 14 southern states.

He also served as General Vice President of IAM Headquarters where he was responsible for the William H. Winpisinger Education and Technology Center, and IAM's Government Employees and Aerospace sectors.

Robert has been a vocal activist for labor rights in the Latino community. In 2018, he received the Cesar Chavez Award for his distinguished work on behalf of the Latino working women and men.

He currently services as the Vice President on the Executive Board of the Labor Council for Latin American Advancement.

I honor and recognize Robert Martinez's 36 years of service to union workers.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SUALUA TUI MASANIAI

HON. AUMUA AMATA COLEMAN RADEWAGEN

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of the last surviving Fita Fita Guard, WWII, and Korean War veteran Sualua Tui Masaniai. From the villages of Vatia and Ili'ili, he embarked on his journey in 1941 as he was sworn into the First Samoan Marine group. Shortly after, Sualua enlisted in the U.S. Navy fighting alongside his Samoan brothers during the Korean era and WWII.

Sualua dedicated much of his time, spiritual legacy and talents to Kingdom Building which led him to the creation of churches within Ili'ili, Puapua, and Westminster, CA.

After serving 20 years of active duty in the U.S. Navy, Sualua was honorably discharged as an E-7 Chief Petty Officer and Electronic Technician. He returned to Santa Ana, CA where at request of the American Samoa Government, he introduced television. Sualua ar-

rived with his family in 1964 where he became the Chief Technician at KVZK-TV on Mount Alava. Shortly after he served in Leone at the WVUV radio station. Sualua was a passionate man who poured his knowledge of electronic profession into the students at Nu'uuli Poly Tech High School.

Sualua's wife of 62 years—Fesili Mata'u Penitusi Amituana'i Masaniai from the villages of Faga'alu and Fitiuta preceded him to heaven on April 1, 2019. Sualua's legacy will continue in his 12 children, 26 grandchildren and 41 great grandchildren.

He was a dedicated community leader of strong work ethic who served his people and always a man of great faith, compassion, gratitude and reciprocity. He has brought great honor to our Samoan people. Sualua Tui Masaniai will be deeply missed, and his life is worthy of our best memories.

Thank you (Soifua).

IN RECOGNITION OF CHELSEA TAYLOR ON HER OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Chelsea Taylor of Van Wert, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Chelsea's offer of appointment permits her to attend the United States Air Force Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2023. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country, but also guarantees a world-class education while undertaking one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Chelsea brings a tremendous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2023. While attending Crestview High School in Convoy, Ohio, Chelsea received numerous academic achievement awards and was ranked first in her class.

Throughout high school, Chelsea was involved with cheerleading, track, and gymnastics. I am confident that Chelsea will carry the lessons of her student and athletic leadership to the Air Force Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Chelsea Taylor on her offer of appointment to the United States Air Force Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available. I am positive that Chelsea will excel during her career at the Air Force Academy, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to her as she begins her service to our Nation.

RECOGNIZING THE CALIFORNIA LGBTQ VETERANS MEMORIAL

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the dedication of the California LGBTQ Veterans Memorial.

The memorial honors LGBTQ veterans across the nation who bravely defended our country and the freedoms we hold dear. California is the first state in the nation to have a state memorial for LGBTQ veterans, which enshrines the sacrifices of our LGBTQ service members and reaffirms our commitment to the LGBTQ community.

The unveiling and dedication ceremony took place on Saturday, April 27, 2019 in Cathedral City, California. Organized by AMVETS, an organization that enhances and safeguards our nation's support for veterans, this event included a wreath-laying service to remember our deceased veterans.

The ceremony also honored 26 individuals with a dove release. Honorees included Jon Castro, an Army soldier from Corona, California, who was killed in the bombing of a mess hall in Iraq. The Rancho Mirage Chapter of Veterans for Peace, a veterans group dedicated to building a culture of peace in our communities, was named in his honor.

All of our veterans regardless of gender, race, religion, sexuality, or gender identity deserve our respect for courageously putting their lives on the line to protect our nation. And with this memorial, we will recognize our LGBTQ soldiers who fight every day to defend our country and protect liberty. It is our solemn duty to honor and respect their service.

I am grateful to AMVETS, Veterans for Peace, and all of the other wonderful organizations and people who made this memorial possible. On behalf of the residents of California's thirty-sixth congressional district, I thank the thousands of LGBTQ Americans who have fought and continue to fight to defend our nation. We will never forget their service.

IN RECOGNITION OF MASTER CHIEF MIHELICH

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Wayne John Mihelich, of Caldwell County, North Carolina. On behalf of the people of Western North Carolina, I would like to honor the military service of Command Master Chief Mihelich and his significant impact on the education of the next generation.

Master Chief Mihelich joined the Navy in 1973. He served in over ten duty assignments and was promoted to the rank of Command Master Chief. He was assigned five separate Commands as Command Master Chief, including U.S. Naval Security Group Activity in Rota, Spain; U.S. Naval Air Station in Sigonella, Sicily; and Naval Air Technical Training Center in Pensacola, Florida. He was also responsible for Chief Petty Officer mess professional development. Master Chief

Mihelich is a qualified Naval Aircrewman, Enlisted Aviation Warfare Specialist, USN Master Training Specialist, and USAF Master Trainer. He graduated from the U.S. Navy Senior Enlisted Academy, Class 43 (Khaki) and USAF Senior NCO Academy, Class 93-B.

Throughout his well decorated career, Master Chief Mihelich received three Meritorious Medals, three Navy Commendation Medals, three Navy Achievement Medals, the Navy Unit Commendation Ribbon, the Meritorious Unit Commendation Ribbon with three bronze stars, the Air Force Organizational Excellence Award, the Navy Good Conduct Medal with one silver and two bronze stars, the National Defense Service Medal with two bronze stars, the Kosovo Campaign Medal with one bronze star, the Armed Forces Service Medal, the Humanitarian Service Medal, the Sea Service Deployment Ribbon with one silver star, the Overseas Service Medal with one silver star, the NATO Medal, the Naval Rifle Marksmanship Ribbon (Expert), and the Navy Pistol Marksmanship Ribbon (Marksman).

Master Chief Mihelich possesses a love for learning which he fostered throughout his service in the Navy. After earning a Master's of Science Degree in Adult Education, he began educating the next generation. Master Chief Mihelich has been an esteemed teacher at West Caldwell High School in Lenoir, North Carolina for 16 years. For his excellence as the Naval Science instructor, he was honored as the Teacher of the Year for the 2017–2018 school year.

Master Chief Mihelich and his wife, Beverly, are the proud parents of their daughters Jessie, Jennie, and Marci, and grandparents to Lexi, Malachi, and Josiah.

It is my honor to acknowledge Master Chief Mihelich for his hard work and selfless dedication to our country and his community. His diligent pursuit of excellence is evident through his service in the Navy, his pursuit of knowledge, and his passion for preparing the students of West Caldwell High School for success.

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

HON. CHRIS PAPPAS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the American Legion Department of New Hampshire. On May 5, 1919, the American Legion of War Veterans in New Hampshire held its first meeting when a group of 47 veterans of World War I convened at the state armory in Manchester. Within that first year alone, 69 American Legion posts formed across the state—of those original posts, 41 remain active and will also be celebrating their 100th anniversary this year.

Over the last century, the American Legion in New Hampshire has remained committed to serving veterans, their families, and the state of New Hampshire. The American Legion is critical in ensuring that those who have sacrificed so much to our great nation are able to find the same sense of community and service when they return to civilian life. The sense of

camaraderie fostered at the over 100 American Legion posts in New Hampshire and among the over 17,000 members in our state is truly unparalleled.

Veterans and families who are part of the American Legion community share a common sense of service to our nation, and also forge deep bonds with their own communities. Legion posts and members are constantly giving back in myriad of ways, from sponsoring American Legion Baseball across the state, to supporting Operation Military Kids, which helps children impacted by deployment. American Legionnaires are not only active within their own communities but also on a larger scale as they advocate for the interests of veterans across our state and nation. I have had many productive conversations with Legionnaires whose knowledge, experience, and guidance have been instrumental as I advocate for the interests of our nation's veterans as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

On behalf of my constituents in New Hampshire's First Congressional District, I want to congratulate the American Legion Department of New Hampshire on their 100th anniversary. Once again, I thank the American Legion for their century of commitment to serving veterans, their families, and the Granite State as a whole. I look forward to continuing to work alongside them to support our nation's veterans.

IN RECOGNITION OF OLIVIA SKELTON ON HER OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Olivia Skelton of Convoy, Ohio has been offered an appointment to the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York.

Olivia's offer of appointment permits her to attend the United States Military Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2023. Attending one of our nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country, but also guarantees a world-class education while undertaking one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of their lives.

Olivia brings a tremendous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2023. While attending Crestview High School in Convoy, Ohio, Olivia was a scholar athlete and received numerous academic achievement awards, as well as attaining a 4.0 GPA and ranked first in her class.

Throughout high school, Olivia was involved with golf and softball, as well as serving as the basketball statistician. I am confident that Olivia will carry the lessons of her student and athletic leadership to the Military Academy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Olivia Skelton on her offer of appointment to the United States Military Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education avail-

able. I am positive that Olivia will excel during her career at West Point, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to her as she begins her service to our Nation.

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, May 2, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 7

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC-217.
SD-192

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine data rights and collection in a digital economy.
SD-538

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine implementing the 21st Century Cures Act, focusing on making electronic health information available to patients and providers, part II.
SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management
To hold hearings to examine agencies early public engagement and retrospective review.
SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine intellectual property and the price of prescription drugs, focusing on balancing innovation and competition.

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission.
SD-138

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower
To receive a closed briefing on the Navy's 355-ship requirement and alternative force structure options.

SVC-217

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Dale Cabaniss, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and Michael Eric Wooten, of Virginia, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.

SD-342

MAY 8

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Department of Defense
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Defense.

SD-192

Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

SD-124

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine new entrants in the national airspace, focusing on policy, technology, and security issues for Congress.

SD-G50

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works program.

SD-406

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine Medicare physician payment reform after two years, focusing on Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act implementation and the road ahead.

SD-215

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
To hold hearings to examine the Department of Energy's atomic defense ac-

tivities and programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020.

SR-222

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine fixing a broken budget process, focusing on lessons from states.

SD-608

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2020 for Indian programs.

SD-628

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Border Security and Immigration

To hold hearings to examine the humanitarian and security crisis at our southern border.

SD-226

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine the Older Americans Act, focusing on protecting and supporting seniors as they age.

SD-562

MAY 9

2 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

MAY 20

4 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-232A

5 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-232A

5:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the sub-

committee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-232A

MAY 21

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Cybersecurity
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

11 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-232A

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Personnel
Business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SD-G50

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities
Closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-232A

MAY 22

9 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-222

MAY 23

12 noon

Committee on Armed Services
Closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

SR-222

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2533–S2577

Measures Introduced: Nineteen bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1259–1277, S. Res. 179–182, and S. Con. Res. 15. **Pages S2569–70**

Measures Passed:

Public Service Recognition Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 180, expressing the sense of the Senate that, during Public Service Recognition Week, public servants should be commended for their dedication and continued service to the United States.

Page S2577

National Specialized Instructional Support Personnel Appreciation Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 181, supporting the designation of the week of April 8 through April 12, 2019, as “National Specialized Instructional Support Personnel Appreciation Week”.

Page S2577

Veto Messages:

Hostilities in the Republic of Yemen Veto Message—Agreement: A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that following disposition of the nomination of Joshua Wolson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Senate resume consideration of the veto message on S. J. Res. 7, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress, and Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, with no intervening action or debate, at 1:45 p.m., on Thursday, May 2, 2019, and with five minutes of debate, prior to the vote, under the control of Senator Menendez.

Page S2551

Ruiz II Nomination—Agreement: By 89 yeas to 10 nays (Vote No. EX. 88), Senate agreed to the

motion to close further debate on the nomination of Rodolfo Armando Ruiz II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Pages S2551–52

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, May 2, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the nomination, post-cloture.

Page S2577

Arias–Marxuach Nomination—Cloture: By 94 yeas to 5 nays (Vote No. EX. 89), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination of Raul M. Arias-Marxuach, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

Page S2552

Wolson Nomination—Cloture: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Joshua Wolson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Pages S2552–61

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 64 yeas to 35 nays (Vote No. EX. 90), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

Page S2552

Ruiz II, Arias–Marxuach, and Wolson Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the post-cloture time on the nominations of Rodolfo Armando Ruiz II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, Raul M. Arias-Marxuach, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, and Joshua Wolson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, expire at 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, May 2, 2019, and Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order in which cloture was invoked.

Page S2548

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 51 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. EX. 85), J. Campbell Barker, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas.

Pages S2534–40

By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. EX. 87), Andrew Lynn Brasher, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama.

Pages S2541–51

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. EX. 86), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

Page S2540–41

Messages from the House:

Page S2568

Measures Referred:

Pages S2568

Executive Communications:

Pages S2568–69

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S2570–71

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S2571–76

Additional Statements:

Pages S2566–68

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Pages S2576–77

Record Votes: Six record votes were taken today. (Total—90)

Pages S2540, S2551–52

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:18 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, May 2, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2577.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Health and Human Services, Indian Health Service, after receiving testimony from Rear Admiral Michael D. Weahkee, Principal Deputy Director, Rear Admiral Michael Toedt, Chief Medical Officer, Gary J. Hartz, Director, Office of Environmental Health and Engineering, and Ann Church, Acting Director, Office of Finance and Accounting, all of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.

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 2020 for the Navy and Marine Corps, after receiving testimony from Richard V. Spencer, Secretary of the Navy, Admiral John M. Richardson, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, and General Robert B. Neller, USMC, Commandant of the Marine Corps, all of the Department of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS: NASA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine the proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after receiving testimony from James F. Bridenstine, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS: NRC

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, after receiving testimony from Kristine Svinicki, Chairman, and Jeff Baran, Annie Caputo, and David Wright, each a Commissioner, all of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine United States nuclear weapons policy, programs, and strategy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Ellen M. Lord, Under Secretary for Acquisition and Sustainment, David J. Trachtenberg, Deputy Under Secretary for Policy, General Timothy M. Ray, USAF, Commander, Air Force Global Strike Command and Commander, Air Force Strategic—Air, United States Strategic Command, and Vice Admiral Johnny R. Wolfe, Jr., USN, Director, Strategic Systems Programs, all of the Department of Defense.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine policy principles for a Federal data privacy framework, focusing on consumer perspectives, after receiving testimony from Helen Dixon, Data Protection Commission of Ireland, Dublin; Jules Polonetsky, Future of Privacy Forum, and Neema Singh Guliani, American Civil Liberties Union, both of Washington, D.C.;

and James P. Steyer, Common Sense Media, San Francisco, California.

NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine an original bill entitled, “Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2019”, after receiving testimony from Senators Cortez Masto and Rosen; Anthony J. O'Donnell, Maryland Public Service Commission, Baltimore, on behalf of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners; Tim O'Connor, Xcel Energy, Inc., Minneapolis, Minnesota; and Geoffrey H. Fettus, Natural Resources Defense Council, Washington, D.C.

HUMANITARIAN IMPACT OF WAR IN SYRIA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the humanitarian impact of eight years of war in Syria, after receiving testimony from Ben Stiller, United Nations Refugee Agency, Geneva, Switzerland; and David Miliband, International Rescue Committee, New York, New York.

INDIAN AFFAIRS LEGISLATION

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 279, to allow tribal grant schools to participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program, S. 790, to clarify certain provisions of Public Law 103–116, the Catawba Indian Tribe of South Carolina Land Claims Settlement Act of 1993, S. 832, to nullify the Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865, after receiving testimony from John Tahsuda, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for

Indian Affairs; William Harris, Catawba Indian Nation, Rock Hill, South Carolina; Ron Suppah, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, Warm Springs, Oregon; and Cecelia Firethunder, Oglala Lakota Nation Education Coalition, Martin, South Dakota.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE INVESTIGATION OF RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Department of Justice's investigation of Russian interference with the 2016 presidential election, after receiving testimony from William P. Barr, Attorney General, Department of Justice.

ENTREPRENEURIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorization of the Small Business Administration's Entrepreneurial Development Programs, after receiving testimony from Allen Gutierrez, Associate Administrator, Office of Entrepreneurial Development, and Hannibal Ware, Inspector General, both of the Small Business Administration; Michael W. Myhre, Florida SBDC, Pensacola; Kiesha Haughton, Maryland Women's Business Center, Rockville; Ken Yancey, SCORE Association, Herndon, Virginia; and Darcella K. Craven, Veterans Business Resource Center, St. Louis, Missouri.

NOMINATION

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Christopher Scolese, of New York, to be Director of the National Reconnaissance Office, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Cardin, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 42 public bills, H.R. 2426–2467; and 13 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 37; and H. Res. 336–347, were introduced. **Pages H3402–05**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3406–07**

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 H3343**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:42 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H3348**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rev. Dr. Andrew Chaney, First & Calvary Presbyterian Church, Springfield, Missouri. **Page H3348**

Question of Privilege: Representative Green (TN) rose to a question of the privileges of the House and submitted a privileged resolution. Upon examination of the resolution, the Chair determined that the resolution qualified. Subsequently, the House agreed to the Hoyer motion to table H. Res. 304, raising a question of the privileges of the House, by a recorded vote of 226 ayes to 183 noes, Roll No. 174.

Pages H3361–62

Climate Action Now Act: The House considered H.R. 9, to direct the President to develop a plan for the United States to meet its nationally determined contribution under the Paris Agreement. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, May 2nd.

Pages H3363–97

Agreed to:

Omar amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that includes findings recognizing the importance of the Paris Climate Agreement’s Task Force addressing the impact of climate change on displacement and the global refugee crisis;

Pages H3382–83

Houlahan amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that requires the President’s plan to meet the United States’ nationally determined contribution to include how the United States may encourage and assist other parties to the Agreement reach their reported goals;

Pages H3383–84

Kuster (NH) amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that requires the administration produce a report examining the effect of the Paris Climate Agreement on clean energy job development in rural communities;

Pages H3384–85

Torres (CA) amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that prevents the President from using the plan mandated in this act to preclude states or cities from taking more ambitious actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions;

Page H3385

Shalala amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that includes findings that the Paris Agreement recognizes the importance of addressing and minimizing sea level rise, saltwater intrusion, and flooding;

Pages H3385–86

DeSaulnier amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that requires a National Academy of Sciences report on the consequences of withdrawing from the Paris Agreement for the United States’ global economic competitiveness;

Pages H3386–87

Pallone amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that adds a finding noting that the Paris Agreement is an example of multilateral, international cooperation needed to overcome challenges facing the international community;

Pages H3387–88

Case amendment (No. 12 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that includes finding recognizing the role of oceans in the global climate system and inter-

national actions being taken to include oceans in the Paris Agreement’s nationally determined contributions;

Pages H3390–91

Bost amendment (No. 13 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that requires the President’s public plan to be posted online to the Federal Register and allow an opportunity for public comment before the plan is submitted to Congress;

Pages H3391–92

Meng amendment (No. 14 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that includes findings that recognizes the fundamental priority of safeguarding food security and ending hunger, and the particular vulnerabilities of food production systems to the adverse impacts of climate change;

Page H3392

González-Colón (PR) amendment (No. 15 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that directs GAO to complete a study and submit a report to Congress on the impact of the President’s plan on the U.S. territories, including the potential positive and negative impacts on their economies, taking into consideration their unique energy needs and systems and the climate change vulnerabilities faced by communities in these jurisdictions;

Pages H3392–93

Brendan F. Boyle (PA) amendment (No. 16 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that includes findings stating that the Paris Agreement recognizes that adaptation is a key component of the global response to climate change;

Pages H3393–94

Panetta amendment (No. 17 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that adds a new finding stating, “American leadership encouraged widespread international participation in the Paris Agreement”;

Page H3394

Rouda amendment (No. 18 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that includes findings recognizing that American cities, States, and businesses are stepping up and pledging to meet the Paris Agreement goals in the wake of absent and uncertain United States Federal leadership; and

Pages H3394–95

Lee (NV) amendment (No. 20 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that recognizes that Article 8 of the Paris Agreement states the importance of addressing loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change, such as drought conditions and water scarcity.

Pages H3396–97

Proceedings Postponed:

Espallat amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that seeks to include findings addressing the importance of climate justice and environmental justice;

Page H3382

Gosar amendment (No. 10 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that seeks to include findings that the Paris Agreement is a treaty and should be treated as such;

Pages H3388–89

Gosar amendment (No. 11 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that seeks to strike Section 3-Prohibition

on use of funds to advance the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement; and

Pages H3389–90

Porter amendment (No. 19 printed in H. Rept. 116–42) that seeks to include findings that recognize the importance of clean energy technology development for the implementation of mitigation and adaptation actions of the agreements under the Paris Climate Accord.

Pages H3395–96

H. Res. 329, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 9) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 173, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 228 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 172.

Pages H3351–61

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, May 2nd.

Page H3397

United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following individual on the part of the House to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission for a term expiring on December 31, 2020: Dr. Larry M. Wortzel of Williamsburg, Virginia.

Page H3397

Discharge Petition: Representative Hice (GA) presented to the Clerk a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of H. Res. 132, providing for the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 109) recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal (Discharge Petition No. 2).

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H3351.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3360–61, H3361, and H3362. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

Committee Meetings

THE STATE OF THE CFTC

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit held a hearing entitled “The State of the CFTC”. Testimony was heard from J. Christopher Giancarlo, Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS—CYBERSECURITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY AGENCY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Department of Homeland Security held a budget hearing on the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency. Testimony was heard from Christopher Krebs, Director, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a budget hearing on the Department of Defense. Testimony was heard from following Department of Defense officials: Patrick M. Shanahan, Acting Secretary of Defense; General Joseph F. Dunford, U.S. Marine Corps, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; and David L. Norquist, Performing the Duties of Deputy Secretary of Defense.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a markup on the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, FY 2020. The Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, FY 2020, was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a markup on the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2020. The Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2020, was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

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 Admiral Craig S. Faller, U.S. Navy, Commander, U.S. Southern Command; Kathryn Wheelbarger, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Department of Defense; General Terrance J. O’Shaughnessy, U.S. Air Force, Commander, U.S. Northern Command; and Kenneth P. Rapuano, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Global Security, Department of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY MODERNIZATION PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing entitled

“Department of the Army Modernization Programs”. Testimony was heard from Bruce D. Jette, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology, Department of the Army; General John M. Murray, U.S. Army, Commander, Army Futures Command, Department of the Army; Lieutenant General James F. Pasqualette, U.S. Army, Deputy Chief of Staff, Army (Programs), Department of the Army; and Jon R. Ludwigson, Acting Director, Contracting and National Security Acquisitions, Government Accountability Office.

FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET REQUEST FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ENERGY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Request for Military Construction, Energy, and Environmental Programs”. Testimony was heard from Robert H. McMahon, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Sustainment, Department of Defense; John W. Henderson, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Environment and Energy, Department of the Air Force; Alex A. Beehler, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations, Energy and Environment, Department of the Army; and Todd C. Mellon, Performing the Duties of Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Energy, Installations and Environment, Department of the Navy.

EXAMINING THE POLICIES AND PRIORITIES OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Committee on Education and Labor: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Examining the Policies and Priorities of the U.S. Department of Labor”. Testimony was heard from Alexander Acosta, Secretary, Department of Labor.

THE STATE OF PIPELINE SAFETY AND SECURITY IN AMERICA

Committee on Energy And Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “The State of Pipeline Safety and Security in America”. Testimony was heard from Howard R. Elliott, Administrator, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration; W. William Russell, Acting Director, Government Accountability Office; Lawrence Friedeman, Commissioner, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio; and public witnesses.

DOE’S MOUNTING CLEANUP COSTS: BILLIONS IN ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY AND GROWING

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled

“DOE’s Mounting Cleanup Costs: Billions in Environmental Liability and Growing”. Testimony was heard from Anne White, Assistant Secretary, Office of Environmental Management, Department of Energy; and David C. Trimble, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office.

EXAMINING DISCRIMINATION IN THE AUTOMOBILE LOAN AND INSURANCE INDUSTRIES

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Examining Discrimination in the Automobile Loan and Insurance Industries”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

GOOD FOR THE BOTTOM LINE: A REVIEW OF THE BUSINESS CASE FOR DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Committee On Financial Services: Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion held a hearing entitled “Good for the Bottom Line: A Review of the Business Case for Diversity and Inclusion”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

COUNTERING A RESURGENT RUSSIA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Countering a Resurgent Russia”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TROUBLE AT THE TOP: ARE VACANCIES AT THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY UNDERMINING THE MISSION?

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Trouble at the Top: Are Vacancies at the Department of Homeland Security Undermining the Mission?”. Testimony was heard from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office; and John Roth, Former Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on a motion to permit an additional hour of questioning, equally divided between the Majority and Minority, for any Full Committee Hearing entitled “Oversight of the U.S. Department of Justice: Report by Special Counsel Robert S. Mueller, III on the Investigation Into Russian Interference in the 2016 Presidential Election; and Related Matters”; a motion to permit Committee staff, as designated by the Chair and Ranking Member, to question the

witness for an additional hour, equally divided between the Majority and Minority, at any Full Committee Hearing entitled “Oversight of the U.S. Department of Justice: Report by Special Counsel Robert S. Mueller, III on the Investigation Into Russian Interference in the 2016 Presidential Election; and Related Matters”; and H.R. 5, the “Equality Act”. A motion to permit an additional hour of questioning, equally divided between the Majority and Minority; and a motion to permit Committee staff, as designated by the Chair and Ranking Member, to question the witness for an additional hour, equally divided between the Majority and Minority, passed, without amendment. H.R. 5 was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 255, the “Big Bear Land Exchange Act”; H.R. 278, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain facilities, easements, and rights-of-way to the Kennewick Irrigation District, and for other purposes; H.R. 312, the “Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act”; H.R. 315, the “Community Reclamation Partnerships Act”; H.R. 375, to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; H.R. 434, the “Emancipation National Historic Trail Act”; H.R. 1014, to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to apply to territories of the United States, to establish offshore wind lease sale requirements, to provide dedicated funding for coral reef conservation, and for other purposes; H.R. 1146, the “Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act”; H.R. 1261, the “National Landslide Preparedness Act”; H.R. 1568, the “SAVE Right Whales Act”; H.R. 1809, to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act, to provide parity for United States territories and the District of Columbia, to make technical corrections to such Acts and related laws, and for other purposes; and H.R. 2156, the “RECLAIM Act of 2019”. H.R. 255, H.R. 278, H.R. 315, H.R. 1014, and H.R. 1809 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 434, H.R. 312, H.R. 375, H.R. 1146, H.R. 1261, H.R. 1568, and H.R. 2156 were ordered reported, as amended.

THE STATE OF FISHERIES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife held a hearing entitled “The State of Fisheries”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PROTECTING THE RIGHT TO VOTE: BEST AND WORST PRACTICES

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties held a hearing entitled “Protecting the Right to Vote: Best and Worst Practices”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 34, the “Energy and Water Research Integration Act of 2019”; H.R. 2397, the “American Manufacturing Leadership Act”; H.R. 1237, the “COAST Research Act of 2019”; H.R. 1716, the “Coastal Communities Ocean Acidification Act of 2019”; H.R. 1921, the “Ocean Acidification Innovation Act of 2019”; and H.R. 988, the “NEAR Act of 2019”. H.R. 34, H.R. 2397, H.R. 1237, H.R. 1716, H.R. 1921, and H.R. 988 were ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 277, the “Access to Sufficient Capital for Everyone in Natural Disaster areas Act of 2019”; H.R. 2142, to amend the Small Business Act to require the Small Business and Agriculture Regulatory Enforcement Ombudsman to create a centralized website for compliance guides, and for other purposes; H.R. 1649, the “Small Business Development Center Cyber Training Act of 2019”; H.R. 1648, the “Small Business Advanced Cybersecurity Enhancements Act of 2019”; H.R. 2331, the “SBA Cyber Awareness Act of 2019”; and H.R. 2345, the “Clarifying the Small Business Runway Extension Act of 2019”. H.R. 277, H.R. 2142, H.R. 1649, H.R. 1648, and H.R. 2331 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 2345 was ordered reported, as amended.

MEMBER’S DAY HEARING

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Member’s Day Hearing”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Lofgren, Chairman Takano, Chairman Velázquez, Chairman Waters, and Representatives Rose of New York, Moore, Trahan, Bustos, Sherrill, Harder, Cunningham, Thompson of Pennsylvania, Omar, Quigley, Marshall, Underwood, Hoyer, Langevin, Himes, Blumenauer, Newhouse, Wittman, Shalala, Peters, Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Gottheimer, Khanna, Haaland, Cline, Welch, Jayapal, Luria, Keating, Meng, King of Iowa, O’Halloran, Cárdenas, Scanlon, Costa, Slotkin, Neguse, Carter of Georgia, Phillips, and Matsui.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a markup on H.R. 95, the "Homeless Veteran Families Act"; H.R. 444, the "Reduce Unemployment for Veterans of All Ages Act"; H.R. 1988, the "Protect Affordable Mortgages for Veterans Act"; H.R. 2109, the "BRAVE Act"; H.R. 2196, to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce the credit hour requirement for the Edith Nourse Rogers STEM Scholarship program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; H.R. 2326, the "Navy SEAL Chief Petty Officer William 'Bill' Mulder (Ret.) Transition Improvement Act"; legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to adjust certain limits on the guaranteed amount of a home loan under the home loan program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements to the educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs with respect to flight training programs and certain other programs of education, and for other purposes; legislation to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 and title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for the HUD-VASH program, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit annual reports to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding homeless veterans, and for other purposes; legislation on the Homes for Our Heroes Act of 2019; H.R. 2221, the "Fry Scholarship Improvement Act of 2019"; and H.R. 2045, the "VET OPP Act". H.R. 95, H.R. 444, H.R. 1988, H.R. 2109, H.R. 2196, H.R. 2221, legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to adjust certain limits on the guaranteed amount of a home loan under the home loan program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements to the educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs with respect to flight training programs and certain other programs of education, and for other purposes; legislation to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 and title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for the HUD-VASH program, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit annual reports to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding homeless veterans, and for other purposes; and legislation on the Homes for Our Heroes Act of 2019 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 2045 and H.R. 2326 were ordered reported, as amended.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 1199, the "VA Website Accessibility Act of 2019"; H.R. 1200, the "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2019"; H.R. 1126, the "Honoring Veterans' Families Act"; H.R. 1628, the "Enewetak Atoll Cleanup Radiation Study Act"; H.R. 1826, the "Veterans Valuing Our Widows and Widowers Act"; legislation to permit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a grant program to conduct cemetery research and produce educational materials for the Veterans Legacy Program; and legislation to update H.R. 299. Testimony was heard from Chairman Takano, and Representatives David P. Roe of Tennessee, Lamb, Brownley of California, and Steube; and Matthew Sullivan, Deputy Under Secretary for Finance and Planning, National Cemetery Administration.

**FISCAL YEAR 2020 NATIONAL
RECONNAISSANCE AND NATIONAL
GEOSPATIAL PROGRAM BUDGET
REQUESTS HEARING**

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Strategic Technologies and Advanced Research held a hearing entitled "Fiscal Year 2020 National Reconnaissance and National Geospatial Program Budget Requests Hearing". Testimony was heard from Robert Sharp, Director, National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency; and Frank Cavelli, Acting Director, National Reconnaissance Office. This hearing was closed.

**FORMER MEMBERS HEARING: SPEAKING
FROM EXPERIENCE**

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Former Members Hearing: Speaking from Experience". Testimony was heard from the following former Members: Tom Davis, Vic Fazio, Martin Frost, Reid Ribble, Tim Roemer, and Ileana Ros-Lehtinen.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY,
MAY 2, 2019**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year

2020 for the Department of Homeland Security, 10 a.m., SD-138.

Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Labor, 10 a.m., SD-124.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of General James C. McConville, USA, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Chief of Staff of the Army, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Daniel Habib Jorjani, of Kentucky, to be Solicitor, and Mark Lee Greenblatt, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, both of the Department of the Interior, 10 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider the nominations of Sean Cairncross, of Minnesota, to be Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation, Alan R. Swendiman, of North Carolina, to be Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, and Robert A. Destro, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, David Schenker, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary (Near Eastern Affairs), Edward F. Crawford, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to Ireland, Jeffrey L. Eberhardt, of Wisconsin, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the rank of Ambassador, James S. Gilmore, of Virginia, to be U.S. Representative to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador, David Michael Satterfield, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Turkey, and Kate Marie Byrnes, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Macedonia, all of the Department of State, 9:30 a.m., S-116, Capitol.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to hold oversight hearings to examine Federal infrastructure permitting and FAST-41, 10 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 820, to strengthen programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004, S. 998, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to expand support for police officer family services, stress reduction, and suicide prevention, S. 1231, to reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program, S. 1208,

to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 with respect to payments to certain public safety officers who have become permanently and totally disabled as a result of personal injuries sustained in the line of duty, and the nominations of Jeffrey Vincent Brown, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Robert J. Colville, and Stephanie L. Haines, both to be a United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Brantley Starr, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, Virgil Madden, of Indiana, to be a Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission, and Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General, Michael G. Bailey, to be United States Attorney for the District of Arizona, Timothy J. Downing, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Oklahoma, Brent R. Bunn, to be United States Marshal for the District of Idaho, and Eric S. Gartner, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, all of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD-226.

House

Committee On Armed Services, Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, hearing entitled "Department of the Air Force Acquisition and Modernization Programs in the Fiscal Year 2020 National Defense Authorization President's Budget Request", 9 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Oversight of the U.S. Department of Justice: Report by Special Counsel Robert S. Mueller, III on the Investigation Into Russian Interference in the 2016 Presidential Election; and Related Matters", 9 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Status of the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act (PROMESA): Lessons Learned Three Years Later", 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled "Cultural Barriers Impacting Women Veterans' Access to Healthcare", 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Fiscal Year 2020 Central Intelligence Agency Program Budget Request Hearing", 9:30 a.m., HVC-304. This hearing is closed.

Résumé of Congressional Activity

FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 3 through April 30, 2019

	<i>Senate</i>	<i>House</i>	<i>Total</i>
Days in session	64	65	..
Time in session	325 hrs., 17'	251 hrs., 58'	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	2,531	3,342	..
Extensions of Remarks	513	..
Public bills enacted into law	7	9	16
Private bills enacted into law
Bills in conference
Measures passed, total	126	197	323
Senate bills	13	7	..
House bills	8	112	..
Senate joint resolutions	1	1	..
House joint resolutions	3	6	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	6	2	..
House concurrent resolutions	5	7	..
Simple resolutions	90	62	..
Measures reported, total	*59	*42	101
Senate bills	30
House bills	1	20	..
Senate joint resolutions
House joint resolutions	1	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	1
House concurrent resolutions	2	..
Simple resolutions	27	19	..
Special reports	9	1	..
Conference reports	1	1	..
Measures pending on calendar	62	7	..
Measures introduced, total	1,468	2,840	4,308
Bills	1,258	2,413	..
Joint resolutions	18	56	..
Concurrent resolutions	14	36	..
Simple resolutions	178	335	..
Quorum calls	2	1	..
Yea-and-nay votes	84	128	..
Recorded votes	42	..
Bills vetoed	1	..
Vetoes overridden

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 3 through April 30, 2019

Civilian nominations, totaling 336, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	43
Unconfirmed	288
Withdrawn	5
Other Civilian nominations, totaling 49, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1
Unconfirmed	48
Air Force nominations, totaling 1,683, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,301
Unconfirmed	382
Army nominations, totaling 3,236, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	2,248
Unconfirmed	988
Navy nominations, totaling 598, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	125
Unconfirmed	473
Marine Corps nominations, totaling 1,410, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,359
Unconfirmed	51
<i>Summary</i>	
Total nominations carried over from the First Session	0
Total nominations received this Session	7,312
Total confirmed	5,077
Total unconfirmed	2,230
Total withdrawn	5
Total returned to the White House	0

*These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 34 written reports have been filed in the Senate, 44 reports have been filed in the House.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, May 2

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, May 2

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will resume consideration of the nominations of Rodolfo Armando Ruiz II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, Raul M. Arias-Marxuach, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, and Joshua Wolson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, post-cloture, with votes on confirmation of the nominations in the order listed at 10:30 a.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of Joshua Wolson, Senate will resume consideration of the veto message on S. J. Res. 7, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress, and vote on passage of the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, at 1:45 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H.R. 9—Climate Action Now Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Beyer, Donald S., Jr., Va., E515
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E518
Carson, André, Ind., E521
Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E517
Correa, J. Luis, Calif., E520
Costa, Jim, Calif., E520
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E516
Foster, Bill, Ill., E518
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E522
Gonzalez, Anthony, Ohio, E516

Hill, J. French, Ark., E516
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E519
Latta, Robert E., Ohio, E517, E518, E518, E519, E520,
E521, E521, E522, E523, E524
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E517
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E522
McNerney, Jerry, Calif., E516
Meadows, Mark, N.C., E523
Pappas, Chris, N.H., E524
Payne, Donald M., Jr., N.J., E515
Radewagen, Aumua Amata Coleman, American
Samoa, E523

Rogers, Mike, Ala., E520
Ruiz, Raul, Calif., E523
Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho, Northern Mariana
Islands, E515
San Nicolas, Michael F.Q., Guam, E520
Scott, Austin, Ga., E519
Sherman, Brad, Calif., E521
Tipton, Scott R., Colo., E518
Veasey, Marc A., Tex., E523
Wenstrup, Brad R., Ohio, E521
Zeldin, Lee M., N.Y., E515



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.