



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 2019

No. 57

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 2, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable G.K. BUTTERFIELD 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.

BROKEN PROMISES FOR HURRICANE MICHAEL RELIEF

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, 2018, a Category 3 storm, Hurricane Michael, entered my State of Georgia with a devastating force.

It was harvest time for the 2018 crop, and it was the best yield, especially for cotton, that we had seen in years. Farmers who had been suffering in the

midst of low commodity prices, unfair trade prices, labor shortages, and consecutive years of storms now had relief in sight. Then entered Hurricane Michael, and it was all gone in a matter of hours. Not just the commodity crops like cotton, but the orchards, too.

Since day one post-Hurricane Michael, I have worked side by side with my friend and my colleague, Congressman SANFORD BISHOP. Hurricane Michael didn't discriminate between our district lines. I want to thank him for his help and his support of our State and our agricultural producers in Georgia.

Soon after the storm, the President, Vice President PENCE, and Secretary Perdue met with the two of us, our farmers, and our community leaders and promised to help them rebuild. Members of both parties, in both Chambers of Congress, echoed the same support. Six months later, and those promises of support have been broken. Never before have we seen communities that were wrecked with catastrophes neglected like this.

Those votes in the Senate yesterday showed a lack of honor and dignity and how truly ugly and partisan politics have become. The truth is, if Hurricane Michael had hit Americans who weren't farmers or farmers who aren't Americans, the stories of yesterday's cowardice would be the front page of every paper.

Whether the press likes it or not and whether the Senators from New York or Vermont like it or not, we are Americans, too. And what happened yesterday was cowardly, partisan politics and truly un-American.

IMMIGRANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO NEW JERSEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIREs) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the hard work and dedication of

immigrant communities across New Jersey and across this country.

Earlier this month, the New Jersey Policy Perspective issued a report confirming something we have known for a long time in my district and in New Jersey: immigrants continue to serve as the backbone of Main Street.

Immigrants make up 22 percent of the total State population, and immigrants own 47 percent of Main Street businesses. Immigrant communities own 81 percent of household maintenance services, 79 percent of laundry businesses, and nearly 50 percent of child care centers and clothing stores. According to the study, immigrants contribute \$4.4 billion a year to just the New Jersey economy, employing thousands and driving economic growth.

This study is just another reminder that toxic rhetoric against immigration is a misguided attack against our neighbors, our teachers, our firefighters, and local shop owners. As a first generation American, I can attest firsthand to the grit and determination needed to succeed in this country. These brave families sacrifice everything to work hard in America and provide opportunities for their loved ones.

Supporting immigrant communities is the right thing to do to advance American values and boost job growth across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say thank you to the immigrants working hard across the State of New Jersey and across this country.

FULL PROTECTION FOR BABIES BORN ALIVE

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the House on an important issue, and maybe the most important issue, Mr. Speaker, and that is the issue of life.

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.

H2941

We brought a bill forward, H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This is a bill, Mr. Speaker, that many wonder why is it even necessary that we need a law to say that if a baby is born alive, outside of the womb, we need to give it the full protections under law.

Many people ask, Mr. Speaker, why isn't that already protected? If a baby is born alive, it should have the full protections of anybody else. And yet, as we see in States like New York and other States around the country, they allow, in those States, the baby, even after it is born alive, to be killed. To me, Mr. Speaker, that is murder, and yet, in many States, they don't have the full protection that all of us enjoy. How could that be, in the United States of America, that a baby born alive can still be killed after it is born outside of the womb?

This issue transcends the abortion debate. In fact, people across every spectrum—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents, even people who align themselves as pro-choice—believe it is wrong to murder the baby after it is born alive, and yet it is still allowed. There should be no reason that this is a gray issue.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I will be joining my colleague, ANN WAGNER, the lead author of this bill, to start a discharge petition: an opportunity for every Member of Congress to make their voices heard loud and clear that this bill ought to come to this floor for a full debate and, ultimately, for a vote.

We ought to pass this law, Mr. Speaker. There should be no doubt. It shouldn't be a partisan issue. It shouldn't be an issue that we have disagreement over, and yet we do. For whatever reason, the Speaker will not allow this bill, though, to come up for a vote. We have tried time after time to move unanimous consent to bring this bill to the floor and, for months, that motion has been denied.

The most vulnerable among us should no longer be denied that protection under the law. Mr. Speaker, this bill has to come up for a vote. This bill has to be debated by the people's House.

Why not allow people all across the country to participate in this debate? As they find out about it, the reaction I get is not a debate on political lines, it is shock that this isn't already law.

Every baby born alive, Mr. Speaker, ought to have the full protection under law that is currently provided to all of us. H.R. 962 should be one of the easiest things that we pass through this House, yet, unfortunately, it has become one of the most difficult. But that is okay, Mr. Speaker. We know that it is the difficult things that we come here to do, not the easy, because it would have already been done.

So we are going to be leading the charge today, standing with people all across the country. And, in fact, we are actually bringing in people, Mr. Speaker, who survived an attempted abor-

tion. It happens all across this country. And when that baby is born alive, that baby ought to have the full protection under the law. We will start the process today to ensure that that full debate happens and, ultimately, that the vote happens to pass the Born Alive Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to sign on to this discharge petition.

AMERICANS DEPEND ON CLEAN WATER

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, as the chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, I rise to celebrate Clean Water Week. I would like to take this opportunity to highlight the importance of water for our communities, not only in my home State of California, but across the country. Americans depend on clean water for their health, the health of their communities, and the health of the economy.

Our water resources are precious, and every drop matters, which is why we need significant Federal investment in our Nation's infrastructure and strong Federal protections for our Nation's water resources.

We need to protect our waterways, large and small, from pollution; ensure we conserve our water resources; recycle water where we can; and protect our groundwater resources for long-term reliance.

There are tremendous clean water infrastructure needs facing our country. Our communities, large and small, urban and rural, and tribal, as well as our American families are facing great challenges in meeting these needs.

Today, our Nation's network of sewers, stormwater conveyances, and treatment facilities are aging, often very outdated, and, in many places all over the country, not meeting the needs of our communities or water quality standards.

We, in Congress, need to do more, not only to renew the Federal financial commitment to repair, replace, and upgrade our water-related infrastructure, but also to ensure that this work remains affordable to all of our communities.

Today, too many Americans are uncertain whether their drinking water is safe for themselves and for their families. Now is not the time to cut back on the protections of our Nation's clean water. Yet, this administration is proposing to do just that.

For more than 45 years, the Clean Water Act has helped to protect our streams, our rivers, our wetlands, and our lakes, and provided States with the tools to keep our waters clean. This administration has proposed eliminating longstanding protections for small

streams and wetlands, which play a very important role in feeding our drinking water resources. They also help store water during storms and alleviate flooding, which, in turn, protects communities. These small streams and wetlands help recharge our groundwater supplies. They also filter pollution and provide habitat for fish and wildlife.

Clean and safe water is a very basic human need. Unfortunately, this administration has made it a priority to dismantle the Clean Water Act, regardless of what the science or the law provides. The President's #DirtyWaterRule puts our water and health at risk and must be stopped.

Our drought cycle in southern California continues, even though we have had repeated rain in March. We must continue to conserve. This must be the new norm for us in the West.

□ 1015

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF EASTERSEALS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Easterseals on its 100th anniversary.

Easterseals is a network of more than 70 leading nonprofit organizations that provide local services and support to children and adults with disabilities, veterans, and older adults.

Founded in 1919 in Ohio, Easterseals works nationwide, in almost every State, to help Americans achieve milestones, live independently, and be active members of their communities.

Easterseals employs more than 30,000 professional staff across the country, including therapists, nurses, employment specialists, and direct support professionals who deliver high-quality services.

Over the past century, Easterseals has helped millions of individuals and families by assisting children who have disabilities; helping them access early intervention, including physical and speech therapies, to help prepare them for successful learning; providing in-home and community adult day services for seniors and people with disabilities; helping individuals with disabilities, veterans, and seniors find meaningful employment; and providing camping and recreational opportunities to youth and adults with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, Easterseals provides autistic individuals early education, employment, camping, caregiving, transportation, and other services to support Americans of all ages.

The number of children in the U.S. with developmental delays is on the rise. A recent study found that approximately 13 percent of infants and toddlers have a developmental delay. Research has also shown that one in

three children who receive early intervention services will not require special education in preschool.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the first few years of a child's life will lay the foundation for his or her long-term well-being and overall success. That is why I am a strong proponent of Head Start and Early Head Start programs.

We can't guarantee that every child will be successful in life, but we can give them the same access to early educational opportunities. This is just one of many reasons why I introduced H.R. 1695, the Community Services Block Grant Reauthorization Act of 2019. This legislation renews our Nation's commitment to reducing poverty through locally driven comprehensive approaches.

Head Start and early education programs are operated through community action agencies and promote school readiness through enhancing the cognitive, physical, behavioral, and social-emotional development of children from low-income families. Easterseals specializes in early childhood development where children with and without disabilities can learn together.

Another piece of legislation I am co-sponsoring is H.R. 1878, the IDEA Full Funding Act. This would ensure that individuals with disabilities are receiving an appropriate education.

In the 1970s, Congress promised to cover 40 percent of the extra cost of special education, but we never come close to fulfilling that promise. In fact, current funding remains only at 14 percent of the targeted amount. This bill would mandate gradual increases in IDEA funding to reach the full commitment—40 percent, a commitment made by Congress—by fiscal year 2029 and each subsequent fiscal year after that. Easterseals is also supportive of this legislation.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, three Easterseals affiliates serve 67 counties. They employ almost 700 people, and they serve nearly 27,900 individuals. Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the incredible services Easterseals works to provide to American families.

For the past 100 years, it has leveraged its network of nonprofits to improve the lives of others. In schools, workplaces, and communities, Easterseals has fostered environments where everyone is included and valued, regardless of age or ability.

I congratulate Easterseals for its contributions to improving so many lives over the past 100 years.

LET MY FARMERS GROW

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I seldom come to this floor to stand in this well. To me, it is almost a sacred place where the great orators like Webster debated. But I have got to talk about this because it is something that is im-

acting thousands and thousands of people I represent in my district.

In a recent letter from the President of the Missouri Soybean Association, farmers expressed their concerns regarding President Trump's ongoing statements on tariffs and the U.S.-China trade relationships, stating: "Missouri farmers have invested time away from their farm, family, and millions of dollars in developing their foreign markets, and it's imperative that we don't jeopardize these investments. . . ."

At what point do we call on one another to address the inevitable detriment these farmers are routinely placed in under this administration?

In Missouri alone, the restricted access to China, which is the number one trading partner for U.S. soybean farmers, has created a \$2 drop in soybean prices, resulting in nearly \$212 million in lost earnings, over 3,000 fewer jobs, and an estimated \$726.6 million annual reduction in State and local economic activity—for the State of Missouri alone. Imagine the combined impact this has had on other States that are major producers and exporters.

Using America's farmers as collateral in a trade war is wrong, and hard-working farmers, their families, and our communities deserve much better.

Farmers in Missouri and across this country working to not only provide for their families deserve market stability and access to the opportunity to forge trade relationships abroad. They deserve to have the backing of a Federal Government that supports and advocates for their success.

Simply put, farmers deserve not to be caught in the crossfire or become collateral damage in an imposed and impractical trade war.

Farming is a risky endeavor, and Mother Nature may at any time bring drought, flooding, hail, and other disasters. The last thing farmers should worry about is a reactionary trade and policy decision made by the President, whom most of the farmers supported.

Moreover, though farmers have been patient holding out for the situation to improve, each passing day that we fail to take into consideration the interest of American farmers only contributes to a mounting problem that we must not ignore any longer. Enough is enough.

As the Representative of a geographically diverse district that encompasses several rural communities, I fear what a continued, retaliatory imposition of tariffs on China would mean for the farmers in my district: that this is going to hurt.

Now, making a bad decision, Mr. President, is understandable, but not correcting it is untenable and unfertile.

Last Friday, the President decided to hit below the belt with his threats to shut down the southern border with Mexico. A border shutdown would wreak havoc on the U.S. economy. I didn't say this. This comes from just

about every major economist in the country.

A border shutdown is not in the best interests of the Midwest or this country. This is another blow to our farmers, and they cannot afford it. They will be forced to tap out.

Missouri farmers depend on foreign trade to market their crops. In my State, we have an \$80 billion industry called agriculture. When it is disrupted, the whole State is disrupted.

We have the largest export market, after China and Canada, to Mexico. The U.S. shipped \$19 billion worth of agricultural products to Mexico in 2018. Mexico is our top market for corn and our third largest market for U.S. beef.

Missouri pork producers cannot afford the loss of the Mexican market on top of all the financial losses from retaliatory tariffs from Mexico and China.

The very threat of a border closure creates uncertainty and depresses the trade of \$1.7 billion in goods and services, daily, that cross the border.

Missouri's economy has a direct connection to Mexico through Kansas City Southern Railroad.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by just saying we have a 2,000-mile border between the United States and Mexico. If we shut that down, we are shutting down the U.S. economy.

NAZIS WERE EVIL SOCIALISTS

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, for 75 years, America has been the greatest nation in world history. America's standard of living is envied by most. America's military is unmatched. America is a beacon of freedom for all.

Unfortunately, America's foundational principles are under attack—not by a foreign foe, but from within our own country.

Socialist Democrats oppose the rule of law that is essential to peace and prosperity by supporting open border policies that consume hundreds of billions in tax dollars and kill tens of thousands of Americans each year.

Socialist Democrats' spending sprees put America \$22 trillion in debt, thus risking a debilitating national insolvency and bankruptcy.

Socialist Democrats support dictatorial and guaranteed-to-fail socialism over the free enterprise economy that has created our prosperity.

If the Mueller report is accurate, for 2 years, socialist Democrats and fake news media allies used the big lie propaganda tactic to undermine our elections' legitimacy and falsely accuse President Trump of colluding with Russia.

History's most famous evil and horrific use of big lie tactics is by the National Socialist German Workers' Party, or Nazis, for short.

Not surprisingly, socialist Democrats and their fake news media allies recently objected to my quoting Adolf

Hitler's "Mein Kampf" to explain what the big lie propaganda tactic is and how horrific the consequences can be for those seduced by it.

Germany's Socialist Party's big lie killed tens of millions of people in the Holocaust and World War II, making it the most horrific and deadly big lie in history.

Also, not surprisingly, today's socialists tried to revise history by falsely claiming the Nazis were not socialists. Bunk.

Mr. Speaker, America can either learn from history or be doomed to repeat it.

By way of background, freedom and liberty are the essence of free enterprise, wherein supply and demand market forces determine which goods and services are offered and at what prices. Citizens who produce goods and services better, faster, or cheaper thrive, and everyone benefits from that.

Conversely, socialism is the mortal enemy of free enterprise. Socialist economies reject liberty, freedom, and market forces, artificially dictate economic activity, and determine which businesses and industries prosper and which do not. In a fully socialist economy, government owns and controls all means of production.

So was Germany's Socialist Party socialists? The founders thought so because they called themselves socialists. They certainly acted like socialists.

Germany's Socialist Party's foundational 25 point platform stated, in part:

Plank 13: "We demand the nationalization of all previous associated agencies, trusts."

Plank 14: "We demand a division of profits of all heavy industries."

Plank 16: "We demand the . . . immediate communalization of the great warehouses."

Plank 17: "We demand a land reform . . . for the free expropriation of land for the purposes of public utility."

Communalization, land seizure without compensation, nationalization and government ownership of industry—those are all socialist policies.

Further, the German Socialist Party hated capitalism and free enterprise. Nazi propaganda posters stated: "The maintenance of a rotten industrial system has nothing do with nationalism. I can love Germany and hate capitalism."

Nazi propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels wrote: "In the final analysis, it would be better for us to go down with Bolshevism than live in eternal slavery under capitalism."

Mr. Speaker, Germany's socialist Nazis are a heinous example of the marriage between big lie propaganda tactics and socialism, but they are not alone. Soviet Union and Chinese-style socialism also subjugated or exterminated tens of millions of people.

Mr. Speaker, America must learn from history. Socialism must lose and free enterprise must win if America is

to remain a free, prosperous, and great nation.

□ 1030

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS CANNOT BE SOLVED BY A WALL ALONE

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. I rise with love of country in mind and liberty and justice for all in heart.

I rise to remind us of the words of the great French intellectual, Voltaire, who reminded us that those who can make us believe absurdities can cause us to commit atrocities.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to the border. I have seen the security people who are there, the Border Patrol officers. They are victims, Mr. Speaker, victims of policies that, unfortunately, do not respect the humanity of many people. I have seen the children stacked in cages. I have seen the parents grieving.

Mr. Speaker, I know why people are fleeing the countries south of the border. They are doing so because they are, literally, many of them, running for their lives. They are seeking safe harbor in the United States of America because we have extended an informal invitation by and through our Statue of Liberty.

We have, with our words and our deeds, said to the world that we are people who you can trust and who you can depend on.

Mr. Speaker, I rise with liberty and justice for all in mind because those who would want us to believe that babies who are coming here are an invading army, if you will, they are wrong. Those babies are coming because their mothers believe that they can find safety in our country.

Mr. Speaker, would anybody deny that a mother who would send her child to this country or some distant place, possibly understanding that the child could be harmed along the way, can anybody deny that this is being done because that mother has such great love for that child that she wants her child to have the opportunity to have life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

Can anybody deny that these parents who come, traversing harm's way, are doing so because they are trying to leave a circumstance that has greater harm?

Mr. Speaker, I rise with the understanding that Voltaire was right. It is an absurdity to believe that women and children and people who are fleeing harm's way are invaders.

I also would remind us of other words of Voltaire. He also reminded us that, "It is difficult to free fools from the chains they revere." I would not utilize the word "fools," but I will say that it is difficult to free people from chains that they revere. Those who want to

separate us from the rest of the world, especially the world of color, they revere these chains that bind and bond them to this notion. I think it is going to be difficult to separate them, but not impossible.

I believe that people of goodwill can always win and that we of goodwill must continue to preach the message and gospel of liberty and justice for all.

I believe that we can make a difference in the lives of people who we will never meet and greet. Those persons who are trying to get here will probably never vote for me. There is no reason for me to do this other than I believe in my heart that an injustice is being perpetrated at the border.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that this problem at the border requires greater scrutiny and greater attention from the American people and from those of us who represent them. It is my belief that if we want to do something about this problem, we have to acknowledge that it is a humanitarian crisis that we are dealing with and that the humanitarian crisis cannot be solved with a wall alone.

We cannot conclude that, if we leave the world alone, it will leave us alone. We are a part of this great world of humanity. There is but one race and that is the human race. We must do our part to protect all within the human race, especially our neighbors to the south.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

Since it was first enacted in 1994, the Violence Against Women Act has saved countless lives and supported millions of domestic violence and assault victims and survivors by funding critical programs.

In February 2019, the Violence Against Women Act expired. This is unacceptable. It is imperative that we fully reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. A stopgap Violence Against Women Act does not address critical issues within the legislation and would seriously impact the life-saving programs needed across Indian Country.

Domestic violence affects every community in America. Tribal communities, though, face it at an alarmingly high rate. According to Federal data, at least 55 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native women have experienced physical violence at an intimate partner's hands.

We are here to make visible the unacceptable and glaring disparities that women and families across Indian Country face when it comes to violence, assault, and abuse. We are here to demand action because there are things we can and should do to help survivors.

In 2013, the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act created special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction. This was critical to holding perpetrators accountable on Indian Country, but it didn't go far enough. The special jurisdiction limits Tribes to prosecuting only crimes committed against intimate partners, not kids or police officers.

As a former law enforcement officer and homicide detective, I can tell you that responding to these types of calls was extremely and is extremely dangerous for police officers. Within the past 3 years alone, the Navajo Nation has lost three officers responding to domestic violence calls. We must honor their sacrifice with action.

Further, these gaps in jurisdiction put children who are victims or witnesses to violence in harm's way. It affects families dramatically. It affects our communities. It affects our country.

This reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act includes my legislation, the Native Youth and Tribal Officer Protection Act. This lifesaving provision would fix these jurisdictional gaps and expand current law regarding special jurisdiction. It would allow Tribes to prosecute and convict non-Indian offenders who harm children and law enforcement officers responding to domestic violence cases, as any town outside Indian Country can already do.

Few things have shaped my life more than the 13 years I served as a police officer. My first call as an officer involved domestic violence. I still remember it and other domestic violence and sexual assault cases. There are too many to remember. Our society has to change if we are to make life and our families successful.

We must protect children and other survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. I join my colleagues in demanding a full reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation and urge all my colleagues to support its passage. It is long overdue.

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 39 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

Dr. Lora F. Hargrove, Mount Calvary Baptist Church, Rockville, Maryland, offered the following prayer:

Let us draw nigh unto God that God may also draw nigh unto us.

O God, author of all mercy and the provider of all peace, in times of uncertain and sometimes unrelenting national and global difficulties, look with favor upon these women and men who seek to serve with integrity from the people's House and bless them.

As the diligent work to silence ideological stalemates, to give voice to Ubuntu—shared humanity toward others—concretize concerns for all Americans, especially the multitude of the marginalized.

Help us all to understand the clarion call to be unified, not uniform; to embrace diversity, despite racial, religious, and gender differences, knowing that difference is never synonymous with deficiency.

Grant that all who are downcast and downtrodden be uplifted by Your unifying and amazing grace.

We ask this in the name of the One who is the creator of us all.

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.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia 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 DR. LORA F. HARGROVE

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRONE. Madam Speaker, it was a true honor to hear the wisdom of Dr. Lora Hargrove this afternoon. Her call for unity, shared humanity, and peace is perhaps more important today than ever before.

Dr. Hargrove is a native of Baltimore, Maryland, just like our distinguished Speaker. She holds a doctorate in ministry from Wesley Theological Seminary, and she is working towards her second Ph.D. in African Diaspora from Howard University.

Dr. Hargrove comes from a long line of servant leaders. Her father, the late Judge John R. Hargrove, Sr., was the first Black Federal prosecutor in Baltimore and the first Black deputy U.S. attorney. Her mother, Shirley H. Hargrove, was a teacher and guidance counselor.

Dr. Hargrove now serves as interim minister at Rockville's Mount Calvary Baptist Church, where my wife, June, and I have seen her practice many times what she preaches. From hosting HBCU college fairs to finding shelter for women and children, Dr. Hargrove lifts up our community every day.

Thank you, Dr. Hargrove.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

DEFENDING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, Kerry from Tucson, Arizona, has a daughter in middle school who has type 1 diabetes.

The countless doctor visits, the fights with insurers and providers and doctors and back again, and the ache of watching her child struggle to be a normal kid on the playground is hard, but, as Kerry said, the fear of not being able to afford her daughter's treatment is a lot harder.

The Affordable Care Act saved Kerry's family. Before the ACA, there were no legal protections for those with preexisting conditions, and the cost of coverage was simply unaffordable.

President Trump continues his war on healthcare.

I ask my colleagues: When can our working families and mothers like Kerry feel safe from the fear of losing their healthcare? When can these families come up for air from the medical bills that drown them?

Arizonans and all Americans deserve a country that is there for them without question or condition. I will continue to defend the Affordable Care Act, its protections, and lowering healthcare costs for all families.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE THE TRUTH

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, thus far, I have released five transcripts from the Committee on the Judiciary's investigation into apparent wrongdoing at the FBI and the Justice Department. Today, I am releasing the sixth.

The American people deserve transparency. They deserve to know what transpired at the highest levels of the FBI and at the origin of the probe into President Trump's campaign.

Madam Speaker, I include the link www.dougcollins.house.gov/priestap in the RECORD so the American people can review the transcripts of Bill Priestap's interview.

Out of an abundance of caution, this transcript has a limited number of narrowly tailored redactions related only to confidential sources and methods, nonpublic information about ongoing investigations, and nonmaterial personal information.

I will continue to work to release as many transcripts as possible. The American people deserve the truth.

THE SKYROCKETING COST OF INSULIN

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Madam Speaker, I rise today for my mother, my sister-in-law, and the millions of Americans living with diabetes.

Diabetes is an epidemic in which one in five healthcare dollars in the United States is spent caring for patients with this disease.

Communities of color are disproportionately affected by the disease. I know because, in my congressional district, we have the highest rate of diabetes, higher than any other congressional district in the State of California.

Those with diabetes use insulin to maintain blood sugar levels. Without it, it becomes a matter of life and death. This is why I am especially appalled at the skyrocketing cost of this lifesaving drug.

At this very moment, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is having an oversight hearing about the rising cost of insulin. Tomorrow, the whole committee will mark up legislation, which, if passed, will help reduce the cost of prescription drugs.

This should not be a partisan issue, and I call on my Republican colleagues and the President to work with us to help all Americans and work for the people.

UVA FINAL FOUR APPEARANCE

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

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Univer-

sity of Virginia Cavaliers, who advanced to the Final Four of the NCAA Men's Basketball Tournament last Saturday night.

Down three points with less than 6 seconds left, the Cavaliers, with what was one of the most exciting plays I have seen—because I am an alum—scored to tie the game and force overtime. This gave them an extra 5 minutes of life, an opportunity they seized, on the way to a historic victory.

It is as a proud alum that I congratulate Coach Tony Bennett and the team on reaching the program's first Final Four since 1984. A tremendous accomplishment for sure, but there is still business to attend to on the court.

I also wish the Cavaliers the best of luck this weekend. For sure, I will be here again in short order after they beat Auburn and win the National Championship game.

Go Hoos, and Wahoowa.

PROTECTING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, today I rise to talk about America's healthcare system and the importance of protecting the Affordable Care Act.

Residents in my home State of California benefited greatly from the ACA. When it became law in 2010, California was one of the first States to implement it. At that time, 22 percent of my residents had no healthcare insurance whatsoever and 17 percent were uninsured.

The ACA greatly decreased that number by less than 10 percent, a big difference, while also providing coverage for those with preexisting conditions, which we all feel strongly about.

Now the President wants to strike down those protections and eliminate the last benefits. That is wrong. These repeated attempts to repeal the ACA are irresponsible, especially when there is no real proposal to replace it by the President of the United States or my Republican colleagues.

If he succeeds, one in seven people in California will lose their healthcare. That is a fact.

Yes, there are improvements that can be made to the Affordable Care Act, and we should address those deficiencies, and that is what I am committed to doing. The Congress and the administration should work together to fix the law and to make it better.

INCREASING ACCESS TO QUALITY, AFFORDABLE HEALTHCARE

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

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Healthcare More Affordable Act.

I am proud to cosponsor this legislation, which is more important than ever following the administration's court filing last week that pushes for the complete and total repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Now, I wasn't in Congress when that law was passed. I don't think it is a perfect law, but there are components of it that are undeniably positive:

It is a good thing that people with preexisting conditions can't be discriminated against by insurance companies;

It is a good thing that young people can stay on their parents' insurance until their 26th birthday;

It is a good thing that preventive care, like mammograms and cancer screenings, and even annual physicals, can be covered without copay;

It is a good thing that millions of people in our country that now have insurance for the first time are able to get the care they need.

Now, unfortunately, all of those positive steps are put in jeopardy as a consequence of the administration's court filing.

Now, rather than unwinding the progress that has been made, we are proposing to build on the success of the existing law. For example, we propose an expansion of the tax credits available under the law, reducing cost for low-income families and enabling more middle-class families to be eligible for assistance to make healthcare affordable.

This is the beginning of the effort on healthcare, not the end. Folks in D.C. shouldn't be sabotaging the American healthcare system; they should be making it work for the people of America.

RETAIN THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, well, the President says that Republicans are "the party of healthcare." I think it would be more accurate to say that they are the party of taking away your healthcare.

The Trump administration is moving to eliminate the Affordable Care Act in its entirety, every provision, which would mean millions of Americans would lose health coverage.

Let's remind ourselves what would happen if the ACA were eliminated:

Millions of Americans with preexisting conditions, including 1.7 million in Michigan, would be at the whim of big insurance companies who once again would be free to discriminate against them because they are sick or once had an illness;

Millions of Americans, including 690,000 Michiganders enrolled in the Healthy Michigan Medicaid expansion, would lose health insurance. If they prevail, they lose health insurance;

Eliminating the ACA would also hinder our ability to deal with the

opioid crisis, since the ACA requires insurance companies to cover substance abuse treatment.

And the Republicans have no plan. Take away the healthcare from Americans; no plan to replace it. We ought to reject that.

□ 1215

HEALTHCARE SYSTEM THAT WORKS FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, while traveling recently through my home State of Minnesota, I met a wonderful couple in their early 60s. They were both teachers who had dedicated their professional lives to enriching our community by educating our children.

They had done everything right, saved as much money as they could, and it was time to retire, until the husband was diagnosed with early-onset Alzheimer's. Now, the out-of-pocket costs for his care will wipe out all of their retirement savings—all of their savings.

Madam Speaker, I ask: What is our President thinking?

This is an all-too-common story played out in blue and red districts throughout our Nation. Yet, we have a White House determined to wipe out the Affordable Care Act. It is callous; it is wrong; and it is unacceptable. It is time for us to make the moral decision to ensure that all Americans have access to affordable, high-quality healthcare, no matter their circumstances.

That is why we just introduced a bill in the House, led by my Minnesota colleague, ANGIE CRAIG, to reduce premiums and lower healthcare costs. That is why I am a cosponsor of Congressman DOGGETT's bill to make prescription drugs more affordable.

There is hard work to be done to make our health system work for all Americans, and we are doing it in the House.

I say to President Trump and my Republican colleagues that it is not too late to abandon this misguided effort to dismantle the ACA and join us to work on real solutions. That is what we are sent here to do.

DON'T GET VOTED OFF THE ISLAND BECAUSE OF HEALTHCARE COSTS

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, last week in Federal court, President Trump radically expanded his war on American's healthcare, asking the court not only to strike down protections for people with preexisting

conditions, but to eliminate every last protection and benefit provided by the ACA.

I am a two-time cancer survivor. Two of my four kids have lived with Crohn's disease for 14 years. There is no way to spin this. Without the protections of the Affordable Care Act, my family would be in big trouble.

If America's healthcare system was a reality TV show, under this President's mean-spirited, every-person-for-himself approach, I guess my family would get voted off the island because, with the hand God dealt us, we simply cost too much.

This week, the people's House will vote to make clear that we don't believe in that vision of America, and we will not stand idly by while Mr. Trump does everything he can to take away the protections and the benefits that American families like mine depend on.

Madam Speaker, I implore my Republican colleagues to stand with us and improve the ACA for the American people.

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

HEALTHCARE—REINSURANCE, PREEXISTING CONDITIONS, PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mrs. CRAIG. Madam Speaker, we have an urgent problem that we must immediately find common ground on to solve. If healthcare isn't affordable, it is not accessible. That is why I led the introduction of the State Health Care Premium Reduction Act, a bill to lower the cost of health insurance premiums in the individual market by 10 percent, on average, across the country. But that is only part of the solution.

Fifty-one percent of nonelderly people in my congressional district have a preexisting condition. That is why it is critical that we pass the bill that I have cosponsored, the Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019.

I will fight this administration every day if they roll back healthcare in this country. It is not perfect, but we have to put aside the petty politics of the past and quit thinking that if we fix our Nation's healthcare, somehow we are handing the other side a victory.

People across this country need our help. They need us to fix the cost of prescription drugs. They need us to unleash generic competition.

CONDEMN CRUSADE TO TAKE AWAY HEALTHCARE

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

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, last week, the President put a five-alarm fire on American families by putting the government's weight behind a lawsuit designed to cripple many healthcare protections. The ordinary people whose lives will be upended by this decision have been offered a raw deal to blow up healthcare and fix it later, but even that is a false promise.

There is no plan to help the 316,000 people with preexisting conditions in coastal Orange County or the millions of Americans across our country. There has been no plan for 10 years.

We have to recognize that the inability to pay healthcare expenses is the leading cause of personal bankruptcy in the United States and a leading cause of homelessness.

I hope my Republican colleagues will have the chance to show the American people that Congress isn't completely without common sense and decency by voting for our resolution Tuesday condemning this ideological crusade to take away healthcare from millions of needy American families.

UNIVERSAL HEALTHCARE COVERAGE

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

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to highlight the need for our country to finally achieve universal healthcare coverage.

As the wealthiest country in the world, there is simply no excuse for us to be the only developed country left without universal healthcare. There are a lot of different ways to achieve universal healthcare, and I believe that a public option is the best way for us to get there. That is why I was pleased yesterday to introduce the Medicare-X Choice Act, which will finally bring our country to universal healthcare coverage.

My bill will combine Medicare physician networks and reimbursement rates with ACA coverage standards to create a new public option available to all Americans. My bill would allow those who are happy with their employer-provided insurance to keep it, while offering another more affordable coverage option to those in need.

With this bill, we are introducing more choice and more competition to the marketplace, starting in the places that need it most, like rural areas with provider shortages. This much-needed competition will drive down costs for everyone.

Our constituents expect us to take on the big issues impacting their lives. This should not be a partisan issue. We must roll up our sleeves and get to work so we can lower the cost of coverage for all Americans.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 7, DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 271, CONDEMNING THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S LEGAL CAMPAIGN TO TAKE AWAY AMERICANS' HEALTH CARE; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 274 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 274

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

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 271) Condemning the Trump Administration's Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans' Health Care. 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 chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of April 4, 2019, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 274. It provides for the consideration under closed rules for S.J. Res. 7, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and for the consideration of H. Res. 271, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. It also provides suspension authority for Thursday, April 4.

Madam Speaker, before I begin, I want to recognize that today marks the 230th anniversary of the Rules Committee being formally constituted for the first time.

Now, the Ways and Means Committee—which my Massachusetts friend and colleague, RICHIE NEAL, chairs—likes to point out that they are the oldest standing committee in the House. While that is true, I would like to remind my friends that the Rules Committee is the oldest committee in the House, being first created on this day in 1789 as a select committee. So it is especially appropriate that we are on the floor today to do some important work before us.

For the record, Madam Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee can celebrate their 230th anniversary on July 24.

Now that I have cleared that up, the first measure included in this rule is S.J. Res. 7, and we are taking action on this because Yemen is in crisis. In a country of roughly 28 million people, an estimated 22 million of them are in need of humanitarian assistance.

That is 75 percent of the population facing famine, disease, and displacement. Half the country is at risk of starvation.

The famine and disease facing children is particularly sobering. Save the Children estimates that as many as 85,000 children under the age of 5 have died because of hunger and disease since 2015.

All told, this is one of the world's worst humanitarian crises, the site of the fastest growing cholera epidemic ever recorded and the biggest food emergency on the planet.

Yet, it wasn't caused by some natural disaster. It is entirely man-made, the result of a Saudi-led military conflict. Seemingly every day, bombs fall on weddings, hospitals, buses, and homes, as civilian neighborhoods are regularly targeted.

This is not some abstract war happening half a world away. In fact, the United States is intimately involved in this conflict. We have supported the Saudi reign of terror by providing logistics, intelligence, ground support, and midair fueling of bombers. Virtually all the bombs that fall on Yemen say "Made in the United States of America."

Make no mistake, Madam Speaker, the United States is involved in a war

in Yemen today. But if our constituents look through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they wouldn't find a vote authorizing it. That is because this body abdicated its responsibility to declare war when it began 4 years ago.

□ 1230

Now, we took one of our most sacred responsibilities and handed it to the executive branch. It is not the first time we have done it, but it is becoming a habit around here. We first let the Bush administration decide the contours of our involvement abroad, and that continues through the Trump administration today.

If that wasn't outrageous enough, past Republican Congresses used every legislative trick in the book to block Members from even debating our role there. On two separate occasions, they went so far as to strip War Powers Resolutions related to Yemen of their privilege. It was unprecedented.

But when it comes to Saudi Arabia, this administration and my Republican friends were all too content to look the other way when they murdered a Washington Post journalist. They lured him into a consulate in Turkey, they murdered him, and then they used a bone saw to dismember him. We know, based on our intelligence reports, that the highest level of the Saudi Government was involved in that terrible human rights atrocity, and the Trump administration did nothing. They rationalized it. They justified it. They basically turned a blind eye.

When it comes to human rights, this administration has abdicated its moral authority. That should be of concern to everybody in this Chamber, whether you are Democrat or Republican, because if the United States stands for anything, we need to stand out loud and foursquare for human rights. If the President of the United States and his administration don't want to do it, then we should.

No Congress should be complicit in abdicating our Article I constitutional responsibility. Thankfully, this Democratic Congress is doing the opposite. We are reasserting our power, and we are taking a stand when it comes to human rights.

Thanks especially to the dedication of Speaker PELOSI, Chairman ENGEL, Congressman RO KHANNA, Congresswoman JAYAPAL, Congressman POCAN, and the entire Congressional Progressive Caucus, we are considering a bipartisan measure that makes clear it is time for the United States' involvement in Yemen to end. No more excuses.

This is virtually identical to the resolution we passed in February. The difference this time is that this is the first opportunity that this House has had to send something on the war in Yemen right to the President's desk.

So I urge all of my colleagues: seize this opportunity. We have a constitutional responsibility and we have a moral obligation to get this done.

Don't let any legislative maneuvers deter us from ending our Nation's complicity in this humanitarian catastrophe. Let's pass this resolution free of changes that would prevent it from going right to the President.

Let me make that more clear: if we change a single word, we will derail this resolution.

Now, the second measure included in this rule is H. Res. 271, in response to a war of a different kind: the Republican war on healthcare. The Trump Justice Department recently moved in Federal Court not only to strike down pre-existing condition coverage under the Affordable Care Act, but to overturn this law completely.

If the President succeeds in *Texas v. U.S.*, the protections for preexisting conditions will be gone. The Medicaid expansion will be nullified. Insurance premiums will skyrocket. I could go on and on and on and on.

Striking down the Affordable Care Act would be a tragedy felt by every single American. We would return to the days when our health insurance marketplace was like the Wild West, when insurers were free to decline or limit coverage because someone had acne, or received an organ transplant, or even because they were a victim of domestic violence. That is how messed up our system was, and that is the system that this President and many of my colleagues want to return to.

Now, for the life of me, I cannot understand what President Trump and his allies in Congress have against Americans getting healthcare. For nearly a decade now, they have worked endlessly to sabotage the Affordable Care Act through Congress, the courts, and administrative actions. Apparently, they are not happy that 20 million people have gained healthcare coverage because of this law, or that 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions can get care. We should be celebrating these advancements. But, instead, some on the other side won't be satisfied until the Affordable Care Act is repealed completely.

Now, this Democratic majority has taken a different course. On the very first day of this Congress, we brought the full weight of the House of Representatives to bear in this lawsuit. As a result, the House Counsel has already intervened in this case to protect the healthcare Americans depend on.

Now, this resolution is our chance to speak with one voice against the administration's attempts to abolish the ACA. I have seen my friends on the other side issue sternly worded press releases and strongly worded letters to the administration. But now it is time to back up words with votes, and then I hope they will work with us moving forward as this majority takes action to reverse the administration's healthcare sabotage and strengthen healthcare for every single American.

Madam Speaker, I believe that healthcare ought to be a fundamental right for every single person in this

country. It is unconscionable to me that rather than working with us to strengthen the Affordable Care Act and rather than working with us to expand healthcare protections, my Republican friends have chosen instead to wipe it out. I don't know how anybody could think like that. I don't know what motivates the President of the United States and some on the other side of the aisle to move in that direction.

Now we are told by the President that even though he doesn't have a plan to replace this, if he succeeds in nulling and voiding the Affordable Care Act, he said: Well, we will provide you one in the year 2021.

So, Madam Speaker, the man who has spent all of his time trying to rip protections away from people with preexisting conditions, the person who wants to not allow you to keep your kids on their insurance until they are 26, the leader of our country who doesn't believe in capping insurance when it comes to people with lifetime illnesses, the person who doesn't want to lower the cost of prescription drugs—I could go on and on and on and on—says: I want to repeal it, I want it gone, I want the courts to null and void it; and then just trust me, and then we will come up with some magical plan, some secret plan, after the election.

I don't think the American people are going to fall for that kind of nonsense, and they shouldn't because healthcare is not a Democratic issue or a Republican issue. It is a moral issue. It is not even an issue, it is a value that all of us should share.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support us in sending a message loud and clear to the administration that we have had enough of their attempts to sabotage the healthcare bill, we have had enough of their trying to take health insurance away from the American people, and that we are going to stand here and make it very clear that we do believe that everybody is entitled to good healthcare in this country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, we are here again considering one nonbinding resolution and a second resolution that will never become law. Both of these prevent us from focusing on the real business of Congress, which is to legislate.

The first, H. Res. 271, is a resolution condemning the Trump administration's recent position in the case of *Texas v. United States*.

So let's revisit that for a minute. Republicans are supportive of protecting access to health insurance for individuals with preexisting conditions. This resolution today will not advance the development of any policies to improve healthcare for the American people. There are options that the Democrats could have brought to the floor to

lower healthcare costs and increase access to care; such legislation would indeed be worthy of our time. But, instead, we are debating expressions that basically amount to political posturing.

The first vote the Republicans called this year was a motion to require legislation protecting individuals with preexisting conditions. Surprisingly, the Democrats voted against that previous question. In 2017, as part of the proposed replacement for the Affordable Care Act, Republicans included legislation that would have preserved access for those with preexisting conditions.

Speaker PELOSI has already intervened on behalf of the House in *Texas v. United States*. While the Department of Justice has weighed in, the department is not litigating the case. As with every other legal case, this will play out in the courts. If Congress must act following the final legal decision, certainly we stand ready to do so. In fact, if the Democrats wanted to void this case, they know their options. They could repeal the individual mandate or they could reinstitute the tax on the individual mandate or they could provide a severability clause that was somehow left out when the Affordable Care Act was passed the first time. But we have seen them do none of those options.

The legal process will take time, and no Americans will lose access to their healthcare while the legal process is being heard. Unlike the case of *Texas v. United States*—which we know will not affect coverage because the judge in that case has issued a stay—individuals covered by what are known as association health plans may actually lose their coverage due to uncertainty in the legal outcome of that case. For last week, a Federal judge in the case of the State of New York, et al. v. Department of Labor, last week a Federal judge ruled that the Department of Labor's final rule on association health plans was not legal.

Association health plans provide employers who otherwise might struggle to provide health insurance for their employees to access the group market through an association, based either on geography or a line of business. The Washington Post recently reported that there are initial signs that association health plans are "offering generous benefits and premiums lower than found in the ObamaCare marketplaces."

Association health plans have provided additional choices for Americans seeking innovative healthcare options, but these choices may soon disappear as a result of the lawsuit State of New York, et al. v. the Department of Labor.

The Democrats are using the case of *Texas v. United States* to delay explaining their real ideas. Their real idea is a one-size-fits-all healthcare. The so-called Medicare for All would be a terrifying reality for our Nation. The Democrats' Soviet style, government-

run, single-payer healthcare bill would not provide access to quality healthcare for Americans. Instead, it would lead to a massive tax increase, eliminate private insurance, and bankrupt the already dwindling Medicare trust fund.

Constituents in my district back in Texas are struggling to afford their health insurance under the Affordable Care Act, and I am certain that we are not the only ones suffering from high premiums and very high deductibles.

Madam Speaker, what good is health insurance if you are afraid to use it because you can't afford your deductible?

This is an issue that I would actually like to see us tackle. But I am confident that a government-run, single-payer system would only further deteriorate our Nation's healthcare.

As the son of a physician who chose to leave Canada because of their system of socialized medicine, I worry that the central state control of healthcare would further damage the doctor-patient relationship. As a physician, I do not believe that the government should hinder a doctor's ability to act in the best interest of his or her patient. I wish the concept of government dictating a physician's practice and decisions was unthinkable, but I find myself here today having to deconstruct the idea of further government control of healthcare.

The House Democratic proposal would implement a global budget, and once that has been set, hospitals and institutions would be required to stick to that for all outpatient and inpatient treatment.

What happens if the budget runs out?

Are the patients simply told: Sorry, we ran out of money, you may try again next year?

Today we should be focusing on the parts of the health insurance market that are working for Americans. For example, 71 percent of Americans are satisfied with their employer-sponsored health insurance. This provides robust protections for individuals with preexisting conditions under ERISA law—a 1970 law, not the 2010 Affordable Care Act. Quite simply, the success of employer-sponsored insurance is not worth wiping out for single-payer healthcare.

Since President Trump took office—and this is important—since the President took office, the number of Americans in employer-sponsored health coverage has increased.

How much has that increased?

I can't precisely tell you because our Congressional Budget folks have not seen fit to give us new coverage numbers.

But since the President took office, how many people are employed that were previously unemployed?

The number is somewhere between 3 and 6 million, and a significant number of those individuals have employer-sponsored health insurance who had no insurance before.

□ 1245

The coverage numbers under President Trump, if the story is ever told, have gone up. Today, there is a greater percentage of Americans in employer-sponsored health coverage than at any time since the year 2000. That is why it is astonishing that House Democrats would want to abolish that insurance option entirely.

Instead of building on the success of our existing health insurance framework, Democrats' radical single-payer, government-run policy would simply tear it down. It would eliminate employer-sponsored health insurance, eliminate all private insurance, eliminate Medicaid, and eliminate CHIP.

Existing Medicare beneficiaries would not be exempt from harm, as the policy would raid the Medicare trust fund, which is already slated to go bankrupt in 2026.

Our Nation's seniors count on the existence of Medicare for their retirement healthcare needs. They have paid into it their entire working lives. How are we supposed to inform them that not only do the Democrats want to endanger their access to Medicare services, but, unbelievably, they will want to increase their taxes also?

There is no question that this policy could be catastrophic for America's patients today and for generations to come.

At least now there is some degree of honesty. Remember, a previous administration said, if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Now at least there is some degree of honesty.

You can't keep your doctor. You can't keep your insurance. You can't keep your personal liberty. You get nothing. Effectively, it would end all the parts of our healthcare system that are, in fact, working for the American people.

Quite simply, single-payer healthcare would be another attempt at a one-size-fits-all approach to healthcare. We know this: Americans are all different. A universal healthcare plan will not meet the varying needs of each and every one of us as individuals. Single-payer is not one-size-fits-all. It is really one-size-fits-no-one.

Again, to restate the obvious: Since the beginning of this Congress, we have heard it. Through the last Congress, we heard it. Republicans support protections for individuals with preexisting conditions.

Instead of spending our time here today worrying about the judicial branch, we could focus on our job as members of the legislative branch. We should be actively working to better our healthcare system, not spending time taking votes that will fail to accomplish any real objective.

Madam Speaker, the second resolution included in this rule directs the removal of the United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

We considered this resolution once before. At that time, Republicans suc-

cessfully passed a motion to recommit that declared the House's opposition to anti-Semitism. However, this version of the bill does not include that important provision, and we are again debating legislation that is, in fact, based on a false premise.

The resolution is fundamentally flawed. United States forces are not engaged in hostilities between the Saudi-led coalition and the Iranian-backed Houthi forces in Yemen. Previously, the United States was providing midair refueling to Saudi Arabia but ceased this assistance in November 2018. The United States continues to provide limited intelligence-sharing and limited logistics support, which does not amount to engagement in hostilities.

The Trump administration is focused on countering al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula and the Islamic State, mitigating the humanitarian crisis in Yemen and assisting our allies.

The United States does not command, coordinate, accompany, nor participate in counter-Houthi operations or any hostilities other than those directed at al-Qaida and the Islamic State.

I might, here, just add: Those activities against the Islamic State have been significantly successful over the last 2 years.

This resolution sets a dangerous precedent. America has a security agreement with Saudi Arabia, just as we do with 117 other countries, including our NATO allies Canada, Australia, South Korea, and Israel. If this resolution were to become law, it could set a precedent that could prevent us from assisting allies and prevent us from meeting our treaty obligations. Rather than condemning a type of assistance that is no longer being provided by the United States, we should be finding ways to aid the millions of Yemenis at risk of starving to death.

Limiting how our forces can engage in the region will only further exacerbate this conflict and not help bring it to a conclusion.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I have to give the Republicans credit for one thing. They are consistent on the issue of healthcare, in trying to avoid talking about the issue at hand.

We are not talking about universal healthcare, although I support universal healthcare. We are not talking about Medicare for All, although I personally support Medicare for All. We are not talking about the Canadian system or the German system or any other system.

We are talking about preventing this President and his Republican allies from null and voiding the Affordable Care Act, thereby taking away healthcare protections for every single American. We are talking about preventing the President from throwing

tens of millions of people off health insurance. We are talking about protecting the over 100 million people in this country who have preexisting conditions. That is what we are talking about.

I loved it when the gentleman from Texas said that the first vote that the Republicans asked for in this Congress was a procedural motion to protect people with preexisting conditions. Does the gentleman not know that people with preexisting conditions already have protections under the Affordable Care Act?

I mean, it sounds to me—and it seemed to me at the time—that that Republican procedural vote was about covering your rear and not about serious legislating, about trying to get the American people to believe that we really do care about healthcare and we really do care about protecting people with preexisting conditions, even though we all know here that that is just not the case.

When I hear the gentleman say that the Republicans care deeply about people's healthcare and want to make sure that everybody gets coverage, it is just not true. The reason I say that so emphatically is because I have been around here for the last few years, and I have watched the dozens of votes that the Republicans have brought up, one after another after another after another after another, to repeal healthcare protections for people in this country without proposing an alternative.

Now, the President is saying: Trust us.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Politico article that just appeared that is entitled "Trump punts health care until after 2020."

[From POLITICO, April 1, 2019]

TRUMP PUNTS HEALTH CARE UNTIL AFTER 2020

(By Quint Forgy and John Bresnahan)

JUST LAST WEEK THE PRESIDENT HAD SEEMED TO GO ALL IN ON A NEW EFFORT TO WIPE OUT OBAMACARE

President Donald Trump signaled Monday that congressional Republicans would wait until after the 2020 elections to vote on a GOP replacement for Obamacare—putting off a presumably savage legislative battle on a hot-button campaign issue until after his re-election bid.

"Everybody agrees that ObamaCare doesn't work. Premiums & deductibles are far too high—Really bad HealthCare! Even the Dems want to replace it, but with Medicare for all, which would cause 180 million Americans to lose their beloved private health insurance," the president tweeted.

"The Republicans . . . are developing a really great HealthCare Plan with far lower premiums (cost) & deductibles than ObamaCare," Trump continued. "In other words it will be far less expensive & much more usable than ObamaCare. Vote will be taken right after the Election when Republicans hold the Senate & win . . . back the House."

Trump claimed that the as-yet-unseen Republican proposal "will be truly great HealthCare that will work for America," writing online that "Republicans will always support Pre-Existing Conditions."

The unexpected string of tweets added drama to a week that has seen Obamacare return to the fore as a policy issue.

The president's pledge comes days after his Justice Department endorsed a federal court ruling to eliminate the Affordable Care Act in its entirety, moving to invalidate the landmark health care law despite objections within Trump's orbit from Health and Human Services Secretary Alex Azar and Attorney General William Barr. The ruling by District Judge Reed O'Connor had suggested that the Obamacare statute, which has passed muster with the Supreme Court, was actually wholly unconstitutional.

The president appeared on Capitol Hill the next day, saying that the Republican Party "will soon be known as the party of health care."

Trump's call to again put Obamacare repeal on the table for Hill Republicans was seen as a potential disaster-in-the-making by GOP leaders, who knew their incumbents and candidates were badly hurt by it last November. And it was an invitation to Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) to pound home the issue once more, as she plans to do with a House vote this week condemning the administration's decision not to defend Obamacare in court.

Trump's efforts to eradicate Obamacare have also endangered some of the administration's health initiatives, such as lowering prices for prescription drugs and combating opioid abuse and HIV.

In public and private, Republican leaders made clear that they didn't want anything to do with the president's most recent maneuver. They begged Trump to back down and made their displeasure known to other administration officials, as well.

GOP lawmakers even took the position that if Trump wanted to lay out his own health care proposal, then they would be willing to look at it. But Senate Republicans—facing a tough electoral fight to maintain their majority in 2020—have refused to sign on to a new administration drive before seeing the specifics, giving them room to disavow any Trump proposal if it hinders their own political outlook.

"I look forward to seeing what the president is proposing and what he can work out with the speaker," Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said in a brief interview Thursday, adding: "I am focusing on stopping the Democrats' 'Medicare for None' scheme."

McConnell is up for re-election this cycle, as are vulnerable GOP incumbents including Cory Gardner of Colorado and Susan Collins of Maine, who said she doesn't want the Justice Department to push to strike down Obamacare.

The Affordable Care Act has been a thorn in the side of Republicans since it was enacted in 2010. After the GOP took back the House in the midterm elections that year, GOP lawmakers repeatedly passed legislation designed to repeal Obamacare.

Once Trump was elected president on a promise of different and better health care options, Republicans seemed on the path to finally scrapping the law, only to see a 2017 "skinny repeal" effort fail unexpectedly in the Senate. That attempt collapsed when Arizona Sen. John McCain—upset with the irregular way the legislation was being handled—stunned his colleagues by voting against it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The President says: Repeal everything, and then we will share our secret plan after the election.

Give me a break. The bottom line is that the American people want us to be on their side, not on the side of big health insurance corporations, not on

the side of big drug companies. They want us to be on their side.

It wasn't too long ago when people would be provided insurance that didn't cover anything. It was junk insurance. There are people on the Republican side and people in this White House who are eager to get back to those bad old days.

Stop trying to take away people's healthcare. Stop trying to get in bed with corporate interests that basically are fighting every attempt to make sure that people have access to good, quality care in this country.

By the way, if they repealed the Affordable Care Act, that repeals essential benefits protections, which guarantee that every insurance company has to provide you coverage when you get sick. That wasn't always the case.

This is a ridiculous fight that we are having here. I cannot believe, after the midterm elections, after it was made crystal clear by the American people to the Republicans that they wanted no part of their effort to take away healthcare in this country, that here we are doing it all again.

Now, maybe they didn't intend it this way. The President wasn't on message and came out for repealing the Affordable Care Act outright, and now they have to kind of scramble to try to, again, cover their rears. That is what is happening here.

It is really disillusioning, I think, for people who are observing these proceedings that we are back again fighting over whether or not people are entitled to good healthcare, whether people are entitled to protections under our healthcare laws.

I think this is a ridiculous fight for the Republicans to be waging. But if they want to fight it, they own it. I think they will see, in 2020, that the American people are having none of it.

Madam Speaker, on the war in Yemen, we cannot wait. The starving children in Yemen cannot wait on this President or on my Republican colleagues to do the right thing.

Just to highlight how bad the war is, here are a few statistics. I noticed the gentleman from Texas barely talked about how horrific the situation is in Yemen, but let me give you a few statistics.

Madam Speaker, 130 children under 5 die each day from hunger and disease as a result of this war. The number of cholera cases in Yemen is 1 million. You heard that right. This is the largest cholera outbreak in recent history. Finally, 3-year-olds in Yemen have lived through 18,000 air raids already.

As I mentioned in my opening statement, the bombs that are dropping on civilian populations say "Made in the United States of America." All of us should be outraged by that, and not only by the Saudi Government's behavior in Yemen, but the Saudi Government's behavior in general.

Yet, what is the response by this administration and their Republican allies? Send Saudi Arabia more weapons.

Sell them more weapons. Turn a blind eye to what is going on in Yemen. Let's make believe that the murder of Washington Post journalist Jamal Khashoggi never happened.

Again, we need to stand firmly on the side of human rights.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, here is one of the uncomfortable truths of the Affordable Care Act: Under the law, every Member of Congress was supposed to be covered under the Affordable Care Act. Obviously, the pay and benefits of a Member in Congress exceed the subsidy limits, so these would be unsubsidized healthcare.gov policies. But then-Speaker of the House John Boehner, then-Leader of the United States Senate Harry Reid, and President Obama himself all intervened. They were fearful that Members of Congress might leave.

There might be a brain drain in Congress—if such a thing was, in fact, possible—if Members of Congress were required to put their health insurance under the Affordable Care Act, so they created an exception for Members of Congress, and Members of Congress only. They are the only people in the United States who can do this. There is a tax-free subsidy that a Member of Congress can walk into the D.C. exchange and get their coverage in the D.C. exchange.

I rejected that option because: Number one, I didn't think it was right. Number two, I didn't think it was legal. I thought it was going to be taken away from us. Apparently, no one else shared my concern because it still exists.

It does make me wonder why we would not offer a health reimbursement account, and I have brought this up several times in committee, where that same tax-free subsidy could be available to any American to walk into a health insurance plan of their choosing. Why not give the people of the country what Members of the Congress so generously bestowed upon themselves?

I didn't take the option to go into the D.C. exchange. I didn't take the option of the tax-free subsidy that went along with it. I bought an unsubsidized health insurance plan in healthcare.gov, signed up for it October 1, 2012. Many of you may remember that. We were in the process of shutting the government down at the time. It was in all the papers.

I started that process October 1, 2012. The check cleared the middle of January 2013. I went that entire time not knowing if I would have health insurance in healthcare.gov the next year because I couldn't get an answer to any questions.

You couldn't call the people at healthcare.gov. You would try, and you would be put on hold. You would stay on hold for a long period of time. You

would eventually get to talk to a person. You would get cut off. You would have to start all over at the beginning. It was a miserable process.

The point is, Members of Congress should have gone through that. We should have had to deal with what we pushed off on the American people, at least those people in the individual market.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

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

Let me just say you have got to love the Republicans. I mean, they have been in charge of this House for 8 years previously. They were in charge of the entire government the previous 2 years. They had the House, the Senate, and the White House. They didn't even need a supermajority in the United States Senate to be able to get whatever they wanted through, and they couldn't do it.

So the bottom line is this: You had your chance. The American people rejected your attempt to take away healthcare from millions of people. The American people believe people with preexisting conditions ought not to be discriminated against by insurance companies, and so they are having none of what you are selling here.

So you can make excuses all you want, but, unfortunately for the country, you were in charge of the House, the Senate, and the White House for the previous 2 years.

Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), who has been a leader on the issue of Yemen, and I commend him for his efforts.

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

Mr. KHANNA. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman MCGOVERN for his leadership in finally bringing up for a vote this resolution on Yemen and for the terrific people on his team, Don Sisson; on Speaker PELOSI's team, Keith Stern, and Shuwanza Goff; and on Majority Leader HOYER's team, who finally allowed for a vote, with the work of Keane Bhatt and Geo Saba.

Let me explain why this matters. As the chairman alluded to, there are 14 million people in Yemen who currently face the possibility of famine—14 million.

I was with Martin Griffiths, the Special Envoy to the United Nations, about 2 weeks ago, and he said, if we do not act in the next couple of months, that situation will become irreversible.

The explanation for this famine is pretty simple. The gentleman from Texas said we need to get more aid in there. I respect that, sir, but the problem is that the Saudis have a blockade on Yemen; they are not allowing the aid to get in. Every day we wait, it makes it harder for us to reverse the famine.

So the solution is very simple: We need to have the Saudis lift the blockade and let food and medicine get to the people who need it to prevent the largest humanitarian crisis and the largest famine the world has ever seen.

Now, the gentleman from Texas said that the administration has already stopped the refueling, and in that, he is actually correct. The administration has stopped the refueling. But the reason they stopped the refueling is precisely because Congress acted, because the Senate passed the War Powers Resolution.

All we are asking to happen now is to codify that policy so that the refueling doesn't begin again. That is why this shouldn't be a partisan issue. The President should want to sign this War Powers Resolution.

The gentleman from Texas said, well, what difference will it make if we have already stopped? The difference this will make is sending a clear, unambiguous message to the Saudis that they can no longer continue a policy of intentional cruelty, of trying to have a nation, through starvation, submit to their will. That is why this is a bipartisan issue. If we pass this, then that message will be heard by the Saudis, and that is why we had bipartisan support in the Senate and in the House for this resolution.

The gentleman from Texas said, well, this is going to hurt our relationships with Israel or other allies. That is just false. That is just false.

The amendment, the Buck amendment, that was in our resolution, or the amendment that is in the Senate resolution, makes it clear that we still can have intelligence sharing with any ally and does not touch any of our treaties.

People often say why am I so passionate that, of all the issues, I decided to take up Yemen in my first term. I will tell you why.

In 1943, there was a famine in West Bengal; 3 million people perished. My grandfather was in jail in 1943 in India when that famine took place. And there was indifference—indifference—by the British Government. They let 3 million people die.

As the United States, we should not allow for another famine, and we should do everything in our power, as a House, to stop it.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the Republican leader of the second oldest committee in the United States Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. BURGESS for his leadership on healthcare in so many ways.

Madam Speaker, embarrassingly designed and hastily written by our Democratic colleagues, the Affordable Care Act, from day one, has come under legal and public scrutiny, and for obvious reasons. This disastrous healthcare experiment, written behind closed doors and stuffed with special

interest giveaways, has driven up healthcare costs for millions of working families so high that more Americans eligible for the Affordable Care Act have rejected it than have chosen it.

Now, as ObamaCare's ever-increasing failures continue to find their way into our courts, Democrats are asking us to condemn the Justice Department's handling of this process.

No matter how Democrats try to frame this stunt, the left is misleading the American people with this political and partisan move. The continuation, regrettably, of falsehoods that Democrats continue to elevate in order to protect this unconstitutional law is really a disservice to the Americans and the patients who hope to have affordable care. We can and must do better as we work to protect patients and lower healthcare costs.

Madam Speaker, the truth is Republicans, creators of the children's healthcare program; creators of part D, the Medicare prescription drugs for seniors; creators of Medicare Advantage, are committed to improving our healthcare system.

If the Court strikes down the Affordable Care Act, Republicans will act to protect those with preexisting conditions. We will work to make healthcare more affordable, guaranteeing that folks can see local doctors or go to their local hospitals, and we will preserve other important provisions, such as no lifetime limits and allowing kids to stay on their parents' plans till age 26. These are shared priorities that patients and families deserve to have secured.

If our Democratic colleagues who drafted this flawed law want to join Republicans, why not start fresh, this time, both parties working together to pass a law that is truly constitutional, that actually lowers costs and that will actually protect patients? We welcome that conversation with open arms.

So I am proud to join with my colleague, the Republican leader of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, GREG WALDEN, to introduce a resolution that calls for this Congress to work together to do just that, because one thing is crystal clear: Republicans won't let the courts take away preexisting protections or let Democrats take away your health plan at work.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on this political stunt so that we can actually start working together toward making our healthcare system more convenient and more affordable for families across this country.

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

I have great respect for the gentleman from Texas, the former chair of the Ways and Means Committee. But I just want to remind my colleagues again that my Republican friends have been in charge of this institution for 8

years. They were in charge for 2 years of the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, and they showed us what they were about.

The gentleman says that they are not going to let the courts take away protections for people with preexisting conditions. Well, my Republican friends tried to do that on dozens of occasions. They brought legislation to the floor that would have ripped protections away from people with preexisting conditions. That is their record. It is there for anybody to see.

Now they are saying: "Oh, we are now for protecting people with preexisting conditions"? Their whole existence in the majority has been about taking protections away from people. Give me a break. I mean, people know what is going on here.

I appreciate the resolution that the gentleman wants to offer to say we all should work together. Look, I am happy to work with my Republican friends to find ways to improve protections for people.

But I want to remind them, when they were in the majority, they didn't want anything to do with us because we wanted to protect people's healthcare. We wanted to protect people with preexisting conditions. We wanted to make sure that parents could keep their kids on their insurance until they were 26. We wanted to lower the cost of prescription drugs. We wanted to put a cap on people with chronic illnesses so that they wouldn't go bankrupt. We wanted to make sure that insurance companies had to offer you real protections. We had essential benefit protections there.

So we are happy to build on that. What we are not happy to do is to work with them to take these things away, and that is what their leadership has been all about for 8 years in the House. And then when they controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House, that is what they tried to do.

Thankfully, some thoughtful Republicans in the Senate didn't go along with it, so they didn't get their way. And now they are trying to use the courts to try to undermine what this body has done.

Madam Speaker, let me inquire of the gentleman from Texas how many more speakers he has.

Mr. BURGESS. I have as many as I need.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Okay. Then I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. It will be me.

Mr. MCGOVERN. We were expecting one more speaker, but she didn't show up. If the gentleman is ready to close, I am ready to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. 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 move a resolution that reinforces our long-held views that every American should have preexisting condition protections.

On the opening day of the 116th Congress, House Republicans brought a measure to the floor that called on lawmakers to legislate on locking in protections for patients with preexisting conditions. Unfortunately, in a fit of partisanship, the Democrats blocked this effort.

If the Democrats were serious, they would take up legislation immediately to protect patients with preexisting conditions. Instead, Democrats are trying to score political points.

Our position is simple and clear: Republicans stand ready to protect those with preexisting conditions in a manner that will withstand judicial scrutiny. This is why, if the previous question is defeated, House Republicans will move a resolution that:

Maintains that no American should have their health insurance taken away or lose protections for preexisting conditions due to the Democrats in Congress enacting an unconstitutional law;

Instructs Congress and the Trump administration to immediately ask the Court for a stay in this decision;

Guarantees that no American citizen can be denied health insurance or coverage or charged more due to previous illness or health status;

Includes commonsense consumer protections;

Provides more choice and affordable coverage than the Affordable Care Act;

Lowers prescription drug prices for patients;

Strengthens Medicare for current and future beneficiaries; and

Rejects the Democrats' radical, one-size-fits-all, government-run healthcare that would outlaw the employer-based coverage of more than 150 million Americans.

Finally, it is important to note that *Texas v. the United States*, the case that is working its way through the courts, did not immediately end ObamaCare and will not affect insurance coverage or premiums for calendar year 2019. Several legal steps remain before the courts reach a final conclusion.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include 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 gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman is agreeable, I am prepared to close.

So, in closing, while Republicans stand ready to legislate, we are again considering unnecessary resolutions. The first seeks to condemn the position of the Department of Justice in *Texas v. the United States*, the case in which the Department of Justice is not a party.

As I have stated several times, Republicans support protecting coverage

for preexisting conditions. I would hope we could work together to find a way to make health insurance affordable for all Americans rather than considering a divisive messaging resolution.

The resolution to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities in Yemen is not only unnecessary, but may prevent future assistance for our allies.

□ 1315

The brave men and women who are assisting Saudi Arabia in the fight against al-Qaida and the Islamic State are working to find solutions to the humanitarian crisis that is unfolding in Yemen, a mission for which we should be unified in our support.

Madam Speaker, with that, I urge a “no” vote on the previous question, and a “no” on the underlying measures.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I just find it a little bit interesting that for the last couple of days, my Republican friends have been assailing us for introducing a sense of Congress resolution, and here we have a sense of Congress resolution from them.

I guess you can't make this stuff up.

But in any event, look, I will say to my colleagues, you don't need to defeat the previous question to make clear that you believe that people with preexisting conditions should be protected, because this sense of Congress wouldn't do that.

We have a law that does that now, a law that, unfortunately, my Republican friends have been trying to repeal for years.

So if Members want to protect people with preexisting conditions, then they ought to support us on our sense of Congress resolution.

So, Madam Speaker, when it comes down to it, both of these resolutions that we are offering today are about what this Congress is willing to tolerate, whether we are willing to tolerate our Nation's involvement in the Saudi-led war in Yemen, despite never having authorized it in the first place. Do we really want our Nation to be partners with a regime that murders journalists like Jamal Khashoggi?

President Trump has said of Saudi Arabia: “They have been a great ally.” Well, I disagree.

And I hope that this Congress will now speak with one voice that we will not look the other way when it comes to the murder of a U.S. reporter, that we will not look the other way when it comes to the murder of innocent people in Yemen, bombing school buses, bombing weddings, bombing funerals.

Enough. We have to say enough. We are no longer okay with the U.S. and Yemen going on unchecked for another year.

This is about whether this Congress is going to tolerate the administration

trying to rip away millions of people's healthcare as well. I know I am not—and many of my colleagues aren't either—willing to tolerate that.

This morning, I joined with many Members of Congress in the House and Senate, including Leader PELOSI and Senator SCHUMER. We marched from the House and the Senate to the Supreme Court to call on this administration to stop its assault on Americans' healthcare.

Abolishing the Affordable Care Act may be just a talking point to the President, but this law is literally a matter of life and death for people. Millions and millions of Americans could lose their insurance coverage. Premiums and out-of-pocket costs could skyrocket, and lifesaving healthcare could once again be out of reach.

The President and his allies claim to support protections for preexisting conditions, they claim that the Republican Party is the party of healthcare, but their actions say otherwise.

When this House voted on the first day of this Congress to allow us to intervene in *Texas v. U.S.*, more than 190 Republicans sided with the President on his brutal assault on Americans' healthcare.

The majority is not going to stand for it.

Enough is enough. Enough with the unauthorized wars abroad, enough with the assault on people's healthcare.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the previous question, this rule, and the underlying resolutions.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong and unequivocal support for the rule governing debate on H. Res. 271 as well as the underlying resolution and ask all Members to join me in supporting this resolution which condemns the Trump Administration's ongoing legal campaign to take away health care from more than 100 million Americans and to make health care dramatically less affordable for those fortunate enough to be insured.

I thank Congressman ALLRED, my Texas congressional delegation colleague, for introducing this important resolution.

As a new member of Congress who unseated an opponent who voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act dozens of times, the gentlemen from Texas knows first-hand how important and critical access to affordable, high quality, accessible health care available to everyone, including those with pre-existing conditions, to the well-being of American families.

Because of the passage of the Affordable Care Act, the national uninsured rate has been slashed from 14.8 in 2012 to 8.89 percent in 2018.

Texas has long led the nation in rate of uninsured so the comparable rates are 24.6 and 15 percent, respectively.

Madam Speaker, I distinctly recall a candidate for the highest public office in the land saying “Obamacare is a disaster” and appealing for voters to support him with this question:

“What have you got to lose?”

The question deserves a response so I hope that person, who occupies the Oval Office, is listening to my answer.

The Affordable Care Act, or “Obamacare,” has been an unmitigated success to the more than 20 million Americans who for the first time now have the security and peace of mind that comes with affordable, accessible, high quality health care.

Madam Speaker, Tip O'Neill used to say that “all politics is local” so let me share with you how Obamacare has dramatically changed lives for the better for the people in my home state of Texas.

1.874 million Texans who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented could lose their coverage if the ACA is entirely or partially repealed or invalidated.

1.1 million Texans who purchased high quality Marketplace coverage now stand to lose their coverage if *Texas v. United States*, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.), the lawsuit brought by Republican Governors, and now whole-heartedly supported and aided by the Trump Administration were to succeed.

913,177 individuals Texans who received financial assistance to purchase Marketplace coverage in 2016, averaging \$271 per individual, are at risk of having coverage become unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates the premium tax credits.

1.1 million Texans could have insurance if all states adopted the ACA's Medicaid expansion; these individuals will not be able to gain coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the Medicaid expansion.

508,000 kids in Texas who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented are also at risk of having their coverage rolled back.

205,000 young adult Texans who were able to stay on a parent's health insurance plan thanks to the ACA now stand to lose coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the requirement that insurers allow children to stay on their parents' plans until age 26.

646,415 Texans who received cost-sharing reductions to lower out-of-pocket costs such as deductibles, co-pays, and coinsurance are now at risk of having healthcare become unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates cost-sharing reductions.

10.28 million Texans who now have private health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductibles stand to lose this access if the Republican Congress eliminates ACA provisions requiring health insurers to cover important preventive services without cost-sharing.

Women in Texas who can now purchase insurance for the same price as men are at risk of being charged more for insurance if the ACA's ban on gender rating in the individual and small group markets is invalidated.

Before the ACA, women paid up to 56 percent more than men for their health insurance.

Roughly 4.5 million Texans who have pre-existing health conditions are at risk of having their coverage rescinded, being denied coverage, or being charged significantly more for coverage if the ACA's ban on pre-existing conditions is struck down.

346,750 Texas seniors who have saved an average of \$1,057 each as a result of closing the Medicare prescription drug “donut hole” gap in coverage stand to lose this critical help going forward.

1.75 million Texas seniors who have received free preventive care services thanks to ACA provisions requiring coverage of annual wellness visits and eliminating cost-sharing for

many recommended preventive services covered by Medicare Part B, such as cancer screenings, are at risk of losing access to these services if congressional Republicans go forward with their plan to repeal the ACA.

The Affordable Care Act works and has made a life-affirming difference in the lives of millions of Americans, in Texas and across the country.

This is what happens when a visionary president cares enough to work with a committed and empathetic Congress to address the real issues facing the American people.

You want to know why the American people have Obamacare?

It is because Obama cared.

The same cannot be said about this Republican president and congressional Republicans who have made careers of attacking and undermining the Affordable Care Act's protections and benefits for the American people.

I urge all Members to vote for H. Res. 271 and send a powerful message to the President and the American people that this House will not stand idly by as this Administration tries to take away health care from more than 130 million persons.

Instead, this House will resist by all constitutional and appropriate means, including opposing this Administration in the courts and by passing the "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," which will lower health insurance premiums with strengthened and expanded affordability assistance by:

1. strengthening tax credits in the Marketplace to lower Americans' health insurance premiums and allows more middle-class individuals and families to qualify for subsidies;

2. ensuring that families who don't have an offer of affordable coverage from an employer can still qualify for subsidies in the Marketplace; and,

3. providing funding for reinsurance, to help with high-cost claims, improve Marketplace stability, and prevent the Administration's sabotage from raising premiums.

The "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," will also strengthen protections for people with pre-existing conditions by curtailing the Administration's efforts to give states waivers to undermine protections for people with pre-existing conditions and weaken standards for essential health benefits.

These improper waivers leave consumers with less comprehensive plans that do not cover needed services, such as prescription drugs, maternity care and substance use disorder treatment.

Another way the "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," protects consumers is by prohibiting insurance companies from selling junk health insurance plans that do not provide coverage for essential medical treatments and drugs, or cover people with pre-existing medical conditions.

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

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 274

Strike section 2 of the resolution and insert 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. 280), Protecting the health care of all Americans, especially those with pre-

existing conditions. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 280.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 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 231, nays 191, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

YEAS—231

- Adams DeLgado Krishnamoorthi
Aguilar Demings Kuster (NH)
Allred DeSaunier Lamb
Axne Deutch Langevin
Barragán Dingell Larsen (WA)
Bass Doggett Larson (CT)
Beatty Doyle, Michael Lawrence
Bera F. Lawson (FL)
Beyer Engel Lee (CA)
Bishop (GA) Escobar Lee (NV)
Blumenauer Eshoo Levin (CA)
Blunt Rochester Espailat Levin (MI)
Bass Evans Lewis
Boyle, Brendan Finkenauer Lieu, Ted
F. Fletcher Lipinski
Brindisi Poster Loeb sack
Brown (MD) Frankel Lofgren
Brownley (CA) Fudge Lowenthal
Bustos Gallego Lowey
Butterfield Garamendi Luján
Carbajal Garcia (IL) Lurla
Cárdenas Garcia (TX) Lynch
Carson (IN) Golden Malinowski
Cartwright Gomez Maloney,
Case Gonzalez (TX) Carolyn B.
Casten (IL) Gottheimer Maloney, Sean
Castor (FL) Green (TX) Matsui
Castro (TX) Grijalva McAdams
Chu, Judy Haaland McBath
Cicilline Harder (CA) McCollum
Cisneros Hastings McGovern
Clark (MA) Hayes Mc Nerney
Clarke (NY) Heck Meeks
Clay Higgins (NY) Meng
Cleaver Hill (CA) Moore
Clyburn Himes Morable
Cohen Horn, Kendra S. Moulton
Connolly Horsford Mucarsel-Powell
Cooper Houlihan Murphy
Costa Hoyer Nadler
Courtney Huffman Napolitano
Cox (CA) Jackson Lee Neal
Craig Jayapal Neguse
Crist Jeffries Norcross
Crow Johnson (GA) O'Halleran
Cuellar Johnson (TX) Ocasio-Cortez
Cummings Kaptur Omar
Cunningham Keating Pallone
Davids (KS) Kelly (LL) Panetta
Davis (CA) Kennedy Pappas
Davis, Danny K. Khanna Pascrell
Dean Kildee Payne
DeFazio Kilmer Perlmutter
DeGette Kim Peters
DeLauro Kind Peterson
DelBene Kirkpatrick Phillips

- Pingree Schrier Tonko
Pocan Scott (VA) Torres (CA)
Porter Scott, David Torres Small
Pressley Serrano (NM)
Price (NC) Sewell (AL) Trahan
Quigley Shalala Trone
Raskin Sherman Underwood
Rice (NY) Sherrill Van Drew
Richmond Sires Vargas
Rose (NY) Slotkin Veasey
Rouda Smith (WA) Vela
Roy Soto Velázquez
Roybal-Allard Spanberger Visclosky
Ruiz Speier Wasserman
Ruppersberger Stanton Schultz
Ryan Stevens Waters
Sánchez Suozzi Watson Coleman
Sarbanes Swalwell (CA) Welch
Scanlon Takano Wexton
Schakowsky Thompson (CA) Wild
Schiff Thompson (MS) Wilson (FL)
Schneider Titus Yarmuth
Schrader Tlaib

NAYS—191

- Aderholt Gonzalez (OH) Nunes
Allen Gooden Olson
Amash Gosar Palazzo
Amodei Granger Palmer
Armstrong Graves (GA) Pence
Arrington Graves (LA) Posey
Babin Graves (MO) Ratcliffe
Bacon Green (TN) Reed
Baird Griffith Reschenthaler
Balderson Grothman Rice (SC)
Banks Guest Riggleman
Barr Guthrie Roby
Bergman Hagedorn Rodgers (WA)
Biggs Harris Roe, David P.
Bilirakis Hartzler Rogers (AL)
Bishop (UT) Hern, Kevin Rogers (KY)
Bost Herrera Beutler Rooney (FL)
Brady Hice (GA) Rose, John W.
Brooks (AL) Higgins (LA) Rouzer
Brooks (IN) Hill (AR) Scalise
Buchanan Holding Schweikert
Buck Hollingsworth Scott, Austin
Bucshon Hudson Sensenbrenner
Budd Huizenga Shimkus
Burchett Hunter Simpson
Burgess Hurd (TX) Smith (MO)
Byrne Johnson (LA) Smith (NE)
Calvert Johnson (OH) Smith (NJ)
Carter (GA) Johnson (SD) Smucker
Carter (TX) Jordan Spano
Chabot Joyce (OH) Stauber
Cheney Joyce (PA) Stefanik
Cline Katko Steil
Cloud Kelly (MS) Steube
Cole Kelly (PA) Stewart
Collins (GA) King (IA) Stivers
Collins (NY) King (NY) Taylor
Comer Kinzinger Thompson (PA)
Conaway Kustoff (TN) Thornberry
Cook LaHood Timmons
Crawford LaMalfa Tipton
Crenshaw Lamborn Turner
Curtis Latta Upton
Davidson (OH) Lesko Wagner
Davis, Rodney Long Walberg
DesJarlais Loudermilk Walden
Diaz-Balart Lucas Walker
Duffy Luetkemeyer Walorski
Duncan Marchant Waltz
Dunn Marshall Watkins
Emmer Massie Weber (TX)
Estes McCarthy Webster (FL)
Ferguson McCaul Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick McClintock Westerman
Fleischmann McHenry Williams
Flores McKinley Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry Meadows Wittman
Foxy (NC) Meuser Womack
Fulcher Miller Woodall
Gaetz Mitchell Wright
Gallagher Moolenaar Yoho
Gianforte Mullin Young
Gibbs Newhouse Zeldin
Gohmert Norman

NOT VOTING—9

- Abraham Mast Perry
Correa McEachin Rush
Gabbard Mooney (WV) Rutherford

□ 1343

Messrs. RESCENTIALER and SCALISE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. BASS changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TITUS). The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 188, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—230

Adams	Eshoo	Luria
Aguilar	Españillat	Lynch
Allred	Evans	Malinowski
Axne	Finkenauer	Maloney,
Barragán	Fletcher	Carolyn B.
Bass	Foster	Maloney, Sean
Beatty	Frankel	Matsui
Bera	Fudge	McAdams
Beyer	Gallego	McBath
Bishop (GA)	Garamendi	McCollum
Blumenauer	García (IL)	McGovern
Blunt Rochester	García (TX)	McNerney
Bonamici	Golden	Meeks
Boyle, Brendan	Gomez	Meng
F.	Gonzalez (TX)	Moore
Brindisi	Gottheimer	Morelle
Brown (MD)	Green (TX)	Moulton
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Mucarsel-Powell
Bustos	Haaland	Murphy
Butterfield	Harder (CA)	Nadler
Carbajal	Hastings	Napolitano
Cárdenas	Hayes	Neal
Carson (IN)	Heck	Neuse
Cartwright	Higgins (NY)	Norcross
Case	Hill (CA)	O'Halleran
Casten (IL)	Himes	Ocasio-Cortez
Castor (FL)	Horn, Kendra S.	Omar
Castro (TX)	Horsford	Pallone
Chu, Judy	Houlihan	Panetta
Cicilline	Hoyer	Pappas
Cisneros	Huffman	Pascrell
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Payne
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Perlmutter
Clay	Jeffries	Peters
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Clyburn	Johnson (TX)	Phillips
Cohen	Kaptur	Pingree
Connolly	Keating	Pocan
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Porter
Costa	Kennedy	Pressley
Courtney	Khanna	Price (NC)
Cox (CA)	Kildee	Quigley
Craig	Kilmer	Raskin
Crist	Kim	Rice (NY)
Crow	Kind	Richmond
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Rose (NY)
Cummings	Krishnamoorthi	Rouda
Cunningham	Kuster (NH)	Roybal-Allard
Davids (KS)	Lamb	Ruiz
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Davis, Danny K.	Larsen (WA)	Ryan
Dean	Larson (CT)	Sánchez
DeFazio	Lawrence	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lawson (FL)	Scanlon
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
DelBene	Lee (NV)	Schiff
Delgado	Levin (CA)	Schneider
Demings	Levin (MI)	Schrader
DeSaulnier	Lewis	Schrier
Deutch	Lieu, Ted	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lipinski	Scott, David
Doggett	Loeb sack	Serrano
Doyle, Michael	Lofgren	Sewell (AL)
F.	Lowenthal	Shalala
Engel	Lowey	Sherman
Escobar	Luján	Sherrill

Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swailwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)

Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela

Velázquez
Viscosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—188

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert

Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mullin
Newhouse

Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Rescenthaler
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylors
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Abraham
Bergman
Correa
Gabbard
Mast

McEachin
Mooney (WV)
Perry
Riggleman
Rooney (FL)

Rush
Rutherford
Woodall

□ 1353

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 140 and “nay” on rollcall No. 141.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam 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, to protect the right to life for innocent children who are born alive instead of allowing the State-sponsored murder after birth, 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. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, if that is the case, I would ask the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately bring that bill to the floor to allow us all to stand up for the sanctity of life.

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

CONDEMNING THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION'S LEGAL CAMPAIGN TO TAKE AWAY AMERICANS' HEALTH CARE

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 271.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 274, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 271) Condemning the Trump Administration's Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans' Health Care, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 271

Whereas on February 26, 2018, 18 State attorneys general and 2 Governors filed a lawsuit in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Texas v. United States, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.) (in this preamble referred to as “Texas v. United States”), arguing that the requirement of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) (in this preamble referred to as the “ACA”) to maintain minimum essential coverage is unconstitutional and, as a result, the court should invalidate the entire law;

Whereas in a June 7, 2018, letter to Congress, then Attorney General Jefferson Sessions announced that the Department of Justice—

(1) would not defend the constitutionality of the minimum essential coverage provision; and

(2) would argue that provisions protecting individuals with pre-existing conditions (specifically the provisions commonly known as “community rating” and “guaranteed issue”) are inseverable from the minimum essential coverage provision and should be invalidated;

Whereas in the June 7, 2018, letter to Congress, Attorney General Sessions also advised Congress that “the Department will continue to argue that Section 5000A(a) is severable from the remaining provisions of the ACA”, indicating a difference from the plaintiffs’ position in *Texas v. United States*;

Whereas on December 14, 2018, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas issued an order that declared the requirement to maintain minimum essential coverage unconstitutional and struck down the ACA in its entirety, including protections for individuals with pre-existing conditions;

Whereas the decision of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas was stayed and is pending appeal before the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit;

Whereas on March 25, 2019, the Department of Justice, in a letter to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, changed its position and announced that the entire ruling of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas should be upheld and the entire ACA should be declared unconstitutional;

Whereas prior to 2014, individuals with pre-existing conditions were routinely denied health insurance coverage, subject to coverage exclusions, charged unaffordable premium rates, exposed to unaffordable out-of-pocket costs, and subject to lifetime and annual limits on health insurance coverage;

Whereas as many as 133,000,000 nonelderly people in the United States—

(1) have a pre-existing condition and could have been denied coverage, only offered coverage at an exorbitant price had they needed individual market health insurance prior to 2014, or had coverage for their pre-existing condition excluded prior to 2014; and

(2) will lose protections for pre-existing conditions if the ruling of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas is upheld in *Texas v. United States*;

Whereas contrary to President Trump’s public claims that he supports protections for people with pre-existing conditions, he has ordered his Department of Justice to actively pursue the destruction of these protections in Federal court;

Whereas employer-provided health plans cannot place lifetime or annual limits on health coverage, and if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, more than 100,000,000 people in the United States who receive health insurance through their employer could once again face lifetime or annual coverage limits;

Whereas if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, insurers would be allowed to impose an unlimited “age tax” on the health insurance premiums of older Americans;

Whereas prior to 2010, Medicare enrollees faced massive out-of-pocket prescription drug costs once they reached a certain threshold known as the Medicare “donut hole”, and since the donut hole began closing in 2010, millions of Medicare beneficiaries have saved billions of dollars on prescription drugs;

Whereas at a time when 3 in 10 adults report not taking prescribed medicines because of the cost, if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, sen-

iors enrolled in Medicare would face billions of dollars in new prescription drug costs;

Whereas as of March 2019, 37 States, including the District of Columbia, have expanded or are in the process of expanding Medicaid to individuals with incomes up to 138 percent of the Federal poverty level, providing health coverage to more than 12,000,000 newly eligible people;

Whereas if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, the millions of individuals and families who receive coverage from Medicaid could lose eligibility and no longer have access to health care;

Whereas as of March 2019, many people who buy individual health insurance are provided tax credits to reduce the cost of premiums and assistance to reduce out-of-pocket costs such as copays and deductibles, which has made individual health insurance coverage affordable for millions of people in the United States for the first time;

Whereas if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, the health insurance individual exchanges would be eliminated and millions of people in the United States who buy health insurance on the individual marketplaces could lose coverage and would see premium expenses for individual health insurance increase exorbitantly;

Whereas if the Trump Administration succeeds in its argument before the court, people in the United States would lose numerous consumer protections in their coverage, including the requirements that—

(1) plans offer preventive care without cost-sharing;

(2) young adults have the option to remain on a parent’s insurance plan until age 26; and

(3) many health insurance plans offer a comprehensive set of essential health benefits such as maternity care, addiction treatment, and prescription drug coverage;

Whereas pursuant to section 516 of title 28, United States Code, the conduct of litigation in which the United States is a party is reserved to the Department of Justice;

Whereas public reports suggest that the President and his political advisors directed this course of action in direct contravention of the Department of Justice’s longstanding policy to defend Acts of Congress and duty to advance reasonable analysis of legal questions, for example—

(1) when the Department of Justice changed its litigating position on June 7, 2018, in the *Texas v. United States* case to ask the court to strike down the ACA’s guaranteed issue and community rating requirements, thereby eliminating protections for people with pre-existing conditions and reinstating legal discrimination based on health status, that position was found to be so legally indefensible that three of the four career attorneys representing the Government refused to sign the relevant briefs and removed themselves from the case; and

(2) when the Department of Justice again changed its litigating position on March 25, 2019, in the appeal of *Texas v. United States* to seek the invalidation of every provision of the ACA, it was reported that decision was made over the objections of both the Department of Justice as well as the Department of Health and Human Services; and

Whereas the Trump Administration has proceeded in the *Texas v. United States* lawsuit with total disregard for the consequences of its actions for the lives of millions of Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the actions taken by the Trump Administration seeking the invalidation of the ACA’s protections for people with pre-existing conditions, and later the invalidation of

the entire ACA, are an unacceptable assault on the health care of the American people; and

(2) the Department of Justice should—

(A) protect individuals with pre-existing conditions, seniors struggling with high prescription drug costs, and the millions of people in the United States who newly gained health insurance coverage since 2014;

(B) cease any and all efforts to destroy Americans’ access to affordable health care; and

(C) reverse its position in *Texas v. United States*, No. 19–10011 (5th Cir.).

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

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ALLRED), who is the sponsor of this resolution.

□ 1400

Mr. ALLRED. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman PALLONE for his leadership, and I am proud to lead the charge on this resolution condemning the administration’s attacks on American’s healthcare in Federal court.

With the support of so many of my colleagues, this resolution puts the United States Congress on the record as being on the side of the people. As this administration seeks to tear down our healthcare system, this Congress will not stand by while cynical and partisan interests attack our healthcare system and that of hard-working Americans.

Whether it is allowing young people to stay on their parent’s insurance until they are 26, or protecting people from lifetime caps, or ensuring that folks with preexisting conditions get the care that they need, this should not be a partisan issue.

The fight to protect preexisting conditions is personal for me. My mother is a breast cancer survivor and my wife Aly and I just celebrated the birth of our son. Both of those are preexisting conditions. And concern about healthcare is, by far, the number one issue that my constituents talk to me about back home.

That brings me to Natalie, a lawyer with young children, Hugo and Mia, who is married to Nathan, a law professor at Southern Methodist University. Nathan recently attended the State of the Union here with me in Washington.

I met Natalie on the same day that the House voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. I learned that she had stage IV cancer and that she had come to my event from her chemotherapy treatment. She explained to me that her goal was to fight her cancer for as long as she could so that her two children would know her.

Natalie came to my event that day because she was worried about future moms who would lose their care if the Affordable Care Act was repealed. She was concerned about a return to the bad old days with lifetime caps and discrimination against people with pre-existing conditions.

Sadly, Natalie passed away last year, but her fight goes on, a fight that I am honored to carry forward on behalf of north Texans here in Washington. My home State of Texas has the highest uninsured rate in the country. One in five people in Dallas County, where I live, do not have health insurance. We can and must do better.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in the House and the Senate to join us in condemning these attacks on our healthcare system. We must make sure that we don't go back to the bad old days where people can get thrown off their healthcare just because they got sick.

This resolution is a good first step, but we must come together to help our constituents by working together to pass legislation that will stabilize our system and lower costs for everyone.

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

Madam Speaker, the American people expect us to come to this floor with solutions, not political "gotcha" statements. The resolution before us in this week's Democratic dosage of attack on the President is just that. It doesn't do a darn thing to protect people with pre-existing conditions; not one thing.

In the opening day of the 116th Congress, House Republicans brought a powerful, but simple, measure to the floor that called on this body to legislate on what we all agree needs to be done: locking in protections for patients with pre-existing conditions.

Let me repeat. Republicans acted on day one of this Congress to protect Americans with pre-existing conditions. Democrats blocked that.

In fact, I introduced legislation which has 45 cosponsors that protects people with pre-existing conditions. Period. This is something I have fought for my entire time in public service. It would lock in existing protections for patients. It is before the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I have worked since the first day of this Congress to get this measure passed so that if the court decision that found ObamaCare to be unconstitutional, if that judge's decision is upheld, we want to make sure that our citizens who have pre-existing conditions still have coverage.

The legislation I have sponsored would do that. Republicans and Democrats could get this done, and the question is: Why are we not voting on that today?

Instead, Democrats have rushed a resolution to the floor that has never had a hearing before the Energy and Commerce Committee. So much for the talk about due process and regular

order, Madam Speaker. No hearing, and it was rushed to the floor.

We only got to see it for the first time last Friday. So it is little more, in my opinion, than a political screed, not a public policy proposal. It will never go to the Senate. It is only here. Americans ought to know this, too: that the legal case working its way through the courts did not immediately end ObamaCare and will not affect insurance coverage on premiums for 2019.

Moreover, Democrat attorneys general and a couple of Republicans from intervening States are already defending the law in this case, and the judge's ruling has been appealed. This body has voted not once, but twice, to allow Speaker PELOSI to intervene in the case, and she has moved to do.

Just as my Democratic colleagues have repeatedly refused to let this House approve protections for people with preexisting conditions, they also know they could moot the lawsuit that they so decry today. All they would have to do is bring a bill to the floor and vote to repeal the individual mandate. That would turn off this lawsuit.

I am sure many on our side might be happy to join them in that effort. And if the Democrats didn't want to do that, they could vote to reinstate the individual mandate penalty. That, too, would moot the lawsuit. But we are not doing that either.

So they had policy options that could have been brought to the floor, three of them. Two would have ended the lawsuit that they decry today, and one would have given rock-solid security to those with preexisting conditions if the law is thrown out. There is no difference between us or among us about protecting people with preexisting conditions.

But, unfortunately, they chose not to actually legislate. Democrats control everything in this House. They decide what gets heard in committee or, in this case, not, and what is brought to the floor, or not. So it is clear they would rather play politics with healthcare and attack the President for political purposes rather than work with us on what could and should be bipartisan solutions.

A fact that my friends on the other side of the aisle must acknowledge is, for many Americans seeking coverage, healthcare costs keep getting more and more expensive. Last week, the Bend Bulletin, a newspaper in my district, reported on a recent analysis by the Kaiser Family Foundation about how insurance premiums are out of reach for many older, middle-class residents of our area, particularly in rural areas, including my home State.

They report: "In central Oregon, for example, a 60-year-old individual with an annual income of \$50,000 must pay at least \$703 a month, representing 17 percent of his or her income, and that would only buy a bronze plan with a deductible of \$6,500."

We should be focused on helping people like that be able to afford insurance.

When the Affordable Care Act passed, Democrats promised people their insurance premiums would actually go down by \$2,500. For many in America, that promise was false. For many Americans, healthcare costs, health insurance premiums, and, certainly, deductibles and copays have done nothing but gone up and up.

I was in Oregon over the weekend and held seven townhalls. Do you know what I hear about when it comes to healthcare? That insurance premiums are out of reach for too many of my constituents. And for those who cannot afford the premiums, many make difficult choices, from choosing which family members to cover, to changing jobs, or limiting income in order to continue to qualify for subsidies. This is a real problem. I think we can find a bipartisan solution if Democrats are willing to work with us on it.

But, plainly, the current healthcare system for too many Americans is not working. So we know we have more work to do, and I hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would agree with us that we need to improve State markets that, in some part, were damaged by ObamaCare; that we should work together to lower healthcare costs and increase access to private health insurance.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee, actually, there are some things we are working on, on drug costs. No President, in my memory, has ever leaned farther forward to get drug costs down for American consumers than President Trump. He has been an incredible leader in this effort, and we are going to see bipartisan work get marked up tomorrow in the Energy and Commerce Committee.

So on that topic of healthcare that is so crucial to survivability of American consumers, we can move forward. We have proven that.

But, meanwhile, the American people need to fully understand that the Democrats' one-size-fits-all, government-run plan itself would end the Affordable Care Act. You have to admit that. That is what your Medicare-for-all plan does.

They need to understand the \$32 trillion price tag for the Democrats' alternative and the tax increases that would be necessary to go with it; the doubling of the individual income tax; doubling of corporate tax; and providers would have to take a 40 percent reduction in their payments.

Think of what the wait lines will be if that were to become law. Americans need to know that when the Democrats Medicare-for-all plan ends, employer-sponsored healthcare and your union plans you negotiated for, 158 million Americans who have health insurance today, will lose it tomorrow. They need to understand how they would have to wait longer for access to care than they do today.

And for my older friends, they need to understand the worst-case scenario. Seniors in America need to fully understand how this plan does away with

popular Medicare Advantage plans and Medigap plans and impacts this proposal would have on access to their doctors and an earlier bankruptcy of Medicare altogether.

So we would be better served today, and so would the American people, if we stood down, parked our partisan swords and shields, and worked together to solve the real problems Americans face when they go to pay their family bills.

I had lunch today with a couple from the southern part of my district, professionals. They said the cost of health insurance for them is so high they have had to make the choice not to have it.

This is going on every day in the marketplace, and I wish we could come together and spend our time on this House floor with a solution we could agree upon, because I think we could. But that is not what we are doing today.

It is like every week there has to be a resolution on the floor to condemn the President, something he said or did; not a policy proposal that will actually solve the Nation's problems. That is all you are dealing with today, another screed.

So let's work together. Let's come together as this Congress can, and as the Energy and Commerce Committee has had a wonderful record of doing over the years, and can going forward, to address healthcare and other issues. We can do that.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this partisan, political resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would hope that we could do what the gentleman from Oregon wants to do and work together in a bipartisan fashion.

I will say to him, however, that his party was in control from 2011 to last year, and there was almost no effort to accomplish that objective. There were, however, over 65 votes to repeal, and there was no replace. When his party won the Presidency as well, there was no replace. We passed something through this House that couldn't get through the Senate. The Senate was controlled by the gentleman's party.

This is something that is not optional for any of our citizens. Healthcare is essential, and they expect us to sit down and work together.

Unfortunately, today, we saw in a tweet—the President who campaigned on the basis of everybody was going to be covered at less cost and higher quality. We are now, I suppose, in about the 29th month in the President's term. He has sent us no bill—and this morning, he has the gall, in my opinion, to tell the American people: I have got a plan. It is secret, and I will show it to you in 2021.

What is interesting about 2021? It is after the election.

Elections ought to be about policy. The election of 2018 was about policy, healthcare, and, very frankly, our argument prevailed. Our argument was that we wanted to protect the Affordable Care Act; that we wanted to make sure that the protections included in the Affordable Care Act were available to all Americans.

□ 1415

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Representative ALLRED for introducing this resolution, and I rise in support of it.

Since taking office, President Trump and his administration have been focused on doing everything it can to take affordable healthcare coverage options away from American families.

Madam Speaker, you can make healthcare a lot cheaper. Offer them no coverage—it is very simple—not hospitalization, not doctors' reimbursement, not this, not that, and not the other. We call them junk policies. They pretend to be health coverage when they are not.

The President did make two failed efforts along with his party to repeal the Affordable Care Act in Congress. They came after Republicans tried to repeal or undermine the bill in more than 65 votes during their years in the majority. The American people do not want to get rid of the Affordable Care Act, because if they did, then they wouldn't have us in the majority because they know we want to keep it. They want Congress, however, to work to improve and make our healthcare system work better for all Americans, and, yes, have it affordable and accessible.

Instead, President Trump and Republicans have doubled down and tripled down on their agenda of sabotaging the law through executive actions on an almost weekly and monthly basis and through lawsuits like the one now pending in Texas.

I am not sure who convinced the President to change his mind, but I have a suspicion Mick Mulvaney did. Mick Mulvaney, of course, voted 65 times—well, I don't know that he was here every one of those votes, but every time he had an opportunity, he voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. If the Americans wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, then they would have voted against us.

Madam Speaker, I would tell my friend from Oregon that if it is partisan, it is partisan because none of you will support it, and so many of you campaigned on the basis of wanting to protect preexisting conditions. Obviously, the President changed his mind about doing that.

All this resolution does is express the sense of this House that such efforts are wrong and would harm tens of millions of Americans who benefit from the ACA. This includes the 133 million or more Americans living with preexisting conditions like asthma, diabe-

tes, cancer, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, who are protected in their ability to get healthcare insurance.

The actions taken by President Trump, however, and the Republicans would make these individuals uninsurable, forcing them and their families into financial hardship in order to pay for medical bills. It also includes older Americans for whom Republicans have proposed an age tax.

It would do harm to the 20 million Americans who are now covered because of the Affordable Care Act who would lose their coverage as a result of what President Trump and Republicans in Congress are seeking to do. That is what the lawsuit does. This says that we don't agree with the lawsuit—a pretty simple proposition.

By joining the Texas lawsuit, the Trump administration is seeking to allow women to be charged higher premiums than men as they used to be. It seeks to allow lifetime and annual limits on coverage, which the Affordable Care Act banned. In addition, it is trying to force Americans under age 26 to get coverage on their own, even if they don't have a job yet and are still in college.

Preventive health visits and screenings would, once more, require out-of-pocket co-pays. Plans would no longer be required to cover essential health benefits. Now, if you don't have to cover required health benefits, then you are going to get a cheaper policy, not a lot of coverage, but a cheaper policy. The objective is not just a cheaper policy, it is a policy that covers your risks. If we can make it cheaper, then we ought to do that. Plans would no longer be required to cover, as I said, essential benefits such as maternity care and prescription drugs.

This resolution is an opportunity to state on the RECORD whether Members support doing away with these reforms or not. Now, that doesn't mean you think that an alternative is perfect, it simply means that we either want to improve or replace it with something that is viable, passable, and good for the American people, whether to turn back the clock or look ahead, and whether to stand with the Trump administration as it seeks to dismantle every single piece of the Affordable Care Act, which it has done.

The gentleman mentions maybe a daily resolution, well, unfortunately, we have daily action by the President that does things that we don't think are appropriate. We voted on one of those the other day where we appropriated money to a certain object, and the President wants to change it on his own. We think that was unconstitutional. We didn't get a lot of help on the Republican side, the gentleman did, I agree with that, the gentleman who has spoken before me.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me and others in supporting Representative ALLRED's resolution in expressing bipartisan opposition to the

Trump administration's efforts—not to Trump, but to the policies. We ought to be talking about policies, not personalities. It is not about personalities. It is about policies and do we believe that we ought to repeal the Affordable Care Act without a replacement?

I think the answer to that ought to be an emphatic “no” for all of us. The gentleman is correct. We ought to work on a bipartisan basis to accomplish good objectives for our people. This vote will show every single American where his or her Representative stands on the question which is so consequential to the everyday lives of millions and millions of Americans.

The President clearly has no intention—he said in his tweet today—of sending a bill down here until 2021, 2 years and more from now. How sad to be the leader of our country and say: I am not going to tell you what I am going to do, just trust me.

Well, Mr. President, we don't have any reason based upon your performance to trust you to make sure that Americans have what you said you were going to give them, that everybody was going to be covered at lower cost or higher quality.

Vote for this resolution and tell the American people that when you said on the campaign trail: I am for preexisting conditions, you meant it; and when you said that there were other protections that you wanted to keep in the bill, you meant it.

If you do, then you will vote for this resolution and send a message—democracy is a lot about messages—by talking to one another. This is the way the Congress can talk to the administration—one way. We can talk a lot of ways.

Have that communication be clear: Mr. President, leave the Affordable Care Act alone and work with us to make it better and work for all Americans, which is what you said you would do during the course of the campaign.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 20½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 26½ minutes.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a couple of comments.

First of all, the President is very good to work with, and we worked in a bipartisan manner last Congress to address the Nation's opioid epidemic. That is a healthcare issue and a life-and-death issue. We passed 60 bipartisan bills that became law, and President Trump signed them.

We extended health insurance for children in America—the CHIP program, the Children's Health Insurance Program—for 10 years. That is twice as long as ever had been done before. We did that on the Energy and Commerce

Committee, and the President signed that. In my State, that is 122,700 Oregon kids and pregnant moms who are covered for certainty for 10 years under that insurance program. We reauthorized and fully funded community health centers. Now 240,000 Oregonians in 63 sites in my district get their healthcare from community health centers, Madam Speaker, and we did that at a fully funded record level.

Now, I just want to address something my friend, the majority leader who schedules bills on the floor, said about how we voted to repeal ObamaCare 65 times. What he kind of failed to mention is Democrats voted for not quite half of those, I would wager, because 25 of those votes became law, signed in large part, if not totally, by one Barack Obama, because there were problems in the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare, however you want to describe it, that this Congress interceded on and in a bipartisan way voted to repeal “ObamaCare.” That is what the leader said, the 65 were all to repeal.

I would argue he probably voted for a bunch of those, because some of them passed unanimously in the House and Senate. Even President Obama agreed there were mistakes in ObamaCare. Our argument is we can fix America's healthcare laws going forward, and we should.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), who is a terrific new Member of Congress and of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Madam Speaker, I hear from hardworking Montanans in my office and throughout the State that they are worried about the rising cost of healthcare. Rising premiums and increasing deductibles force Montana families to spend more and more on healthcare and less and less on clothes, books, and food for the table.

Since my first day in office, I have made lowering healthcare costs, promoting rural access to care, and protecting those with preexisting conditions my primary priorities.

Unfortunately, the Affordable Care Act has been anything but affordable. In the first 3 years of ObamaCare, premiums in Montana rose by 66 percent, and they are still rising today. ObamaCare robbed consumers of choice and gave hardworking Montanans plans they can't afford.

As we work toward solutions that make healthcare more accessible and affordable, I will keep fighting to protect those with preexisting conditions. I cosponsored the Pre-Existing Conditions Protection Act that ensures patients with preexisting conditions have access to health insurance. I also voted to ensure those same protections. We need to ensure that those with preexisting conditions have coverage.

House Democrats have said they are for protecting those with preexisting

conditions. Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, it seems they are only interested in defending them if the solution includes preserving ObamaCare or pursuing a government-run, single-payer healthcare plan.

One of the earliest votes we took in this Congress was to lock in protections for Americans with preexisting conditions. It was a simple and straightforward measure that I enthusiastically voted for. It would protect Americans with preexisting conditions period—so simple and straightforward. We should revisit that approach.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, my friends across the aisle voted down that measure, because it appears the majority values trying to score political points more than providing certainty and peace of mind to Americans with preexisting conditions.

I hope they will come to the table in good faith and choose to work with us to find a bipartisan solution to bring down healthcare costs and protect people with preexisting conditions.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I continue to yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I appreciate the gentleman's comments and share them.

This is H.R. 692, legislation that would guarantee Americans with preexisting conditions are not discriminated against. We have a lot of cosponsors on this, but we don't have a single Democrat willing to cosponsor a bill that would provide protection to Americans should this judge's decision be upheld. That is my argument today.

Why wouldn't we go ahead and schedule this, pass this, and move this to the floor so that if by some means this judge's decision is upheld, Americans with a preexisting condition would have coverage?

Meanwhile, why don't we start hearings on the Medicare for All proposal that Democrats have championed?

I have asked for those hearings from my friend. We have not seen that happen, and I know there is a certain dust-up in the press even today about alleging the Speaker's own staff person here may have been saying things or not about whether this is a good idea or not.

We ought to have a hearing on that because close to 200 million Americans might lose their insurance under this plan. So there is lots we should be doing here.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who is the Speaker of the House and who was so much the force behind making the Affordable Care Act reality.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for the leadership role he played in making America healthier in the original passage of the Affordable Care Act and protecting it from the constant sabotage that the Republicans in the Congress and in the White

House have exacted on the Affordable Care Act.

I want to pay special tribute to the outside groups, the patient advocacy groups, the Little Lobbyists, the children, so many people who spoke and told their stories at 10,000 events across the country to oppose the Republicans' constant assault on the Affordable Care Act for the first 2 years of the Trump administration, a time when the President had the White House, the House, and the Senate and could very well have passed legislation to replace the Affordable Care Act, as they said they would do.

□ 1430

They didn't replace it because they don't believe in a government role. Much about the Affordable Care Act has to do with Medicare and how we prolonged the life of Medicare and adjusted funding so that we could reduce the cost of prescription drugs for our seniors.

The Republican approach to Medicare is that it should wither on the vine, that there is no place in a free society, in a free economy, for Medicare.

Let's understand this. This is not just about the issue or the legislation of the Affordable Care Act. This is about a value system in our country, about understanding that healthcare is a right for all Americans, not just a privilege.

Yes, they could get preexisting conditions coverage—with rates that go right through the ceiling and are a gift to the insurance industry, but not to make care affordable and accessible to all.

So, here we are, in an unusual situation where the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, and it is the responsibility of the Justice Department and the administration to defend the law of the land in court, and what are they doing? Just the opposite. Why? Because they don't believe in governance.

That is why they are happy to shut down government for any reason. They don't believe in governance. They don't believe in a public role in the well-being of the American people. They don't believe in the Affordable Care Act.

What they are trying to do is strike down every last provision of the ACA: protection for preexisting conditions, which I will come back to; bans of lifetime and annual limits; the Medicaid expansion; Medicare solvency going out for many more years; savings for seniors on prescription drug costs; and the vital premium assistance that makes healthcare coverage affordable for millions of families. It all would be ended if the President and the Republicans in Congress get their way. I hope it is not all Republicans in Congress, because I hope that some of them will care enough about their constituents and meeting their needs.

On the subject of preexisting conditions, how many times during cam-

paigns did they say, "Oh, we are for preexisting conditions," having voted it down over and over and over again?

The misrepresentations were almost embarrassing. Let's look the other way, so we don't embarrass them any further. It is almost a joke, but it is not funny if you have a preexisting condition.

What was interesting about the Affordable Care Act is it wasn't just about expanding coverage to 20 million more people. That, in itself, would be a justification. It was about the more than 150 million families who had better coverage, on a trajectory of lower cost, better benefits, no preexisting condition barrier, no lifetime limits, no annual limits, and the rest. And if your child is up to 26 years old, your child could be on your policy.

Actually, the issue of subsidizing those so that everyone could participate and it would be affordable, can we do more there? We certainly can, and we certainly will.

I want to tell this story. As I said, the outside groups were so instrumental in saving us from the Republican sabotage of the Affordable Care Act and of the good health of the American people. The outside groups held, as I said, 10,000 events around the country, telling stories. Nothing conveys more information and more understanding than people telling their own stories.

The statistics are interesting. They are staggering. But the stories are powerful, and they make a difference.

I am going to tell the story that I have told before. It is about America's families paying the price and America's children paying the price for this Republican sabotage of the Affordable Care Act.

The story I would like to tell is about Zoe Madison Lihn. Zoe was born with a congenital heart defect in May 2010. She faced the first of her three heart surgeries at just 15 hours old.

By 6 months old, Zoe was halfway through the lifetime limit that her insurer had placed on her case. She faced a grim future, not just using up her lifetime limit by preschool—her lifetime limit was used up, but her preexisting condition had not gone away—but carrying the preexisting condition that would require attention and care for the rest of her life.

Under the ACA, Zoe is protected. She will celebrate her 9th birthday next month.

But the Republicans want to take all that away, not only from Zoe but from their own constituents.

Our Democratic House majority will not let that stand. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said: "Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in healthcare is the most shocking and inhumane because it often results in physical death."

Our colleagues are used to our colleague, Whip CLYBURN, telling that story, which I think he heard Dr. King say.

On day one of this Congress, freshman Member from Texas Congressman

COLIN ALLRED led the way. House Democrats voted to throw the full legal weight of the House against the Texas lawsuit to destroy the ACA.

We salute Congressman ALLRED for his outstanding leadership to protect America's families' health and to reach out to the Republicans to join him in doing so. But more than 190 Republicans voted to be fully complicit in that attempt to overthrow the ACA and tear away those health protections.

Now, with this resolution led again by Congressman ALLRED, we call on our Republican colleagues to go on the record once more. Either they will vote for protecting their constituents' healthcare, or they will vote for taking it away. With this vote, we will see their values and their intentions.

House Democrats will always fight to protect families' affordable and quality healthcare. We don't see it as an issue or legislation. We see it as a value—a value. It is not just about healthcare. It is about the good health of America, a source of our strength.

After we pass this resolution, we will continue to advance our transformative legislation to reverse the GOP healthcare sabotage. We will lower healthcare costs and strengthen protections for people with preexisting medical conditions.

By the way, under the Affordable Care Act, being a woman is no longer a preexisting medical condition. As a mother of five, I can attest to that being a preexisting condition.

Democrats are for the people: lowering healthcare costs by reducing the costs of prescription drugs, preserving the preexisting condition benefit, increasing wages by building the infrastructure in a green way, and cleaning up government. Lower healthcare costs, bigger paychecks, cleaner government.

Once we can reduce the role of dark, special-interest money in Washington, D.C., people will have confidence that it is possible that their voices will be heard more strongly than the voices of those who stand in the way of progress.

Three months ago from tomorrow, the Members of this institution, Democrats and Republicans, took a solemn oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution of the United States, after the beautiful preamble of our Nation's purpose, is Article I, the legislative branch. The legislative branch's responsibilities are spelled out in the text of the Constitution.

This body, the first branch of government, voted to protect the health and well-being of the American people. It is the law of the land. It is the responsibility of the executive branch to protect the law of the land.

They have departed from that and, therefore, departed from our oath to the Constitution to protect and defend.

If they have a better idea, we haven't seen it. On top of that, the President has said we won't see it until 2021, after the 2020 elections.

That is just not good enough, Mr. President. The needs of the American people will not stop right now because you have stopped believing in them. The needs of the American people go on, and we will continue this fight. We will fight in the Congress; we will fight in the courts; and we will fight in the court of public opinion.

I hope that we can have some Republican support from the other side of the aisle to vote to protect America's families and their healthcare and, therefore, strengthen America.

Madam Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote.

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

Madam Speaker, I hope, before the Speaker of the House leaves, she will listen to this.

I was moved by her story about a young child with a congenital heart defect, but nobody is going to lecture me about the need to protect people with preexisting conditions or the need to repeal the lifetime caps.

Let me tell you a story about a young man with a heart defect. February 7, 1994, he was born in Portland, Oregon, at Oregon Health Sciences University, with hypoplastic left heart syndrome. It would require immediate surgery and multiple surgeries to try to save his life, or a complete heart transplant.

Tragically, that little boy did not live long enough to be flown to Loma Linda Hospital in California for that heart transplant.

His name: Garrison Daniel Walden. He died the next day.

Madam Speaker, nobody is going to tell me about the need to protect people with preexisting conditions. Nobody is going to lecture me about the need to get rid of caps on lifetime. My wife and I dealt with those issues directly, and I will always stand up for people who face similar challenges.

That is not what this is about today, and you can laugh if you want.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman WALDEN for his sobering words, for his actions. He has a bill that will protect preexisting conditions. The difference about that to today: It is actually a bill; this is a resolution.

I always thought, when you ran for Congress, you would want to do more than a press release. Apparently, it is different with the new election, Madam Speaker.

"Show me your budget, show me your values." It has been said so many times on this floor. Those were the words that have been recited by Speaker PELOSI quite frequently. You could have a whole ring of videos of her just saying those exact words.

But, of course, that was before the newly minted Democratic majority quickly decided they won't be introducing a budget.

Madam Speaker, I wonder if America will question the values. It appears they won't be sharing their values with the American people. But if we had questions as to what those values were, this week removes all doubt.

Madam Speaker, we are celebrating 40 years of C-SPAN, but I wonder if those who are watching today understand what is happening. You see, on this floor, they learned early on, even from a childhood of "Schoolhouse Rock," I'm just a bill on Capitol Hill.

This is not a bill we are talking about. This isn't even a resolution that goes to the Senate. This will never end up with the President. This will do nothing for your healthcare. What will it do? It will make a great press release.

The difference, Madam Speaker, in one election is what happens on this floor. The difference is: Do you really want to protect people with preexisting conditions? Because, Madam Speaker, there is an individual who has a bill that is filed, that has cosponsorship, that is sitting in committee, that the Democrats control. They didn't mark it up. They didn't talk about it. They wrote a resolution.

To those who are watching on C-SPAN, I know what they have watched on this floor before. I know what they watched in the last Congress, that we sat and talked about not a resolution for children's health, for the CHIP program, but we wrote a bill. We extended it longer than anyone has ever dreamed possible, a full decade.

Yes, Madam Speaker, we had to do it with one side of the aisle, because the majority on the other side of the aisle didn't even write a press release supporting it. They voted "no."

To those who are watching on C-SPAN and questioning what has gone on in this House, yes, they watched it the last Congress. When we had an opioid epidemic, we wrote a bill. We didn't write a press release, and we didn't write a resolution.

□ 1445

Or when the National Institutes of Health, where you could really care about an individual with healthcare and solve a problem, we didn't write a resolution about giving them more money. We actually voted for it. We actually moved it through committee, and we had a bill and we funded \$3 billion more.

To those who are watching on C-SPAN, don't change the channel. Don't wonder about the words that were used before, "show me your budget," "show me your values"; there is no budget, and you are probably going to question their values.

Show me the bill and show me your values. I guess that is the new line we should ask, because what does a resolution do?

Maybe we can all get together and go to the Rayburn Room today and have a press release. What? Let's go further. Let's have a press conference. Let's get

really serious about a problem, and let's write a resolution for the floor, because that problem will still exist.

A lot of people put a lot of effort into running for office. A lot of people make a lot of promises, and Americans expect legislation to solve them, not a resolution.

You know what is most ironic today? If they wanted to solve the problem, there are options there.

If we are worried about a lawsuit, if we are worried about preexisting conditions, go to Congressman WALDEN's bill. Let's bring that to the floor. It is not a resolution. We will have to vote for something different. We will have to actually vote for a bill.

It is interesting that, on the other side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, I heard people were concerned the Republicans were concerned about what ObamaCare has done, that premiums have risen, that the promise we were given that, if you liked your healthcare, you could keep it. For millions of Americans, that proved to be a lie and false.

We are not the only ones who believe that has been a failure. If that were not true, why do half the Members on the other side of the aisle cosponsor a bill that says Medicare for All? They must believe it is not working either.

Or maybe they want to take more healthcare from individuals. I am not quite sure. The way I look at Medicare for All, it has got a great name. Anybody who is 65, they should get Medicare, and I will stand with them. But they shouldn't take away 158 million Americans' private health insurance, because that is exactly what they do.

Why don't they make another promise to the American public and deny them their healthcare?

Or why don't they even go further? For everyone who is on Medicare Advantage, that goes away as well. Or for everyone who is on Medicare itself, you are going to bankrupt it.

You have got that in legislation. That is not a press release. Why don't we bring that to the floor or committee? Why don't we debate that?

And, Madam Speaker, when I sat on this floor and I heard the words used from the other side of the aisle, from the leader of that side of the aisle to say Republicans don't care about Medicare, that was a lie. Medicare part D; you know, when you talk to seniors, you know what they are most concerned about? The price of prescription drugs.

Or for those C-SPAN viewers who have more than 40 years to watch it, Republicans were in the majority. Do you know what they did? They didn't bring a press release down with a resolution. They brought a bill. They created Medicare part D to lower prescription drug prices. It has been one of the most effective programs around.

And do you know what we had to do? We had to do it alone because we passed legislation. We didn't pass a press release.

Madam Speaker, shame, shame on an individual who would lie to the American public about their own healthcare, lie about another side, but, more importantly, say they care about Americans' health and bring a resolution.

I want to see everybody go home this weekend, go back to their constituents and tell them what they did about preexisting conditions. They passed a resolution when they could have passed a bill.

I happen to be the leader of the Republicans, and I stand here in this well, in this body, and tell you we support preexisting conditions. I tell you to bring his bill up, Congressman WALDEN's, and we will support this bill on this floor.

We won't support shams. We won't support press releases, because we care about Americans' health. And we will not support kicking 158 million off their healthcare.

I know half the body on the other side has cosponsored that. That is even further than I have seen before. They want to end Medicare Advantage.

When are they going to say that to the seniors? And that is not a press release. That is something they are really going after.

If they are serious about their words, if they believe they care and are concerned about a court case because maybe they wrote a bill that isn't constitutional, they could have solved it today.

You know what we could be talking about today? They own the majority. They control the floor.

What is most interesting, the majority of bills that they brought to the floor in this new majority—they have brought more bills and resolutions to the floor than even passed the committee, but they sat here and told us it is for the people.

They are about to have 100 days, but it is 100 days of disappointment. I have never thought a majority would want to claim how many press conferences or how many resolutions they could pass on the floor, but they are setting a record. They are setting a record while they are failing the American public.

Do you know what they could be doing right now? If they really cared about fixing our healthcare system and protecting Americans with preexisting conditions, they could do one of the three things in the face of this lawsuit. And let's not lie to the American public. They could repeal the individual mandate. Boom, the lawsuit is gone.

They could reimpose the penalty. They voted for it before, so why don't they vote for it again?

Or they could put a bill on the floor that explicitly protects preexisting conditions. The difference is that is a bill, not a resolution.

Maybe if they had a lot of power, maybe if they really felt strongly about this, make a resolution that even goes to the Senate so the Senate can talk about it, too.

Or if they really care, make a bill. Write a bill. Don't write a press release. Don't lie to the American public. They are smarter than this.

You know, the words I have heard today, the line that will sit up to speak, not one of them will use the term of a bill; not one of them can look the American public in the eye and say they are protecting preexisting conditions. But what they can say, Madam Speaker, is they are denying a bill that would protect preexisting conditions to come to the floor because the Republicans offered it.

This is an honorable floor. This is a floor that makes history. This is a floor that has changed and shown the values of America to lead the world, but it has not done that by doing resolutions. It is a shame that we are trying to put a resolution on the floor.

Is this why you ran? Is this why you craved to become the majority?

I didn't hear any of my constituents say, "I want you to go there"—because I heard this language. I heard this language on the other side, Madam Speaker, just from the last speaker: We will fight in court. We will fight on the floor. We will fight in the public's opinion.

Do you know what fighting means if you want to succeed? Put a bill. I didn't know fighting was writing a press release. Don't take America's time and don't waste it, because that is exactly what they are doing.

Do you want to tell stories? Go tell the stories to the individuals who are concerned about this. Go tell those individuals you did nothing to solve it. Go tell those individuals you denied a bill to come to the floor that could solve the problem.

Be honest, but stop wasting our time. And if you don't want to lead, get out of the way, because we will definitely solve it.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), who is the vice chair of our Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 271. This resolution, I would say to the minority leader, is a statement. It is a statement by Democrats of our position on the Affordable Care Act.

It is not surprising to me that they would not want the facts to be before the American people. That is what this resolution is about.

On day one of his administration, President Obama announced he would address the critical need for affordable healthcare for millions of uninsured Americans.

He reminded us that nearly 50 million Americans were uninsured. Low-income, childless adults could not benefit from Medicaid.

Millions of seniors were not fully benefiting from prescription drug benefits under Medicare part D because of the doughnut hole.

He told us that parents needed insurance on their children to age 26.

And finally, Madam Speaker, President Obama stressed that insurance companies were increasing premiums and not providing quality coverage, and they were discriminating based on preexisting conditions, high copays, and higher deductibles.

After much debate, we passed ObamaCare. It has made a difference in health accessibility and health outcomes. It is not a perfect solution, but it has impacted millions of lives.

We want to make ObamaCare better; we want to make it more affordable. I would say to my friend from Oregon, with bipartisan cooperation, we can do that, and we can do it effectively.

But Republicans have repeatedly tried to legislate ObamaCare out of existence with no replacement. This Congress has repeatedly said "no" to any repeal.

On February 26 of last year, Republican plaintiffs filed a lawsuit in the Northern District of Texas contending that the minimum essential coverage provision is unconstitutional, and, since Republicans removed the mandate penalty, the entire law is unconstitutional. That was their claim.

Three months later, Attorney General Sessions announced that the Trump administration wouldn't defend the minimum essential coverage claim and that the Trump administration would argue that preexisting conditions protections should be invalidated. However, the Trump administration said that the remaining parts of the law could be severed or separated and the law could remain intact.

The Court heard the case and, as we all know, the Affordable Care Act was declared to be unconstitutional. It is now on appeal.

On March 28 of this year, President Trump changed his position. On appeal, he is now aligning with the Republican plaintiffs and thumbing his nose, Madam Speaker, thumbing his nose again at this Congress.

The Affordable Care Act, as the Speaker said a few moments ago, is the law of the land, and Republicans are refusing to defend it.

Protection of preexisting conditions is the law of the land, Mr. President.

The final insult came this morning when President Trump confirmed that he will ask the higher courts to throw out the entire law and that he will have a replacement ready the day after the election. I am outraged, and so should the American people be.

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, we stand here today with another in a series of weekly messaging bills. I wonder what, next week, we will deal with. I am sure it will be another whipsaw response to the headlines of the day.

If you truly want to protect people with preexisting conditions, as Republicans do, bring forth Mr. WALDEN's

bill. It has teeth. In the event that this lawsuit is upheld and the Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional, it will protect people with preexisting conditions.

The Speaker, Ms. PELOSI, a minute ago said that the Republicans' position on healthcare was a joke. Well, I will tell you what is a joke, and that is to call the Affordable Care Act successful.

The promises on which the Affordable Care Act were based were that we would cover all Americans; that the premiums would go down; that if you like your doctor, you could keep your doctor; and that if you like your insurance policy, you could keep it.

Clearly, almost every existing insurance policy was declared invalid. You could only keep your doctor if he is in your plan and your hospital. Premiums have gone from an average of \$225 in 2013, just before the Affordable Care Act was enacted, to \$475, average cost for an individual policy today, almost a 250 percent increase.

What did we get for that?

Before the Affordable Care Act, 85 percent of Americans were covered. Before the Affordable Care Act, 85 percent of Americans were covered. At the peak, after the Affordable Care Act, last year, 91 percent of the Americans were covered. We covered 6 percent more people, mostly because we gave them insurance policies with the Medicare expansion. We covered 6 percent more people.

But what was the cost of that? The 85 percent that were already covered had to pay 250 percent more for their health insurance. That is completely absurd.

And don't lecture me about people with preexisting conditions. I have a son who had a congenital heart defect. I had a son who, as a 7-month-old child, was in a car wreck and had a brain injury, both preexisting conditions.

□ 1500

Throughout their life, they were covered. For a brief period of time, South Carolina, like almost every other State in the country, had protections for preexisting conditions before the Affordable Care Act. Under the health insurance pool in South Carolina, they had to pay 30 percent more.

It irritated me as a father that my children had to pay 30 percent more for their health insurance, but guess what? Under the Affordable Care Act, instead of having to pay 30 percent more, they have to pay 250 percent more and their deductibles have tripled.

You call that a success? In what world is that a success?

Republicans want to protect people with preexisting conditions. We have voted repeatedly to do it. We have bills out there that will do it.

Stop with the messaging, stop with the lies, and let's move forward and do something that actually works. Let's move forward and protect people with preexisting conditions in the event that this law is declared unconstitutional.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I would just point out Gallup just announced in a survey, 65 million Americans, 20 percent, put off treatment this last year and borrowed \$88 billion to cover their healthcare costs. So we know there are problems out there we need to address.

Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARBAJAL). The gentleman from Oregon has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 22½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the chair of our Consumer Protection & Commerce Subcommittee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, clearly, we have hit a nerve with the Republicans on the Affordable Care Act, which they opposed before it began, have been opposing it for 9 years, promising to come up with some sort of a repeal and replace, never being able to do it, and now standing up here and saying life was better before the Affordable Care Act. Amazing. People with preexisting conditions love the Affordable Care Act.

Why are we here in the majority today? Because the American people came to understand that before the Affordable Care Act, children born with preexisting conditions from the day of birth were not able to be covered by healthcare, that there were limits in how much insurance companies would pay per year or per lifetime caps, and making families live in fear of disaster and financial chaos.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the Trump administration and their decision to support the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, not in the Congress, but now in the courts.

They couldn't defeat it here. They tried when they had the majority in both Houses and could not repeal it.

When I came here, being a woman was essentially a preexisting condition. Women paid more for healthcare, sometimes 40 percent more, just because we are women. Pregnancy was very rarely covered by insurance, and now women are covered for those things like preventive services, mammograms, pregnancy.

The Affordable Care Act has let people 26 years old stay on their parents' policies.

No wonder the American people have completely turned around and understood the sham that the Republicans were offering and support the Affordable Care Act.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this debate as it has gone on, and the bottom line is, if you listen to the Democrats, you would think that they had stuck it to the insurance industry with all of the rules and all of the laws that they passed.

As we talk about values, I thought I would give you a few values.

Aetna in 2010 was trading at \$27.39 a share. In 2018, it was \$187 a share.

You know who you stuck it to? You stuck it to the American citizens. You took the money out of our pockets and you put it into the hands of the insurance industry.

If you don't want to talk about Aetna, let's talk about United Healthcare: \$29 a share in 2010; in 2018, \$246.54 a share. How did that happen?

If the American citizens were getting a square deal before the legislation that you passed, that you could only pass if the insurance industry didn't object, how did United's stock go from \$29 a share to \$246 a share?

If that's not enough, how about Humana: \$29 a share in 2010 to \$246 a share in 2018. How did this happen?

This happened because you left the insurance industry exempt from the antitrust laws of the country.

Now, how did that work out for the American citizen? We got a mandate by the Democratic Party to purchase a product from an industry that is exempt from the antitrust laws of the country.

Now, there are flaws in the legislation that you passed. I am amazed at your refusal to accept that.

You can't even buy an Affordable Care Act contract today. Do you realize the next time you can buy it is January 1 of next year?

If you are uninsured right now—you all have been telling the American public, if you are uninsured and you go to the doctor and the doctor says you have got cancer, you can get a contract the next day. It is just not true. You can't get it until January 1 of 2020.

It is a poorly worded piece of legislation. Regardless of the intent, it is a poorly worded piece of legislation that moved money from the individual citizens of this country to the pockets of the insurance industry, and it needs to be rewritten.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the leadership of Congressman COLIN ALLRED, who has been an incredible advocate for his community in Dallas and for millions of Americans whose healthcare President Trump and our Republican colleagues are trying to take away.

President Trump has claimed over and over again that he wants to protect

access to healthcare, and he has even announced recently that he has a secret plan that he will make available to the American people after the 2020 election.

But as is true with any con man and charlatan, when you dig a little past the surface of the President's words, the facts tell a much different story.

Last week, the President's Justice Department asked a court to eliminate every single protection and benefit that the Affordable Care Act has provided.

Democrats won the majority because the American people understand that we are fighting to protect their healthcare. And now Republicans have moved away from the Congress to try to take away healthcare from millions and millions of Americans in the courts.

Let's be clear about what this means. President Trump wants to repeal the caps on out-of-pocket costs, he wants to eliminate the prescription drug savings for seniors and end the Medicaid expansion.

If he succeeds in this litigation, it will be legal for insurance companies to limit the amount of coverage someone can get in their lifetime, it will deny access to people with preexisting conditions, and it will allow insurance companies to sell junk plans that offer no real coverage for the American people.

Democrats have a better plan, and the minority leader will be happy to know there are actually bills to do it. We are going to strengthen the protections for people with preexisting conditions, we are going to expand access to insurance for more working men and women, and we are going to bring down the costs of prescription drugs with bills like my legislation, the CREATES Act, to allow more generic drugs into the marketplace.

Look, we take a lot of complicated votes in this Chamber. This is not one of them.

This vote is very simple. A vote in favor of this resolution is a vote for access to quality, affordable healthcare. A vote against it is a vote for the interests of insurance companies at the expense of working people.

I know where members of the Democratic Caucus stand. We ran on this, we are committed to it. We are fighting every day to protect the Affordable Care Act and to build on its success and to improve it.

The Republicans' last vote was TrumpCare, which took away health coverage from 23 million Americans, and that is why they were rejected in the midterms.

People want Members of Congress to stand up and fight to protect their access to quality, affordable healthcare, to protect their access to coverage for preexisting conditions, to drive down the costs of prescription drugs, and to end these junk plans that, in fact, don't provide coverage to the American people.

This resolution is a strong statement of our position on this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues, don't be afraid of the resolution, don't be afraid that it is going to expose that you actually don't support efforts to protect access to healthcare, because you have an easy solution to that problem: vote for it. Show the American people you care about the quality of their healthcare, you want to expand access, strengthen the Affordable Care Act, and support this excellent resolution.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's Department of Justice letter seeking the invalidation of the entire Affordable Care Act by the Fifth Circuit is nothing short of self-sabotage.

The Trump position in *Texas v. United States* would deny coverage for those with preexisting conditions, dismantle protections on out-of-pocket costs and the ban on annual and lifetime caps, and the return of the notorious donut hole for seniors on expensive medications would come forward again.

I support this resolution. It is important that we band together to protect the Affordable Care Act and its protections against junk insurance policies.

The American people deserve to know whether their Representative is going to fight for them and vote to condemn the DOJ's actions or if they will simply fall in line behind this President on his thoughtless and heartless mission to destroy access to the healthcare system for millions of Americans.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 271, a resolution condemning the Trump administration's legal campaign to take away America's healthcare.

Here is what healthcare means: it is the freedom and security to live your life the way you choose. It can be the difference between financial security and bankruptcy, or life and death.

Donald Trump and congressional Republicans want to use the courts to take health insurance away from 21 million Americans. They want to eliminate protections for the more than 133 million Americans with preexisting conditions.

Now, the Affordable Care Act is not perfect, but never in American history has the uninsured rate been lower than it is today.

But rather than be honest about what is working, rather than coming to the table to work across the aisle and

fix what is wrong, Republicans are fighting tooth and nail to overturn the ACA, with no plan except one that was so bad, they couldn't pass it when they controlled both houses of Congress.

Meanwhile, the Democratic majority is proposing real solutions and smart healthcare policies that will lower costs and expand coverage.

The contrast couldn't be more clear. Democrats want quality, affordable health coverage for every American, and Republicans don't.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), our resident pharmacist on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is not working for too many Americans.

I welcome all efforts to lower costs, to increase choice, and to protect those with preexisting conditions.

Remember, the very first thing, the very first floor vote we pushed as Republicans this Congress was to solidify protections for those with preexisting conditions. It was the first thing we did. We did it right out of the gate.

While Republicans have stood ready to work on lowering costs and increasing choices, so far the Democrats, the Democratic majority, have only tried to double down on the ACA.

On the Energy and Commerce Committee, the only solution we have seen from Democrats are partisan bills that throw billions of unpaid-for dollars at a broken system, at a failed experiment.

If my Democratic colleagues were serious about helping patients, they would work with us on reforms to lower costs and increase choices.

□ 1515

The fact is we could vote on independent legislation that protects patients with preexisting conditions. The fact is, if my Democratic colleagues were serious about their concerns over this lawsuit, they could, legislatively, end this lawsuit once and for all. We could vote to repeal the individual mandate. That would immediately invalidate the lawsuit. They could vote to reinstate the individual mandate penalty. That would also stop the lawsuit in its tracks.

But, instead, we are here to vote on a resolution about politics, not solutions. It is clear that Democrats would much rather score political points than to protect the ACA.

They would have surprised me 2 years ago, but now the Democratic Party seems to have already moved on from the Affordable Care Act. Instead of truly working on improvements to the ACA, Democrats are focused on their \$32 trillion plan to kick 152 million people off their insurance for their one-size-fits-all government-run healthcare plan.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my Democratic friends to stop the politics and to work with us to protect those with preexisting conditions, to lower healthcare costs, and to increase choices for patients.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about the amount of time that remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 14½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON).

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn this administration's latest attempt to do away with the healthcare provided by the Affordable Care Act.

The Department of Justice's decision to go after the healthcare of millions of Americans by seeking a ruling that the Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional underscores their belief that healthcare should be a luxury reserved for the privileged few, only now we have moved from repeal and replace to just flat-out repeal. I could not disagree more strongly.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, the ability to get health insurance regardless of chronic illness has saved countless lives. Tens of thousands of my constituents have gotten healthcare for the first time under the Affordable Care Act. Those with preexisting conditions have received peace of mind, and many, myself included, have been able to keep their children on their health plans even as they become adults themselves.

The administration's callous decision to continue undermining the Affordable Care Act endangers my constituents, just as it endangers the lives of Americans in every district of our country.

We were chosen to serve in this House to protect Americans who need us most, and that means protecting their healthcare. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes" on this important resolution.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor and privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the Republican whip of the House, and an incredibly important member of our committee.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on healthcare.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, which has nothing to do with actually helping improve healthcare, the costs, especially, that so many millions of people are enduring, because the Affordable Care Act is anything but affordable.

Mr. Speaker, let's keep in mind what this resolution is about. It is not about changing any healthcare policy. It doesn't do that. It has been made clear. It is attempting just to try to take cheap shots at the President while di-

verting attention away from what this lawsuit that you see moving through the courts is really all about.

Mr. Speaker, if the healthcare law that my friends on the other side of the aisle rushed through Congress and passed is held unconstitutional, they have nobody to blame but themselves. Let's keep in mind—and they want you to forget this, Mr. Speaker—and let's go back to those days when they rammed this bill through and the infamous statement: You have to pass the bill to find out what is in it.

Nobody read that bill who voted for it. We said back then that it was unconstitutional.

And, oh, by the way, not only was it that, but it has actually led to dramatic increases in cost for families. So someone with a preexisting condition—whom we want to protect, by the way, Mr. Speaker. But we don't just want to protect the fact that they shouldn't be able to have costs go up. We want to help them lower the costs for health insurance and lower their premiums.

So many millions of Americans are not only facing double-digit increases, but people with preexisting conditions, in many cases, are facing a \$10,000 deductible, so they have no access to healthcare, Mr. Speaker.

Why don't we focus on the underlying problem?

We on the Republican side support protecting people with preexisting conditions, but we also want to lower their premiums and lower their deductibles. The other side wants to see their costs continue to go up. That is the biggest difference between the two sides.

We ought to focus on lowering premiums. Let families make those decisions, not unelected bureaucrats in Washington. That is what we ought to be focused on. This resolution falls short.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, too often, we forget what our healthcare system was like before we passed the Affordable Care Act.

Before the ACA, healthcare costs were skyrocketing; insurers could deny people coverage if they had a preexisting condition; policies did not have to provide essential benefits; and people were losing their insurance at alarming rates. Before the Affordable Care Act, insurers could place annual and lifetime caps on insurance coverage.

Today, the Affordable Care Act ensures that 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions can have access to the healthcare peace of mind and financial security that comes with quality, affordable health coverage.

Now, we have heard a lot about what we can do to make things better. We have heard about a bill that just protects those with preexisting conditions. The problem with that, Mr. Speaker, is, if you allow people to wait until

they get sick before they buy insurance, they will wait until they get sick before they buy insurance. Those buying insurance are, on average, sicker, and the costs tend to go up. Fewer people can afford it. The healthy people drop out, and the costs go up.

There is a name for this cycle. It is called the death spiral. Every time they try to protect those with preexisting conditions without the supports of the Affordable Care Act, there is a death spiral out of control.

In Washington State, for 3 years, they tried that. In the 3 years, nobody could buy insurance.

New York was in the death spiral when we passed the Affordable Care Act. When we passed the Affordable Care Act, the costs for individual insurance dropped more than 50 percent.

So we know we just can't protect those with preexisting conditions without the supports and tax credits available under the Affordable Care Act. But we do know what a replacement plan looks like.

The Republicans voted on such a thing. It was actually evaluated by the Congressional Budget Office, finding that, if the bill passed, about 20-some million fewer people would have insurance.

They talk about costs. Under their plan, the costs would go up 20 percent the first year. Insurance policies would not have to cover essential benefits, as they do now, and those with preexisting conditions would lose many of their protections.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and support people with preexisting conditions so that they can have access to the care they need to live healthy and fulfilling lives.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I think we have had a very important debate today. I just wish that that debate had occurred on H.R. 692. This is the legislation that we should put in place in case the decision that the judge made in the Texas case that said ObamaCare was unconstitutional is upheld. If that is upheld, then there is going to be this problem, this gap that everybody is talking about.

This is an honest attempt to make sure there is a safety net for people with preexisting conditions, H.R. 692. You are welcome to cosponsor it. I wish we would move it. I always think maybe it is the old Eagle Scout in me that you are always supposed to be prepared and ready and that you help people.

I will tell you, Republicans also believed we should take care of people with preexisting conditions. Republicans also supported getting rid of lifetime caps on insurance policies and many of the other things you have heard about today, and we will continue to.

But we also led the effort to deal with the Nation's opioid crisis, made it

bipartisan, brought it to the floor, and it became law.

When seniors couldn't afford their medicines, it was Republicans, under George W. Bush, who put Medicare part D into law, and we had to fight Democrats to do that. Then seniors didn't have to go to Mexico or Canada or somewhere to get their drugs anymore. It has been highly successful. The costs are 40 percent or more less than what the Congressional Budget Office said it would be, and premiums have remained low. Now we need to do some modernization there.

Republicans also passed the longest extension of children's health insurance in the history of the country: 10 years, fully funded. Democrats voted against it over and over again on this House floor less than a year ago.

Community health centers, an incredibly important part of our network, I led the effort to get them funded at the highest levels ever. That funding is going to run out, but we don't have a plan from the Democrats yet. We are told we are not even going to have a budget on how to go forward. I think we can find bipartisan consensus there.

We are working together right now and will have a markup tomorrow in the Energy and Commerce Committee to address the drug issue and the cost of drugs. As I said earlier, I can't remember a President of the United States more engaged in getting better prices for consumers than this one. Donald Trump has led the country in an initiative to drive down the cost of drugs, and Congress is responding in a bipartisan way, and that is a good thing. We should do that here, Mr. Speaker.

The resolution before us today, if you are just watching or listening to my colleagues, is just that. It is a resolution. It will never leave the House because it is only for the House. It is the taxpayer-funded equivalent of a press release; that is all it is.

And we know that there are Members who never have accepted the outcome of the 2016 election, and no matter what the President says or does, they want to do a resolution or attack him. Yet the American people want us to come here and get our work done and stand up for them.

So rather than that resolution, I genuinely wish that H.R. 692, a bill that would protect people with pre-existing conditions, was what we were voting on today. We stand ready to work with Democrats to get that done and provide that safety net that these Americans need.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I talk about H. Res. 271 which is before the House today, I want to respond to my ranking member's statements about H.R. 692. This is the bill that he repeatedly has mentioned on the Republican side.

I want to point out that the Republican bill, H.R. 692, under that legislation, you could theoretically buy insurance if you have a preexisting condition; but it is very deceptive because the bill will still allow insurers to set premiums based on health status, resulting in individuals with preexisting conditions being charged substantially more or priced out of the market.

The Republican bill does not include critical ACA consumer protections, including community rating, essential health benefits requirements, and annual or lifetime prohibitions. Basically, the GOP bill would allow insurance companies to once again discriminate against 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions. They would be priced out of coverage because they wouldn't be healthy enough. Individuals with preexisting conditions like cancer or diabetes could face extremely unaffordable premiums and, again, be priced out of the care that they desperately need.

The GOP bill would also put a significant financial burden on older Americans, while doing very little to lower costs for young adults. This Republican bill leaves Americans worse off and does nothing, really, to protect people with preexisting conditions, in reality.

Now, if I could speak again in support of H. Res. 271, which is before us today, that condemns the Trump administration's legal campaign to take away Americans' healthcare.

As you know, last Monday night, the Justice Department filed a brief saying that they wanted the court to repeal the Affordable Care Act in its entirety.

□ 1530

The Trump administration's announcement last week that it would actively support this frivolous lawsuit striking down the entire Affordable Care Act shows the President's shameful disregard for the health and well-being of the American people, in my opinion.

If the Trump administration got its way in court and the ACA is struck down, tens of millions of Americans would lose their health coverage overnight. Hundreds of millions would immediately lose protections for pre-existing conditions, and we would be sent barreling back to the days of lifetime limits and price discrimination against women based on their gender.

Republicans had their chance to repeal and replace the ACA, and the American people overwhelmingly rejected their plan. And now by refusing to defend the ACA in court, the Trump administration is asking the courts to do what President Trump and the Republican Congress could not do, and that is repeal the ACA and all the protections that it includes for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle repeatedly claim that they stand for protections for people with preexisting conditions and for other protections in-

cluded in the Affordable Care Act. Well, now is your chance to show it.

We have an opportunity today to send a clear message that we will not support this reckless attack that imperils the well-being of millions of hardworking Americans.

The time for empty promises has expired. It is time to act. The Trump Administration is determined to destroy protections for preexisting conditions and to tear down every last benefit guaranteed by the Affordable Care Act, and today's vote is an opportunity to stand up in solidarity against this heartless attack.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 271, to send a clear message: We will not stand idly by while the Trump administration wages an all-out assault on Americans' healthcare.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on my bill, H.R. 692, known as the Pre-Existing Conditions Protection Act of 2019.

As we've made clear today, Republicans have long believed that pre-existing condition protections are an essential part of our nation's health care markets.

These assurances give patients and families who have suffered from or are battling pre-existing conditions peace of mind. As a nation, we will not go back to the days when patients could be denied care or charged more than their peers because of their pre-existing condition.

The Pre-Existing Conditions Protection Act has 45 cosponsors and would lock in existing protections for patients.

It aims to achieve three important goals for patients: guaranteed access to coverage; a prohibition on pre-existing condition benefit exclusions; and, a ban on premium rating based on health status.

This bill reaffirms the commitment by House Republicans to uphold these three safeguards, commonly defined as the principle pre-existing condition protections in Obamacare.

And we can build on this foundation if necessary to adapt to potential changes in law or decisions from the courts in order to ensure our citizens who have pre-existing conditions are protected.

In the first few months of the new Congress, Democrats have already voted down multiple attempts to lock in a commitment to legislate on pre-existing condition protections. Instead, they'd rather score political points on an issue that we actually have agreement on.

This bill represents the desire of House Republicans to maintain these crucial protections for patients.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the first registered nurse elected to Congress, I can attest to the importance of the Affordable Care Act in improving our country's health care, especially for the 133 million Americans living with pre-existing conditions—of which 11.5 million live in my home state of Texas.

Today, we bring a resolution to the floor that reaffirms our support of the Affordable Care Act and defends its protections. It is clear as day that this president and his administration will stop at nothing to tear down the very law that has expanded critical health care coverage to millions of Americans.

I urge my Republican colleagues to join us to protect the health care of all our constituents. We cannot stand silent when our health care system is thrown into chaos.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 271, Condemning the Trump Administration's Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans' Health Care.

Last week, the Trump Administration launched a monstrous attack on our nation's health care system and on the people of our country when it was announced that they would be joining the 18 Republican state attorneys general in support of the *Texas vs. United States* lawsuit to strike down the entirety of the Affordable Care Act. By joining this lawsuit, the Trump Administration demonstrated they do not believe Americans should have access to comprehensive, affordable health insurance or that the 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions should be protected.

I've already heard from many constituents who are frightened about losing protections for their preexisting conditions, panicking about being able to afford their medical bills, and worried about where they can go to get their health insurance if this lawsuit succeeds.

For those enrolled in the Affordable Care Act, if this lawsuit is successful, 13 million Americans who gained health insurance through the Medicaid expansion will lose their health insurance; the 9 million Americans who rely on tax credits to help them afford their insurance plan will no longer be able to afford their insurance; and the 130 million patients with preexisting conditions could be denied coverage or charged more.

Since the Affordable Care Act was signed into law over 20 million Americans have gained health insurance that requires coverage for preexisting conditions; disallows charging sick consumers more; allows children to stay on their parent's health insurance until the age of 26; and provides coverage for preventive health services with no cost sharing.

The insurance reforms of the ACA protect every American, including those who get their health insurance through their employer. Every insurance plan today is required to cover ten basic Essential Health Benefits; there are no longer lifetime limits; and women can no longer be charged more because they are females. All of this is at risk if this lawsuit succeeds, and the Trump Administration demonstrated their total disregard for the consequences of its actions on the people of our country last week.

On the first day of the 116th Congress the House voted to intervene in this lawsuit on behalf of the tens of millions of Americans who rely on and have benefited from the ACA. Today, we renew our promise to the American people that we will fight this Administration's sabotage and do everything to protect, defend and improve the ACA.

The resolution we're considering today condemns the *Texas vs. United States* lawsuit and the Trump Administration's recent actions to intervene to seek the invalidation of every provision of the ACA. It calls on the Department of Justice to protect Americans with preexisting conditions, cease their efforts to destroy access to affordable health care, and reverse its position in the court case. I urge my colleagues to support this timely and critically important resolution we are considering today

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong and unequivocal support for H. Res. 271 as well as the underlying resolution and ask all Members to join me in supporting this resolution which condemns the Trump Administration's ongoing legal campaign to take away health care from more than 100 million Americans and to make health care dramatically less affordable for those fortunate enough to be insured.

I thank Congressman ALLRED, my Texas congressional delegation colleague, for introducing this important resolution.

As a new member of Congress who unseated an opponent who voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act dozens of times, the gentlemen from Texas knows first-hand how important and critical access to affordable, high quality, accessible health care available to everyone, including those with pre-existing conditions, to the well-being of American families.

Because of the passage of the Affordable Care Act, the national uninsured rate has been slashed from 14.8 in 2012 to 8.8 percent in 2018.

Texas has long led the nation in rate of uninsured so the comparable rates are 24.6 and 15 percent, respectively.

Mr. Speaker, I distinctly recall a candidate for the highest public office in the land saying "Obamacare is a disaster" and appealing for voters to support him with this question:

"What have you got to lose?"

The question deserves a response so I hope that person, who occupies the Oval Office, is listening to my answer.

The Affordable Care Act, or "Obamacare," has been an unmitigated success to the more than 20 million Americans who for the first time now have the security and peace of mind that comes with affordable, accessible, high quality health care.

Mr. Speaker, Tip O'Neill used to say that "all politics is local" so let me share with you how Obamacare has dramatically changed lives for the better for the people in my home state of Texas.

1.874 million Texans who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented could lose their coverage if the ACA is entirely or partially repealed or invalidated.

1.1 million Texans who purchased high quality Marketplace coverage now stand to lose their coverage if *Texas v. United States*, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.), the lawsuit brought by Republican Governors, and now wholeheartedly supported and aided by the Trump Administration were to succeed.

913,177 individuals Texans who received financial assistance to purchase Marketplace coverage in 2016, averaging \$271 per individual, are at risk of having coverage become unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates the premium tax credits.

1.1 million Texans could have insurance if all states adopted the ACA's Medicaid expansion; these individuals will not be able to gain coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the Medicaid expansion.

508,000 kids in Texas who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented are also at risk of having their coverage rolled back.

205,000 young adult Texans who were able to stay on a parent's health insurance plan thanks to the ACA now stand to lose coverage if the Republican Congress eliminates the requirement that insurers allow children to stay on their parents' plans until age 26.

646,415 Texans who received cost-sharing reductions to lower out-of-pocket costs such as deductibles, co-pays, and coinsurance are now at risk of having healthcare become unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates cost-sharing reductions.

10.28 million Texans who now have private health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductibles stand to lose this access if the Republican Congress eliminates ACA provisions requiring health insurers to cover important preventive services without cost-sharing.

Women in Texas who can now purchase insurance for the same price as men are at risk of being charged more for insurance if the ACA's ban on gender rating in the individual and small group markets is invalidated.

Before the ACA, women paid up to 56 percent more than men for their health insurance.

Roughly 4.5 million Texans who have pre-existing health conditions are at risk of having their coverage rescinded, being denied coverage, or being charged significantly more for coverage if the ACA's ban on pre-existing conditions is struck down.

346,750 Texas seniors who have saved an average of \$1,057 each as a result of closing the Medicare prescription drug "donut hole" gap in coverage stand to lose this critical help going forward.

1.75 million Texas seniors who have received free preventive care services thanks to ACA provisions requiring coverage of annual wellness visits and eliminating cost-sharing for many recommended preventive services covered by Medicare Part B, such as cancer screenings, are at risk of losing access to these services if congressional Republicans go forward with their plan to repeal the ACA.

The Affordable Care Act works and has made a life-affirming difference in the lives of millions of Americans, in Texas and across the country.

This is what happens when a visionary president cares enough to work with a committed and empathetic Congress to address the real issues facing the American people.

You want to know why the American people have Obamacare?

It is because Obama cared.

The same cannot be said about this Republican president and congressional Republicans who have made careers of attacking and undermining the Affordable Care Act's protections and benefits for the American people.

I urge all Members to vote for H. Res. 271 and send a powerful message to the President and the American people that this House will not stand idly by as this Administration tries to take away health care from more than 130 million persons.

Instead, this House will resist by all constitutional and appropriate means, including opposing this Administration in the courts and by passing the "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," which will lower health insurance premiums with strengthened and expanded affordability assistance by:

1. strengthening tax credits in the Marketplace to lower Americans' health insurance premiums and allows more middle-class individuals and families to qualify for subsidies;

2. ensuring that families who don't have an offer of affordable coverage from an employer can still qualify for subsidies in the Marketplace; and,

3. providing funding for reinsurance, to help with high-cost claims, improve Marketplace stability, and prevent the Administration's sabotage from raising premiums.

The "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," will also strengthen protections for people with pre-existing conditions by curtailing the Administration's efforts to give states waivers to undermine protections for people with pre-existing conditions and weaken standards for essential health benefits.

These improper waivers leave consumers with less comprehensive plans that do not cover needed services, such as prescription drugs, maternity care and substance use disorder treatment.

Another way the "Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019," protects consumers is by prohibiting insurance companies from selling junk health insurance plans that do not provide coverage for essential medical treatments and drugs, or cover people with pre-existing medical conditions.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 274, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1585, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Ms. SCANLON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-32) on the resolution (H. Res. 281) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

LOUISE AND BOB SLAUGHTER POST OFFICE

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 540) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 540

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

SECTION 1. LOUISE AND BOB SLAUGHTER POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 540, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office".

Representative Louise Slaughter was a groundbreaking Member of this House. She served here for 32 years. She was the first female chairwoman of the Rules Committee, and she coauthored the landmark Violence Against Women Act. She was also a dear friend.

Born in Harlan County, Kentucky, in 1929, Louise Slaughter was the daughter of a blacksmith. After graduating from high school, she went on to earn a bachelor's degree in microbiology and a master's degree in public health, both from the University of Kentucky.

After moving to upstate New York and marrying her beloved husband, Bob, Louise became active in local community groups and, eventually, in politics. She served a number of years in local elected offices and in the New York State Assembly.

Louise was first elected to Congress in 1986, where she eventually rose to become the top Democrat on the powerful Rules Committee. Tragically and very sadly, Louise died in March of last year, and she is sorely missed by all of us.

Naming a post office in her honor in her hometown of Fairport, New York, is maybe the least we could and should do to honor the distinguished career in public service of this remarkable woman.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 540, which names a post office located in Fairport, New York, in honor of Louise and Bob Slaughter.

Louise Slaughter was a Member of the House body for over 30 years. From 1987 until she passed away last year, Representative Slaughter was a tireless advocate for the people of her upstate New York district.

In addition to her numerous legislative accomplishments, Representative Slaughter made a mark on this body as the first woman to chair the House Committee on Rules.

Representative Slaughter was an intellectual and a beloved Member of the House. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I took my colleague by surprise here. We just came down from a Rules Committee meeting, and I appreciate her yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, if you didn't have the pleasure of serving with Louise on the Rules Committee, it looks kind of strange to have the Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office.

I have been here only 8 years, but I can't recall us doing that after a couple out here. Perhaps it is done regularly, but to serve with Louise—you know, the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, goes into the wee hours of the morning; 2 a.m., 3 a.m., 4 a.m., the Rules Committee is working, and it is truly Louise and Bob Slaughter.

Since my first day on the Rules Committee back in 2011, Louise took me under her wing. Yes, I was a young conservative Republican. Yes, she was an older—we can say, I think, honestly—liberal Democrat. She began building those partnerships with the young members of the Rules Committee with each and every committee meeting that took place.

I don't know if she was the first one who said it to me, but she was certainly one of them. She said: You know, ROB, of your colleagues on the other side of the aisle, folks sometimes think that we are upset with each other and we are bad people.

She said: I always tell folks, it is not that the people on the other side of the aisle are bad people. They are really good people. They just have some bad ideas.

She would share that with me from time to time, that my ideas were amongst those bad ideas. Her picture hangs right across from my seat there today.

There are so many men and women in America, Mr. Speaker, who are worthy of celebration, and it seems like we always make time to talk about those things that tear us apart, and we just don't make enough time to talk about those things that bring us together.

Louise was a strident, a fighter for her beliefs, as is any man or woman in this institution, but she never missed a moment to try to bring people together instead of pushing people further apart.

This is a wonderful gesture that the committee is moving forward today.

I hope that all of my colleagues will find, amongst their very busy Tuesday, time to sit back and reflect that they have an opportunity to be a uniter or to be a divider. It doesn't mean you trade away one iota of who you are and what you believe. It is just how do you tell that story, and how do you go about persuading your colleagues that it is true.

Louise gave us a wonderful example every single day of her decade upon decade of service in this institution, and I am honored to have sat across the aisle from her there in the Rules Committee.

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and Mr. WOODALL, whose words prompted me to want to come speak, because I served on the Rules Committee when we were in the majority a number of years ago. Louise was our leader, and she ran that thing with an iron fist. Excellent woman, articulate, powerful, in her tiny little frame. She was somebody who made us stay on task.

We worked a lot of hours on that committee, as I am sure my friend from the Rules Committee would agree, and she was indefatigable. The number of hours that the Rules Committee would meet, and she would make sure we were on task—and a great sense of humor, focused, and smart.

This is really a nice honor that the committee is bringing in her name and in Bob's name. He would be at the committee almost as much as Louise, and they were a great team. I just want to add my word of thanks for this honor for the Slaughters.

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, on a personal note, Louise Slaughter was an extraordinary Member of this body. She had a marvelous sense of humor. She was an encyclopedia about the procedures of the Rules Committee, which often mys-

tified many of us. Her heart was in the cause every day.

The last few years she was here were tough. She lost her beloved Bob very suddenly, and she struggled with a lot of health issues in the last year of her life. None of it left her daunted.

□ 1545

She faced every day with an indomitable spirit and will, a commitment to her values and to fighting for her constituents and for those values.

This is the least we can do to honor Louise Slaughter and her husband, Bob. I hope we can do more as we progress, but it is an honor to have served with Louise, and it is a privilege to manage this bill today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 829.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ARMY SPECIALIST THOMAS J. WILWERTH POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 829) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, as the "Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 829

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

SECTION 1. ARMY SPECIALIST THOMAS J. WILWERTH POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 829 to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, as the Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building.

Army Specialist Wilwerth's life was defined by a call to service. While still a junior in high school, Thomas felt the call to serve his country in the years after 9/11, and he made the decision to join the Army to defend his country.

After finishing his senior year, during which he also served in the Army Reserves, Thomas was assigned to the 4th Infantry Division based out of Fort Carson, Colorado.

In December 2005, Thomas was deployed to Iraq, and he served selflessly with his division as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom. While on deployment, he was tragically taken from us on February 22, 2006, when an improvised explosive device detonated near his Bradley Fighting Vehicle.

At just 21 years of age, Thomas' tragic death serves to remind us all of the human cost of war. He demonstrated in his short life, Mr. Speaker, the kind of commitment and service to this great country that is an example to all of us.

Naming a post office in his honor in his hometown of Mastic, New York, is the least we can do as a country to honor and remember a young man who made the ultimate sacrifice in service to all of us.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 829 introduced by Representative LEE ZELDIN. The bill names a post office located in Mastic, New York, in honor of Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth.

Specialist Wilwerth joined the United States Army while he was still in high school. He felt called to defend our Nation after the terrorist attacks on September 11. After graduating high school, he was assigned to the 1st Battalion, 8th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team based out of Fort Carson, Colorado.

In December 2005, Specialist Wilwerth was deployed to fight in Operation Iraqi Freedom. On February 22, 2006, Specialist Wilwerth and two others in his unit were killed by an improvised explosive device.

Specialist Thomas Wilwerth was 21 years old when he gave his life in service to his Nation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN)

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 829, my legislation to honor the life and legacy of Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth by renaming, in his name, the post office in his hometown of Mastic, New York.

Specialist Thomas Wilwerth always possessed a strong sense of duty to his country, having participated in the Junior ROTC program at William Floyd High School, where I once graduated as well. But it was in our Nation's darkest hour that 17-year-old Specialist Wilwerth was driven to enlist.

During his junior year of high school, Specialist Wilwerth bore witness to the unimaginable horror of September 11, with Ground Zero just under 100 miles from his high school. Instead of cowering in the face of terror, he shipped off to basic training that summer and actually finished high school while serving in the Army Reserve.

As a member of 1st Battalion, 8th Infantry Regiment, 3rd Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division based out of Fort Carson, Colorado, Wilwerth was deployed to Iraq in 2005 as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

It was only 3 months into his deployment on February 22, 2006, that 21-year-old Specialist Wilwerth and two of his fellow soldiers were killed in action when an explosive device detonated near his Bradley Fighting Vehicle while on a routine morning patrol near Balad, Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I wish there were more people who possessed such a strong sense of patriotism. Even fewer answer the call at just the age of 17 and sacrifice their entire lives and their entire future to serve in the U.S. military.

Specialist Wilwerth was the best of who we are. He is the embodiment of what makes this country the greatest in the world: the willingness to make the ultimate sacrifice serving this most exceptional Nation, and the willingness to lay down one's life for his neighbors, for his community, but most courageously, for those Americans he never knew.

Before serving in Congress, I was in the New York Senate, and I introduced a bill that also became law, the Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Military Dignity Act, to ban protests at military burials in my home State.

It is my greatest honor to stand here on the House floor today to speak about this new legislation in honor of Thomas.

Specialist Wilwerth is survived by his loving parents, Elaine and Terry Wilwerth, and his sister, Kerry. There are no words to describe the emptiness this loss left in their hearts and in the heart of our entire community.

Before I close, I would like to read a few words from the Wilwerth family that really drive home why this straightforward legislation will have such a profound impact.

The Wilwerth family said: "Tommy died so that his fellow Americans could live a better life. His deep-rooted sense of patriotism drove him to enlist in the aftermath of September 11, and he would have been so proud of his sacrifice on behalf of our entire Nation.

"To have his name and legacy displayed in the heart of the community he loved—the community he laid his life down for—will never bring him home, but it will ensure his memory and sacrifice live on in the hearts of those who call Long Island home."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I thank both Members who have spoken in its favor today.

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, as Mr. ZELDIN indicated, there is nothing we can do, not this action, that can really make up for the loss of a loved one, even in the time of war. But we can, as a grateful Nation, explain our appreciation and gratitude for the ultimate sacrifice that was made, and that is what we are doing today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 829.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

CHANGING THE ADDRESS OF THE CAPTAIN HUMAYUN KHAN POST OFFICE

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 725) to change the address of the postal facility designated in honor of Captain Humayun Khan.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 725

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

SECTION 1. CAPTAIN HUMAYUN KHAN POST OFFICE.

Section 1(a) of Public Law 115-347 (132 Stat. 5054) is amended by striking "180 McCormick Road" and inserting "2150 Wise Street".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in consideration of S. 725, a bill to change the address of the postal facility designated in honor of Captain Humayun Khan. Captain Khan was an extraordinary military officer and an American hero who lived in this country since he was 2 years old.

Mr. Khan represented the best of what it means to be an American. Growing up, he was captivated with the writings of Thomas Jefferson and his writings on freedom. It was at the school Jefferson founded, the University of Virginia, that Mr. Khan learned to put those ideas into practice. There, he joined the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

After graduation, Mr. Khan put his dreams of becoming a lawyer on hold to serve the American people on Active Duty in Iraq.

On June 8, 2004, while serving with the 201st Battalion of the 1st Infantry Division, tragically, Captain Khan was killed. While visiting the Guard personnel on his day off, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Khan was killed by an improvised bomb outside Forward Operating Base Warhorse.

It is to honor the life and memory of Captain Khan that we today dedicate this post office in Charlottesville, the home of his alma mater and the beginning of his distinguished military service, in his name.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill that makes a technical change to correct the address of a post office named last Congress.

The post office is named after Captain Humayun Khan, who sacrificed his life in service of our country.

Captain Khan served in the Army Reserves while he studied at the University of Virginia and was commissioned as an officer after he graduated in 2000. In 2004, he was deployed to Iraq, and he was killed on June 8, 2004.

This bill corrects the address, to ensure that the correct facility is named in Captain Khan's honor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from West Virginia. I

think this is an important honor, and it is an important technical correction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 725.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 540; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

LOUISE AND BOB SLAUGHTER POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 540) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 7, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]
YEAS—414

Adams	Biggs	Burgess
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Bustos
Aguilar	Bishop (GA)	Butterfield
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Byrne
Allred	Blumenauer	Calvert
Amash	Blunt Rochester	Carbajal
Armstrong	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Arrington	Bost	Carson (IN)
Axne	Boyle, Brendan	Carter (GA)
Babin	F.	Carter (TX)
Bacon	Brady	Cartwright
Baird	Brindisi	Case
Balderson	Brooks (AL)	Casten (IL)
Banks	Brooks (IN)	Castor (FL)
Barr	Brown (MD)	Castro (TX)
Barragán	Brownley (CA)	Chabot
Bass	Buchanan	Cheney
Beatty	Buck	Chu, Judy
Bera	Bucshon	Cicilline
Bergman	Budd	Cisneros
Beyer	Burchett	Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)	Hern, Kevin	Meuser
Clay	Herrera Beutler	Miller
Cleaver	Hice (GA)	Mitchell
Cline	Higgins (LA)	Molenaar
Cloud	Higgins (NY)	Mooney (WV)
Clyburn	Hill (AR)	Moore
Cohen	Hill (CA)	Morelle
Cole	Himes	Moulton
Collins (GA)	Holding	Mucarsel-Powell
Comer	Hollingsworth	Mullin
Conaway	Horn, Kendra S.	Murphy
Connolly	Horsford	Nadler
Cook	Houlahan	Napolitano
Cooper	Hoyer	Neal
Costa	Hudson	Neguse
Courtney	Huffman	Newhouse
Cox (CA)	Huizenga	Norcross
Craig	Hunter	Norman
Crawford	Hurd (TX)	Nunes
Crenshaw	Jackson Lee	O'Halleran
Crist	Jayapal	Ocasio-Cortez
Crow	Jeffries	Olson
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Omar
Cummings	Johnson (LA)	Palazzo
Cunningham	Johnson (OH)	Pallone
Curtis	Johnson (SD)	Palmer
Davids (KS)	Johnson (TX)	Panetta
Davidson (OH)	Jordan	Pappas
Davis (CA)	Joyce (OH)	Pascrell
Davis, Danny K.	Joyce (PA)	Payne
Davis, Rodney	Kaptur	Pelosi
Dean	Katko	Pence
DeFazio	Keating	Perlmutter
DeGette	Kelly (IL)	Perry
DeLauro	Kelly (MS)	Peters
DelBene	Kelly (PA)	Peterson
Delgado	Kennedy	Phillips
Demings	Khanna	Pingree
DeSaulnier	Kildee	Pocan
DesJarlais	Kilmer	Porter
Deutch	Kim	Posey
Diaz-Balart	Kind	Pressley
Dingell	King (IA)	Price (NC)
Doggett	King (NY)	Quigley
Doyle, Michael	Kinzinger	Raskin
F.	Kirkpatrick	Ratcliffe
Duffy	Krishnamoorthi	Reed
Duncan	Kuster (NH)	Rice (NY)
Dunn	Kustoff (TN)	Richmond
Emmer	LaHood	Riggleman
Engel	LaMalfa	Roby
Escobar	Lamb	Rodgers (WA)
Eshoo	Lamborn	Roe, David P.
Españalat	Langevin	Rogers (AL)
Estes	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)
Evans	Larson (CT)	Rose (NY)
Finkenauer	Latta	Rose, John W.
Fitzpatrick	Lawrence	Rouda
Fleischmann	Lawson (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Fletcher	Lee (CA)	Ruiz
Fortenberry	Lee (NV)	Ruppersberger
Foster	Lesko	Ryan
Foxx (NC)	Levin (CA)	Sánchez
Frankel	Levin (MI)	Sarbanes
Fudge	Lewis	Scalise
Fulcher	Lieu, Ted	Scanlon
Gaetz	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Gallagher	Loeb sack	Schiff
Gallego	Lofgren	Schneider
Garamendi	Long	Schrader
Garcia (IL)	Loudermillk	Schrier
Garcia (TX)	Lowenthal	Schweikert
Gianforte	Lowe y	Scott (VA)
Gibbs	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Gohmert	Luetkemeyer	Scott, David
Golden	Luján	Sensenbrenner
Gomez	Luria	Serrano
Gonzalez (OH)	Lynch	Sewell (AL)
Gonzalez (TX)	Malinowski	Shalala
Gooden	Maloney,	Sherman
Gosar	Carolyn B.	Sherrill
Gottheimer	Maloney, Sean	Shimkus
Granger	Marchant	Simpson
Graves (GA)	Marshall	Sires
Graves (LA)	Mast	Slotkin
Graves (MO)	Matsui	Smith (MO)
Green (TN)	McAdams	Smith (NE)
Green (TX)	McBath	Smith (NJ)
Griffith	McCarthy	Smith (WA)
Grijalva	McCaul	Smucker
Guest	McClintock	Soto
Guthrie	McCollum	Spanberger
Haaland	McGovern	Spano
Hagedorn	McHenry	Speier
Harden (CA)	McKinley	Stanton
Hartzer	McNerney	Staubert
Hastings	Meadows	Stefanik
Hayes	Meeks	Steil
Heck	Meng	Steube

Stevens	Trone	Watson Coleman
Stewart	Turner	Weber (TX)
Stivers	Underwood	Webster (FL)
Suo zzi	Upton	Welch
Swalwell (CA)	Van Drew	Wenstrup
Takano	Vargas	Westerman
Taylor	Veasey	Wexton
Thompson (CA)	Vela	Wild
Thompson (MS)	Velázquez	Williams
Thompson (PA)	Visclosky	Wilson (FL)
Thornberry	Wagner	Wilson (SC)
Timmons	Walberg	Wittman
Tipton	Walden	Womack
Titus	Walker	Woodall
Tlaib	Walorski	Wright
Tonko	Waltz	Yarmuth
Torres (CA)	Wasserman	Yoho
Torres Small	Schultz	Young
(NM)	Waters	Zeldin
Trahan	Watkins	

NAYS—7

Flores	Massie	Roy
Grothman	Rice (SC)	
Harris	Rouzer	

NOT VOTING—11

Abraham	Ferguson	Rooney (FL)
Amodei	Gabbard	Rush
Collins (NY)	McEachin	Rutherford
Correa	Reschenthaler	

□ 1625

Messrs. GOSAR, JOHNSON of Louisiana, DAVIDSON of Ohio, TONKO, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. SIMPSON and MULLIN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 189, answered "present" 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]
YEAS—222

Adams	Cárdenas	DelBene
Allred	Cartwright	Delgado
Amodei	Case	Demings
Armstrong	Casten (IL)	DeSaulnier
Arrington	Castor (FL)	Deutch
Bacon	Castro (TX)	Diaz-Balart
Banks	Chu, Judy	Dingell
Barr	Cicilline	Doggett
Barragán	Clark (MA)	Doyle, Michael
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	F.
Bergman	Clay	Engel
Beyer	Cleaver	Escobar
Bilirakis	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Españalat
Blumenauer	Cooper	Evans
Blunt Rochester	Courtney	Finkenauer
Bonamici	Cox (CA)	Fleischmann
Boyle, Brendan	Cummings	Fortenberry
F.	Curtis	Foster
Brady	Davidson (OH)	Frankel
Brown (MD)	Davis (CA)	Gallego
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny K.	Garcia (IL)
Buchanan	Dean	Garcia (TX)
Bustos	DeFazio	Gianforte
Butterfield	DeGette	Gomez
Carbajal	DeLauro	Gonzalez (TX)

Green (TX)	Maloney,	Scanlon
Grijalva	Carolyn B.	Schakowsky
Haaland	Matsui	Schiff
Hastings	McBath	Schneider
Hayes	McCarthy	Schrier
Heck	McCaul	Schweikert
Higgins (LA)	McClintock	Scott (VA)
Higgins (NY)	McCollum	Scott, David
Hill (CA)	McGovern	Serrano
Hollingsworth	McNerney	Shalala
Horn, Kendra S.	Meadows	Sherman
Hoyer	Mitchell	Simpson
Huffman	Moolenaar	Sires
Jackson Lee	Moore	Smith (NJ)
Jayapal	Morelle	Smith (WA)
Jeffries	Mucarsel-Powell	Soto
Johnson (GA)	Murphy	Speier
Johnson (TX)	Nadler	Stanton
Joyce (OH)	Napolitano	Stauber
Kaptur	Neal	Steil
Keating	Neguse	Stevens
Kennedy	Newhouse	Stivers
Khanna	Norcross	Swalwell (CA)
Kildee	O'Halleran	Takano
Kim	Ocasio-Cortez	Taylor
King (IA)	Omar	Thompson (MS)
Kinzinger	Pallone	Thornberry
Kirkpatrick	Pascrell	Titus
Kuster (NH)	Payne	Tlaib
Lamb	Perlmutter	Torres (CA)
Langevin	Perry	Torres Small
Larsen (WA)	Peters	(NM)
Larson (CT)	Peterson	Trahan
Lawrence	Phillips	Trone
Lee (CA)	Pingree	Underwood
Lee (NV)	Pocan	Vargas
Levin (CA)	Posey	Veasey
Levin (MI)	Pressley	Vela
Lewis	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Lieu, Ted	Quigley	Visclosky
Lipinski	Raskin	Wagner
Loebsock	Richmond	Wasserman
Lofgren	Riggleman	Schultz
Long	Rodgers (WA)	Watkins
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Webster (FL)
Lowe	Ruiz	Welch
Lujan	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)
Luria	Ryan	Yarmuth
Lynch	Sánchez	Yoho
Malinowski	Sarbanes	

NAYS—189

Aderholt	Estes	Kelly (IL)
Aguilar	Ferguson	Kelly (MS)
Allen	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
Amash	Fletcher	Kilmer
Axne	Flores	Kind
Babin	Foxx (NC)	King (NY)
Baird	Fudge	Krishnamoorthi
Balderson	Fulcher	Kustoff (TN)
Bera	Gaetz	LaHood
Biggs	Gallagher	LaMalfa
Bishop (UT)	Garamendi	Lamborn
Brindisi	Gibbs	Latta
Brooks (AL)	Golden	Lesko
Brooks (IN)	Gonzalez (OH)	Loudermilk
Buck	Gooden	Lucas
Buechson	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Budd	Gottheimer	Maloney, Sean
Burchett	Granger	Marchant
Burgess	Graves (GA)	Marshall
Byrne	Graves (LA)	Massie
Carson (IN)	Graves (MO)	Mast
Carter (TX)	Green (TN)	McAdams
Chabot	Griffith	McHenry
Cheney	Grothman	McKinley
Cisneros	Guest	Meeks
Cline	Guthrie	Meeng
Cole	Hagedorn	Meuser
Collins (GA)	Harder (CA)	Miller
Comer	Harris	Mooney (WV)
Conaway	Hartzler	Moulton
Cannolly	Hern, Kevin	Mullin
Cook	Herrera Beutler	Norman
Costa	Hice (GA)	Nunes
Craig	Hill (AR)	Olson
Crawford	Himes	Palazzo
Crenshaw	Holding	Palmer
Crist	Horsford	Panetta
Crow	Houlihan	Pappas
Cuellar	Hudson	Pence
Cunningham	Huizenga	Porter
Davids (KS)	Hunter	Ratcliffe
Davis, Rodney	Hurd (TX)	Reed
DesJarlais	Johnson (LA)	Rice (NY)
Duffy	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Duncan	Johnson (SD)	Roby
Dunn	Jordan	Ro, David P.
Emmer	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY)	Smucker	Walorski
Rose (NY)	Spanberger	Waters
Rose, John W.	Spano	Watson Coleman
Rouda	Stefanik	Weber (TX)
Rouzer	Steube	Wenstrup
Roy	Stewart	Westerman
Scalise	Suzoi	Wexton
Schrader	Thompson (CA)	Wild
Scott, Austin	Thompson (PA)	Williams
Sensenbrenner	Timmons	Wilson (SC)
Sewell (AL)	Tipton	Wittman
Sherrill	Turner	Womack
Shimkus	Upton	Woodall
Slotkin	Van Drew	Wright
Smith (MO)	Walberg	Young
Smith (NE)	Walden	Zeldin

PRESENTS—1

NOT VOTING—19

Abraham	Correa	Rooney (FL)
Bass	Gabbard	Rush
Bost	Gohmert	Rutherford
Calvert	Katko	Walker
Carter (GA)	Lawson (FL)	Waltz
Cloud	McEachin	
Collins (NY)	Reschenthaler	

□ 1634

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. 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. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately schedule the Born Alive bill, so we can stand up and protect the—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ALZHEIMER'S IS A PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, Alzheimer's is a public health crisis. It is fitting that today, the second day of

National Public Health Week, the Alzheimer's Association held their annual Day on the Hill. That is why I am wearing purple, to help raise awareness about Alzheimer's.

Someone new develops Alzheimer's every 65 seconds in the United States. The cost of caring for those with Alzheimer's and other dementias is around \$290 billion a year in the United States. That cost is only going to get higher.

In New Jersey alone, there are 180,000 people over the age of 65 who suffer from Alzheimer's. Each year, nearly 3,000 of them die from Alzheimer's.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me to raise awareness on Alzheimer's. But raising awareness is not enough. We need to increase research funding, commit to a public health response to Alzheimer's, and support Alzheimer's planning and care services under Medicare.

RECOGNIZING WORLD AUTISM AWARENESS DAY AND WORLD AUTISM MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on World Autism Day, to recognize and support all children or adults with autism spectrum disorder.

In 2018, an estimated 1 in 59 children in the United States was diagnosed with some form of autism spectrum disorder. Notwithstanding these diagnoses, Americans with autism make exceptional contributions across our Nation and around the world.

Each April Autism Speaks celebrates the start of its signature campaign, Light It Up Blue. Light It Up Blue is a unique global campaign to increase understanding and acceptance for people with autism.

Today we celebrate World Autism Awareness Day, and this month is World Autism Month.

Mr. Speaker, let's renew our commitment to support the entire international autism community, including children and adults with autism, their families, and caregivers.

Together, we can increase access to information, encourage heightened understanding of autism, promote respect and dignity, and support the services that assist people with autism to reach their full potential.

RELEASE PETER BIAR AJAK AND ALL OTHER POLITICAL PRISONERS IN SOUTH SUDAN

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak, once again, about Peter Biar Ajak, a renowned peace activist unlawfully detained in South Sudan.

In July of 2018, Peter was arrested by South Sudan's security forces. He has

been held without charge or trial ever since, and has been frequently denied access to his family, to counsel, to care, and to adequate food.

Peter was one of Sudan's "Lost Boys," he resettled in Philadelphia, and attended La Salle University, where I taught for 10 years. I knew Peter as a brilliant student and a leader. He later went on to Harvard and to Cambridge.

He is a dedicated peace activist who co-founded South Sudan Young Leaders Forum. In his work, he has criticized South Sudan's leaders for failing to secure a permanent peace for their people.

Incredibly, Peter is now under investigation for crimes including treason and terrorism. If charged and convicted, Peter could be sentenced to death. In reality, he is being persecuted for his speech.

I call on President Kiir to release Peter and all other political prisoners in South Sudan.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF RICHARD D. WESLEY

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Richard D. Wesley, who retired from being a Savannah River pilot after over 40 years of guiding ships to port through the Savannah River.

This expertise cannot be overstated. An incredible asset to our economy in coastal Georgia, river pilots risk their lives by jumping onto moving container ships, and then guiding them safely into harbor, keeping the ship itself, the cargo on board, and the entire area's economy moving forward.

A graduate of the Maine Maritime Academy in 1976, Mr. Wesley has piloted over 11,000 ships safely in and out of Savannah River. These trips included nearly any situation you could imagine; for example, Coast Guard visits that discovered stowaways, along with previously undiscovered contraband.

He has also seen the ships change dramatically over his tenure, going from 460 feet in length to around 1,200 feet in length. But, all of this accumulated experience over the years enabled him to mentor up-and-coming bar pilots through any situation, and to ensure that they are also going to have safe careers, which keep the economy of our State moving.

Thank you for your work, Mr. Wesley, and enjoy your retirement.

□ 1645

IF THIS LAWSUIT SUCCEEDS, CENTRAL VIRGINIANS WILL BE LEFT BEHIND

(Ms. SPANBERGER asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPANBERGER. Mr. Speaker, last week the administration asserted that the Affordable Care Act should be invalidated in Federal court. If this effort succeeds, protections for those with preexisting conditions would vanish.

Approximately 51 percent of central Virginians under the age of 65 have a preexisting condition. If this effort succeeds, we would see the return of caps on lifetime coverage, and those over 65 could be forced to pay higher Medicare premiums.

If this effort succeeds, we would lose the ability to keep our children on our insurance plan until age 26. In Virginia, where we just saw Medicaid expansion become law, this would be upended as well.

If efforts to scrap our healthcare system succeed, Medicaid expansion would be completely gutted, and with it, our efforts and ability to deal with the opioid epidemic across our State.

Right now, we need a bipartisan effort to stabilize and fix our healthcare system, not a hyperpartisan lawsuit focused on settling old scores.

Central Virginians deserve better. We are here to solve problems, and if there is a problem with our healthcare system, we should fix it, not upend our system, not hurt those with preexisting conditions, not get rid of the prohibition on lifetime caps, not eliminate a provision that allows young people to stay on their parents' insurance.

This is why, among the other efforts we are making in this body, I am proud to cosponsor the Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Healthcare More Affordable Act of 2019.

HONORING CORPORAL HERMAN JENKINS TURNING 100 YEARS OLD

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Herman Jenkins, a native Floridian, African American, and World War II veteran who, today, turns 100 years old.

Mr. Jenkins enlisted in the United States Army in 1943 when he was 24 years old, was stationed in northern France, and fought to defend Western civilization against the Nazi regime.

He rose to the rank of corporal and received numerous recognitions, including the Conduct Medal, the American Theater Ribbon, and a World War II Victory Ribbon.

After being honorably discharged in 1946, he returned to Lakeland, Florida, where he married his wife, Essie Mae Bryant, and together gave birth to their daughter, Sheila.

Upon returning to Lakeland, Mr. Jenkins entered the retail industry and enjoyed a successful career as a manager of several stores in our community. He also owned his own photog-

raphy business and continues to be a skilled photographer, chef, and musician. However, his greatest passion is being a loving husband to his wife, Essie, daughter, Sheila, four grandchildren, and 11 great-grandchildren.

Mr. Jenkins has made a permanent and positive impact in defending our Nation and building our community, and for that, sir, I thank you. I wish you a very happy birthday and hope that your next 100 years are better than your last.

WE COULD LOSE THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in the 2016 election, as the candidate who now is in the Oval Office said that ObamaCare is a disaster, the question was asked: What do you have to lose?

Well, now we know. It is the Affordable Care Act, which has provided 20 million Americans, for the first time, with security and peace of mind in healthcare.

I rise to support H. Res. 271, and I thank the gentleman from Texas, my colleague, COLIN ALLRED, because we know that the Texas case is the epicenter of destruction of the Affordable Care Act.

The administration's flip on us to now be against the position of survival of the Affordable Care Act tells us we have a lot to lose: 1.8 million Texans have gained coverage; 1.1 million Texans have purchased high-quality marketplace coverage; 913,000 individual Texans have received financial assistance.

More importantly, there are 1.1 million Texans who have insurance. If all the States adopted ACA's Medicaid, we would have that as well. We did not do it.

But, as well, Texans have no lifetime caps. They have the ability to have their children on their health insurance plans.

This is a tragedy. Mr. Speaker, I condemn the action of the administration in filing their opposition to the Affordable Care Act.

WE MUST VOTE TO PROTECT THE SANCTITY OF NEWBORNS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the discharge petition that was signed by me today on this floor, as well as 189 total Members of this House, and a special thank you to Representative ANN WAGNER and Whip STEVE SCALISE for their great work on this issue.

This discharge petition is to force consideration of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, known

as H.R. 962, which so far has been blocked by the majority in this House.

I am willing to bet most Americans assume that doctors and nurses would do everything they can to help a baby who has somehow miraculously survived an abortion. You would be surprised and saddened to know that that is not always the case.

In 2002, Congress recognized the simple fact that an infant who survives an abortion is, indeed, a person. So why is there still no legal protection for those newborn babies who have been born alive after a failed abortion attempt?

It is past time to hold abortion providers accountable for ensuring the best possible care for any newborn baby regardless of whether that baby happens to survive an abortion. We must vote to protect the sanctity of newborns, and I hope the American people will call their Member of Congress and have them sign on to this discharge petition and support this act.

EQUAL PAY DAY

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to recognize Katherine Johnson, Dr. Christine Darden, Dorothy Vaughan, Mary Jackson, and the hundreds of women in STEM who made incredible contributions to our country and to the cause of scientific research and exploration.

Katherine and her team of mathematicians and engineers were pivotal to one of our Nation's greatest triumphs: landing the first man on the Moon. Yet, as Black women in America, they faced pervasive discrimination. They were subjected to segregated facilities and their careers were stifled by an explicit and implicit culture of racism and misogyny.

I will also note that today is Equal Pay Day and that the gender pay gap is even more stark for women of color. It takes a Black woman 7 months longer to earn what a man takes home in 1 year, which is why I have been a strong supporter of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

I will further note that we were supposed to send the first all-woman space walk on March 29 up into outer space, but we had to cancel that trip because of lack of proper suits for women. We must do better.

Katherine Johnson, Dr. Christine Darden, Dorothy Vaughan, Mary Jackson, and the hundreds of other women in STEM were never properly recognized for their brilliance and determination, which is why I, as a Member of Congress, am a cosponsor of the Hidden Figures Congressional Gold Medal Act.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

(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, more than 4 million women in the United States experience physical violence by a domestic partner every single day. This staggering statistic underscores the great importance of the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization.

This critical legislation, which I am proud to cosponsor, provides the support and protections that victims of sexual assault and domestic violence need and deserve.

In my community, we have many organizations, like the Willow Domestic Violence Center, that provide life-saving services to women in need and rely on funding authorized by the Violence Against Women Act to operate.

I am especially pleased that this reauthorization includes vital provisions to keep guns out of the hands of those accused of stalking or dating violence.

I look forward to the passage of this important legislation and will continue working with my colleagues in the House to advance policies that support and empower women and ensure a safer community for all people.

MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the importance of honoring our government handshake agreements.

Medicare and Social Security are cornerstones of America's safety net. Social Security enables millions of Americans to retire with invaluable peace of mind, and Medicare is an effective tool that provides greater healthcare to millions and millions of Americans.

These programs are a golden handshake agreement between the Federal Government and the people of the United States that must be honored, and I will not stand for any attempts to undermine our commitment.

Our seniors rely on Social Security and Medicare, and it is our responsibility to ensure that these programs are always there for them.

Our word is our bond. Keeping the promises made to the people is essential to the success of our Nation and to the success of our government.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act.

Congress first enacted this bipartisan law 25 years ago to unite our Nation in the fight against domestic violence. It ushered in a new era of protection for all Americans and continues to provide

essential support so that victims have the legal tools and resources to seek justice and receive care.

Domestic violence is a horrific crime experienced by one out of three women and one out of four men. We must do all we can to stop it.

Recently, I visited the WINGS domestic violence shelter on the southwest side of Chicago, and I was joined by Chicago Police Officer Gino Garcia. Gino was only six when his mother, a Chicago police officer, was killed by her boyfriend. Gino was inspired to become an officer and now works with shelters and other domestic violence organizations.

By reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act, we help organizations like WINGS, and we empower victims and save lives. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

HEALTHCARE IS A RIGHT, NOT A PRIVILEGE

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

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, healthcare is a right, not a privilege. Unfortunately, I know all too well what it is like to have family members without healthcare coverage.

My mother went 15 years without health insurance, 15 years without seeing a doctor. My father used to drive to Mexico to get his diabetes medication because he had no insurance to cover the high cost.

The Affordable Care Act has provided over 20 million people with insurance and allowed them to have access to healthcare; 9,000 of them are in my district. It has also provided protections for those with preexisting conditions, protections that this administration and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have tried to take away.

I have spoken with so many parents who may have a child with a heart condition, childhood diabetes, or asthma. If these protections are taken away, so many families won't be able to afford the necessary surgeries or medications for these kids.

Let's do what is right for kids. Let's do what is right for families and protect the Affordable Care Act. Let's protect healthcare.

CONDEMNING REPUBLICAN HEALTHCARE SABOTAGE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn President Trump and his anti-life Republican enablers in Congress as they seek to repeal the Affordable Care Act, cutting off millions of Americans from their lifeline of affordable healthcare.

Just last week, the Trump administration announced its support of a Federal ruling that would strike down the

entire Affordable Care Act. To do so would threaten the lives of millions upon millions of Americans, including 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions.

If President Trump and Republicans get what they want and the entire ACA becomes invalidated, then the current cost of healthcare for millions of people will skyrocket.

More than 130 million Americans, more than one-third of our people, live with preexisting conditions, and they would no longer receive protection under Federal law.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve a caring President and Congress; they deserve a President who is committed to expanding access to affordable healthcare; they deserve a Congress that is committed to protecting those with preexisting conditions; and they deserve a government willing to stand up to the insurance industry and Big Pharma, whose profits will soar even more if the Affordable Care Act is struck down.

We were elected by the people to work together to strengthen our healthcare system, not destroy it. I thank Representative ALLRED for introducing a resolution condemning the administration's attack on the American healthcare system, and I urge its swift passage through this House and Senate.

□ 1700

AFFORDABLE HEALTHCARE

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, as I often do these Special Order hours here on the floor, I want to start by stating the fundamental reason I am here and my Democratic colleagues are here. I harken back to a very famous American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. This is actually etched in stone down at his memorial on the other end of the plaza here. He said: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

That "we provide enough for those who have too little," a fundamental value, a fundamental statement of purpose, a fundamental statement of why we seek elective office, not to provide more for those who have much, but, rather, for those who have too little.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why a man who says he has much would purposely set out to harm those who have too little.

Why, Mr. Speaker, would the President of the United States put in place a policy to take healthcare away from Americans? Obviously, he has much, or at least he says he does. But millions

of Americans rely upon the Affordable Care Act for their insurance, for their health insurance, literally for their ability to stay alive.

Why would the President of the United States ask the court to repeal, to find unconstitutional, the Affordable Care Act that has provided insurance coverage to more than 20 million Americans and healthcare benefits to millions upon millions more?

Why would our colleagues on the Republican side of this aisle fall in lockstep to support the President's effort to take away healthcare from Americans?

I do not understand this. Where is the compassion? Where is the empathy? Where is the concern for Americans, not one or two, but millions upon millions of Americans who have come to rely upon the Affordable Care Act to give them their basic insurance?

More than 20 million Americans found insurance coverage through the expansion of the Medicaid program, not in every State, because there were State Governors who were willing to go along with the President and the Republicans and not institute the Medicaid expansion. But there are still 20 million more Americans who have comprehensive healthcare coverage today.

Why? We must ask the question of the President and any of his sympathizers: Why would you do that?

It is not just those people who have been able to get coverage in the Affordable Care Act, but it is every senior who is on Medicare who will lose coverage. Every senior on Medicare has an annual visit to a doctor to determine if they have any medical problems, a free annual check-up. That, too, would disappear.

For seniors who had hundreds of dollars, if not thousands of dollars, in annual expenses for drugs because of the Medicare drug doughnut hole—yes, the infamous doughnut hole that was created in the expansion of the Medicare program in 2003—that doughnut hole is literally closed as a result of the Affordable Care Act.

Eliminate the Affordable Care Act, Mr. President, and seniors who rely upon expensive drugs are going to, once again, pay billions of dollars of additional costs right out of their pocket.

Here it is: "Whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

Think of seniors who are in nursing homes. Most of the Medicaid dollars are for nursing home care. The expansion will affect them, if it is repealed.

Remember the bad old days when your insurance policy had a cap, a \$50,000 lifetime cap, maybe a \$100,000 lifetime cap? If you had a bad car accident, you would blow right through that. If you had cancer, guaranteed within the first month of treatment, you would blow through that cap, and it would come right out of your pocket.

Remember the bad old days when the great majority of personal bankruptcies were a direct result of medical expenses?

Mr. Speaker, does the President remember those days, that now he wants to eliminate the Affordable Care Act? Is that where we are in this country? How mean-spirited.

Maybe his test of progress is whether we add more to those who have much.

Look at this. The Affordable Care Act actually raised taxes on the superwealthy. Maybe that is what the President wants, to, once again, give a massive tax cut to the superwealthy. If the Affordable Care Act is repealed, the average tax cut for the superwealthy, the top one-tenth of 1 percent of Americans, will be nearly \$200,000 a year. Is that what our President wants?

Apparently, he took the first half of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's statement about values and said: Oh, yes, we want more for the wealthy.

That is precisely what will happen if the Affordable Care Act is repealed, to the tune of more than \$197,000 for the top one-tenth of 1 percent of America's wealthy.

What in the world? What is going on here in America that the President of the United States, in league with many of our Republican colleagues, would rip out of the hands of Americans a healthcare program that is working?

That is not where we are on the Democratic side of this aisle. We have fought this fight for 8, 9, 10 years. The Affordable Care Act passed in 2009 and 2010, and here we are. Our Republican colleagues gained control of this House and the Senate, and we fought the fight over those years to stop the repeal.

Now, the President, once again, is going around Congress, this time to the courts, asking the Supreme Court of the United States to rip out of the hands of Americans the healthcare that they have come to rely upon.

We will continue this fight. Not only will we continue this fight, but we are stepping up to improve the Affordable Care Act, and we intend to do it with a piece of legislation. We call it the Protecting Pre-Existing Conditions and Making Health Care More Affordable Act of 2019, H.R. 1884, protecting pre-existing conditions.

You heard my colleague, just before I stood up here, talking about pre-existing conditions. 130 million Americans have pre-existing conditions: high blood pressure, being a woman who might get pregnant, you name it. We all, at least 130 million of us, have pre-existing conditions.

Here is what we intend to do: improve the Affordable Care Act and reduce premium costs for consumers by expanding the eligibility for the premium tax credit, expanding affordability for working families, protecting comprehensive coverage for small businesses and workers, and eliminating junk insurance policies.

I was the insurance commissioner in California for 8 years, and I can talk for hours and hours about insurance companies that sold junk to people. They worked until they had an illness, and then it failed to work. We would

make those junk insurance policies unavailable in America.

We would ensure that there would be comprehensive benefits, like maternity care. If you talk about family values, you better talk about maternity care.

We would make sure that the programs to make people aware that they can get insurance would be in place.

We would help the States as they carry out their coverages. We would make sure that the exchanges were not eliminated, that they would be strong. Unlike the President who would eliminate the exchanges, we would strengthen them.

We have work to do. We are here to make things better for America, for the people, and we intend to do so.

Joining me tonight are a couple of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), a fellow who has worked on this for years.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1966, at a healthcare conference, the late Martin Luther King, Jr., said: "Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in healthcare is the most shocking and inhumane."

I often think of the debate back in 2009 and 2010 when we were trying to pass the Affordable Care Act. I remember one day I was conducting a call-in program on the local radio station. A gentleman called in and said to me: I want you to keep your hands off of my health insurance. I like what I have got, and I don't want you and President Obama messing with it.

□ 1715

I assured the gentleman that we were going to do nothing to interrupt his relationship with his insurance company or his policy.

But then a little while later, a lady called in, and she said, Congressman, I don't have a question, but I would like to say something to the gentleman who just called in. I want to say to him that I had insurance for 30 years, and I thought I liked it, until I tried to use it. When I went for my second treatment for breast cancer, I got a notice, she said, from the insurance company that I had used up my lifetime of benefits.

And then she said, I would like to say to that gentleman, Maybe he likes what he has because he has never tried to use it.

And that is what you have reference to here when you talk about junk policies. What we did with the Affordable Care Act was to make healthcare accessible and affordable for all American citizens.

We created the possibilities of States expanding Medicaid so that low-income people could have access to healthcare.

And if you want to know a little bit about what can be done if we were to, in some way, get rid of the Affordable Care Act, just look at the States that

have refused to expand Medicaid; the number of low-income people today who still do not have access to healthcare.

Think about those middle-income families who had a family member get sick and find out that they are in bankruptcy because they are trying to pay the bills.

The Affordable Care Act is an attempt, like everything else ought to be here.

If we are talking about education, it ought to be accessible and affordable.

If you are talking about housing, it should be accessible and affordable.

Healthcare; accessible and affordable.

And we all know that until we passed the Affordable Care Act, healthcare was not accessible and affordable for all Americans.

We hear the slogan that takes place throughout this country. We don't need to Make America Great Again. America is great. It has always been great. That is not our challenge.

Our challenge, it seems to me, is to make the greatness of America accessible and affordable to all Americans; apply it fairly and equitably.

That, to me, is what this country is all about.

So I want to thank you, my friend from California, Mr. GARAMENDI, I want to thank you for all the work that you are doing on H.R. 1884, because I think before we go home this week, we are going to pass a resolution, a resolution to condemn this administration for attempting to legally take away healthcare from so many citizens.

And I want to close with this: You talk about preexisting conditions. I think that people tend to think about preexisting conditions in a way that deals with people that they know or can relate to. I want all of our listeners, and those looking on, to just think of what you are doing.

If you say to a child born with diabetes, a child who didn't ask to come here, and even if that child could ask to come, they certainly wouldn't ask to come sick. Diabetes; born with it.

And then the insurance company says that it is a preexisting condition and you cannot come on to your family's insurance policies.

If we cannot see the wrongness in that, I am not too sure anything anybody says about anything can be ever wrong in your eyesight.

So I want to thank you so much for the work that you are doing here. I want to thank the American people for keeping our focus on making healthcare accessible and affordable for all Americans.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman (Mr. CLYBURN) so very much. He has been working for those qualities and values all of his life, and I really appreciate his coming to us and bringing us the awareness of what Dr. Martin Luther King said about America and about where the role of healthcare fits into justice in America.

I see Mr. CICILLINE from Rhode Island here, the chairman of the Democratic Policy and Communication Group.

Would you like to communicate with us?

Mr. CICILLINE. I would be honored to. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI), my friend, for organizing this Special Order hour and for giving us an opportunity to speak more about what seems to be a recurring fight here in Congress between Democrats who are committed to preserving access to high quality, affordable healthcare and to our Republican friends who are committed to undoing the progress we have made.

I know the gentleman will remember this. In the last Congress, I think, we were confronted with 50 or 60 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act in its entirety. And we were able to defeat each of those efforts.

Then President Trump was elected, that effort continued, and the administration began to administratively sabotage the Affordable Care Act, and even proposed TrumpCare, which would have cost 23 million Americans their healthcare in its entirety.

So now having lost that battle, Democrats ran an agenda for the people of this country.

The first item on that agenda was driving down healthcare costs, driving down the cost of prescription drugs, and preserving coverage for preexisting conditions.

We won the election. We were put into the majority, in part because the American people rejected the Republican's relentless effort to destroy healthcare in this country and wanted Democrats to come to Congress in control to build on the success of the Affordable Care Act and make sure that we continue to protect access to quality, affordable healthcare.

Having lost in this body on this issue, now what do the Republicans do? They take the battle to the courts. Let's use the courts to strike down the Affordable Care Act.

And we should be very clear, as I know the gentleman from California knows, President Trump has claimed over and over again that he wants to protect access to healthcare.

In fact, just in the last couple of days, he now claims he has a secret plan. It is so good he is going to share it with the American people after the 2020 election.

But what we know is, unfortunately, what the President says and what he does aren't always the same. Because the truth is, the President has asked his Justice Department to go to court and fight to eliminate every single protection and benefit that the Affordable Care Act has provided.

So that means if President Trump gets his way and our Republican colleagues, there will no longer be caps on out-of-pocket expenses, there will no longer be savings by closing the donut hole, so prescription drug costs are reduced for our seniors. Medicaid expansion will end. The limits that prevent

insurance companies from limiting the total coverage over your lifetime, that ban will no longer exist. You will be able to deny access to healthcare for people with preexisting conditions. And the insurance company will be free to sell junk plans that offer little or no real coverage at all.

And so we are back to the same fight. Democrats have legislation that has already been introduced to build on the success of the Affordable Care Act:

To drive down premiums; to expand access for more working men and women; to drive down the costs of prescription drugs.

But we are back at it where our Republican friends are now joining this Republican President in an effort to use the courts to undo all the progress we have made on the Affordable Care Act.

This is going in exactly the wrong direction. We remain committed to make sure that we do everything we can to protect access to care and drive down costs, because we believe healthcare is a right.

It is not a privilege for a small group of people. It is a right of every single citizen of this country.

And I thank the gentleman for convening this Special Order hour, because amidst the noise, people should know there is one party here in Washington, the Democrats, who are fighting to protect and expand access to healthcare and drive down costs. There is another party that is continuing their effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act in its entirety, to take away coverage for preexisting conditions, to drive up the cost of prescription drugs. And the American people have the right to know who is fighting for them and who is not.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman (Mr. CICILLINE).

It is extremely important that we continue this fight we fought successfully for 8 years, 9 years. And here we are once again.

The general public, keep in mind, Protecting Preexisting Conditions and Making Healthcare More Affordable Act of 2019, H.R. 1884.

I turn to the gentleman from the State of New York (Mr. MORELLE). If you would like to join us and tell us how all of this affects your constituency in New York.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) for his eloquence and his leadership on this critically important issue.

I rise to express my strong opposition to the Trump administration's efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act and pull the rug out from millions of Americans who rely on the ACA for essential health coverage.

Quality, affordable healthcare should be a right for every American, and we should make it easier, not harder, for individuals and families to get the insurance they deserve.

The House majority made a promise to always offer protections for individ-

uals with preexisting conditions and fight back against those who seek to dismantle their fundamental protections.

That is why I am proud to cosponsor a resolution to reverse the administration's cruel attempts to sabotage care for Americans in need, and I thank Mr. GARAMENDI for his leadership with House Resolution 1884.

We will not allow people with preexisting conditions to go back to the days where they were denied coverage when they needed it the most. And I might also say, parenthetically—and I appreciate very much the gentleman from California's leadership as the superintendent of insurance in the State of the California—I had the privilege of working on legislation in New York back in the early nineties as a new member that introduced community rating in the State of New York and offered protections for preexisting conditions.

Subsequent to that, I had an opportunity to serve as the chair of the Insurance Committee in the New York State Assembly.

In that role, I was responsible for helping to implement the Affordable Care Act in the State of New York.

Many of the protections in the Affordable Care Act were already part of New York law. I am very, very proud of that; and continued to work on that as majority leader of the State Assembly.

But the protections which we, I think, rely on in New York are not available to all Americans, and to those plans which we are not able, as a state, to regulate, self-regulated plans and other plans protected by ERISA, don't have those protections.

So I think it is critically important as we continue to move forward that we work tirelessly. And I will work with my colleagues to protect and expand the Affordable Care Act, to lower costs and ensure hardworking families everywhere in America have healthcare that they can rely on.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman could stand by for a few seconds.

I knew that he had been in the New York legislature as a leader in the assembly there. And I had some recollection of the work he did on insurance matters.

If he could just talk about the experiences he had when he tried to protect people with preexisting conditions, and those issues that he dealt with in the early nineties, some of the work that was done and the experiences that he had there.

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from California.

You know you understand how it is for many of us who are blessed to have either employer-offered health insurance or are in a situation where you don't think as much about the costs or the issues that involve health insurance. But what you find from talking to people, as many people are not as

privileged as I might be, and really faced critical decisions about whether they could have medicine to treat chronic illnesses or had to make the decision between that and rent.

Or for people who had—as I have said on this floor before, I, unfortunately, lost my daughter to cancer, breast cancer, about a year and-a-half ago.

Lauren had good health insurance, but during her illness, I often thought about men and women in her circumstance, what challenges they would face, even if they are able to defeat the illness, whether or not those preexisting conditions would cause their insurance premiums to be so high and so unattainable that the idea of having quality, affordable healthcare would simply not be within their reach.

□ 1730

This affects millions of Americans. Whether it is women who plan on beginning a family, starting a family; whether it is the elderly who have chronic conditions—you mentioned hypertension; or whether you have diabetes, there are a whole host of conditions. Most Americans have some form of preexisting condition.

For us to allow the underwriting to be done with those preexisting conditions in mind would simply put healthcare out of the reach of most Americans, quality, affordable healthcare. That is why I think this is so important.

I might also add that the Department of Justice is charged with defending the laws duly enacted by this Congress and by the President of the United States. That is the job of the Department of Justice. I find it reprehensible that this Department of Justice under this administration would take the view that they will join in a lawsuit against a law fully enacted that is the law of the land of the United States and seek to overturn it. It is virtually without precedent.

What is so troubling about it is that this will leave millions of Americans without coverage and without health insurance at a time when we should be doing everything we can to ensure that more Americans have access to quality, affordable care.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MORELLE so much. Actually, I didn't know that the gentleman had lost his daughter. That tragic illness is an example of why the Affordable Care Act is so important, because people will have coverage. There are no lifetime limits.

Although your daughter was unsuccessful in the treatment, many thousands upon thousands of Americans are able to get treatment and survive cancer or some other debilitating illness.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for his experience, and I thank him for being here and bringing all those years of knowledge and experience to this House and helping us fight this fight.

Let me now turn to my colleague from New Jersey who often is here with

me on the floor, Mr. PAYNE. He and I talk about a lot of different subjects. Here, we are talking about one that affects every American. I thank the gentleman for joining us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GARAMENDI for once again setting aside time to talk about the issues that affect the lives of people across this country.

I want to start by saying that the contrast between Republicans and Democrats on this issue of healthcare could not be any clearer.

As the gentleman has described in his discussion of the ongoing legal case down south, Republicans and the Trump administration want to make Americans sick again. They want to eliminate protections for people with preexisting conditions.

Let me just stop there. This Nation was built on a morality that we held very deeply in this country. But, to me, it feels like it has been torn apart, is falling apart, that we do not care about people who find themselves in circumstances that they did not create on their own, that they should alone be left, because of a preexisting condition, not to be afforded healthcare.

That is unconscionable. That is profiting at its worst. It deeply upsets me that we find ourselves turning our backs on our brothers and our sisters, our mothers and our fathers, and our aunts and our uncles in this country to say, no, because you have an illness, we cannot protect you and give you insurance. It is unconscionable.

They want to take the United States backward, and they are weaponizing the courts to do what they failed to do in Congress: repeal the Affordable Care Act.

I arrived here in 2012, and the Affordable Care Act was already the law of the land. But what I witnessed in my time here was the over 50 times, close to 60 times, that the Republicans attempted to repeal the Affordable Care Act but could never do it. They could never do it. With the White House, with the Senate, and with the House, they still could not do it, because it was too popular with a lot of Americans in this country. They did not listen to the people. They did not want the Affordable Care Act repealed.

Now they are trying to go the court and the executive route and do what they could not do in this body, which is the body that determines those matters.

Democrats, on the other hand, want to make America healthy. We want to expand healthcare access. We want to strengthen the Affordable Care Act. We want to make sure that people with preexisting conditions are not denied insurance coverage.

Now the Trump administration is fighting to bring healthcare discrimination back. Well, there is no going back. More than 200,000 people in my State of New Jersey who purchased

their insurance through the Affordable Care Act marketplace have preexisting conditions.

President Trump wants to make it easier for insurers to deny coverage. He is playing politics with their lives.

What my constituents want and need is for the Affordable Care Act to be strengthened. The 200,000 New Jerseyans who purchased their insurance through the Affordable Care Act should not have their insurance coverage put to risk because of politics. New Jerseyans and all Americans deserve protection, not discrimination.

Let me be clear: The Trump administration wants to put lives at risk by undermining people's access to healthcare across this country. The Trump administration is sabotaging the Affordable Care Act, and Americans are paying the price.

The Trump administration has made it more difficult to enroll in the Affordable Care Act by increasing website downtime during open enrollment and cutting the budget for healthcare navigators, the people who help Americans determine and figure out what they need in terms of coverage. They cut that.

The Trump administration has stopped finding cost-share reductions, which lower people's out-of-pocket expenses.

The Trump administration has launched a full-scale legal attack on the Affordable Care Act.

In light of those attacks, let me be clear about one thing: Democrats will keep fighting to ensure that all Americans' healthcare is protected. We will fight in the House. We will fight in the Senate. We will fight in the courts.

Once again, I thank the gentleman for his true leadership on the issues that are facing the American people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PAYNE for his consistent work here on the floor on multiple issues.

Healthcare issues have always been at the front of his agenda for him and his constituents, and he has fought fiercely since 2012 to see to it that the Affordable Care Act remains in place.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to put up one more chart that I think graphically displays what we have been talking about here. This is 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013. The Affordable Care Act really took hold in 2013. It took a couple years to set up the administrative systems and the like.

You can see in 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017, the number of uninsured in America went from 44 million down to 27 million, which is just, in large numbers, a clear description of what the Affordable Care Act was able to do in bringing insurance to Americans.

Here we have a President who was unable to get his wall and decided to go around Congress and the Constitution to try to fund the wall by moving money from one military account to another so that he could build his wall.

Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution clearly states that it is the Con-

gress that appropriates money. It says no money shall be appropriated from the Treasury without law. Congress passed a law that said \$1.2 billion was for border security. That is it. Now the President wants \$8 billion, literally going around Congress and the Constitution.

He is doing it once again with the Affordable Care Act. He was unable to get Congress to repeal the law, so now he is going to the court system to try to get the court to repeal the law.

Hopefully, the court won't do that. But if it does, those 20 million Americans who will lose their insurance and those 130 million Americans who have preexisting conditions and will once again be open to insurance discrimination—not able to get insurance, paying vastly more because they have a preexisting condition, like being a woman, or blood pressure, or diabetes, or any number of things—those people will remember that it was the President who went around Congress to the courts to ask the court to strike down the Affordable Care Act.

There is so much at risk. Every senior on Medicare will see the doughnut hole come back, and their drug expenses will skyrocket billions of dollars. The free annual checkup that seniors are able to get now will no longer be available. It goes on and on, all gone.

I am going to end with this before I turn this over to my colleagues.

I don't know that I could ever put this up enough, when FDR said: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

In this case, probably close to 27 million Americans have too little. They didn't have healthcare, and today, they do. Those are the Americans who had too little.

Where do we stand? What are our values? How do we approach this fundamental question of America as we go into the 2020s? Are we for those who have much, like the President? Or are we for those who have too little, like the Americans who were uninsured prior to the Affordable Care Act?

I will tell you where we Democrats stand. We, without any Republican support, created the Affordable Care Act. We fought over the last decade, not only to implement it, but to fight the defensive battle to see that it would continue.

Now we are going to continue that fight. We are not going to give up because our values, our purpose, are with those Americans who now rely upon the Affordable Care Act, and, indeed, with those seniors and with this country so that we can provide for those in need.

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

IMPORTANCE OF JOURNALISM IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank those watching and my colleagues who will join me in the next half hour to talk about journalism, the importance of journalism in the United States and the importance of journalism to democracy.

Abraham Lincoln once said: Let the people know the facts, and the country will be safe.

The challenge is, how do we get them those facts?

For professional journalists, there is nothing more important. They don't always make us who hold office happy. Sometimes, we disagree with them. Sometimes, we think they are not being fair. But they are extremely important to the success or failure of American democracy.

□ 1745

Neil Postman, in 1985, in his book, "Amusing Ourselves to Death," wrote about his own belief in 1985 that how people got information in journalism was changing too dramatically, and he was just talking about the media in terms of television news. Think about how much that has changed since 1985.

Mr. Postman talked about the Lincoln-Douglas debates and that thousands of people would go and listen to those debates because Douglas and Lincoln took the time to write out what they would say and how they anticipated answering questions. People would listen without speakers and without any kind of amplification of what they were saying—thousands of people—for as long as 6 or 7 hours, with a break for dinner.

Mr. Postman's whole argument was this was cognitively different, that when you read something that was prepared over and over again by people who were really good writers, people responded differently and they accepted factual information in a different way than we were learning to accept facts.

Now, in 2019, with this administration and with social media and 24/7 news, I think Mr. Postman would be horrified about how Americans get their facts, how they cognitively process them, and how they engage as American citizens.

There is nothing more important than, as Lincoln said and I would opine, that Americans get journalism with factual content, with the professional expertise of people, many of whom have gone to school, to journalism schools for undergraduate degrees, often for graduate degrees, who go out to work for not a whole lot of money but to be able to investigate, get to the facts, and then communicate. Too many of us underestimate those talents. Maybe we have become spoiled.

But what has happened is a consequence of many things. The business model has changed. Being from the bay area, Craigslist changed classified ads, and that is a revenue source to print journalism. But now as it moves to digital, a group of us wants to talk about what we can do appropriately in Congress and maybe work with—not maybe, but work with State and local officials to talk about how we can appropriately support professional journalism so we can get back to that point where Americans are engaged in a very deep way in their discussion with government and, specifically, with local government.

Most Americans—and maybe it is because I came from local government—learn about democracy, oftentimes, at the local level. They know the people who are in the city council and on the school board. An issue comes up. Their kids start to go to school, and they take an interest in the governance and superintendent and the superintendent's bosses. They care about the curriculum. Maybe there is a land use decision at their city council, and so they start to learn about democracy in a meaningful way that way.

Heretofore, except in the last 10 years with the demise of local journalism, for a variety of reasons, they don't get that information. They get a lot of information about Congress. They get a lot of information about the President of the United States, and some information still at the statehouse, but not nearly as much, and very little at the local level.

I will say there are heroic people out there who are still doing great local journalism, but because of the business model and because of consolidations, that has become, I am afraid, very ill.

So just in terms of the definition of the problem, in 2017, estimated daily U.S. newspaper circulation—that is print and digital. So when we focus on, "Oh, well, print is gone; forget about it," we realize that the business model has changed.

But there is a digital model here that we can see in The Washington Post, The New York Times, The Boston Globe, Los Angeles Times, San Francisco Chronicle. There is still a model. But their ability to talk about local news is where we have to get more effort, I think, in understanding, as citizens.

Circulation, print and digital, in 2017 was 31 million for weekday and 34 million for Sunday. That is down 11 and 10 percent, respectively, from each previous year. The chart next to me shows the steady decline.

Newspaper consumption—that is digital and print—has been falling every year since 1994. Today most Americans get their news from television and social media, the primary way they get their information.

Fifty-five percent of Americans are regularly tuning into TV to consume that news information. In contrast, only 20 percent of Americans regularly

get their news from a physical newspaper. Only 38 percent of Americans regularly get their news online.

In 2017, advertising revenue for the entire newspaper industry was \$16.5 billion, a 10 percent decrease from 2016.

Then there are consolidations, an issue that I know Mr. CICILLINE will talk about, the consolidation of the print newspaper business in particular.

And I will say this for the bay area where I live and represent, in the bay area, newspapers, at their peak, had about 1,500 journalists. This is for about 7.5, 7.75 million people, in one of the largest metropolitan areas in the country that is very diverse, 1,500 journalists. These aren't support people. These are writers, professional journalists. Now there are less than 300 serving those same 7.5 million people in an area that is growing and has one of the most innovative and fastest growing economies in the world.

It is not just the bay area. Since 2004, 1,800 local papers have been closed or merged. What traditionally happens—and there are two large companies that do this—is they go in and buy the newspaper and then sell the assets. So very rarely now—when you go around to a city or a town where it used to be a prominent building was the headquarters of the local newspaper, those buildings have been sold.

The San Jose Mercury News had a prominent building in downtown San Jose right by city hall. In Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Times still thrives because it has local ownership, fortunately; but that L.A. Times building, a beautiful art deco that was so much a part of the history of Los Angeles, was directly across the street from city hall. There was a reason for that.

The Examiner and the Chronicle in San Francisco were prominent downtown. These were icons. Well, a lot of these consolidations came about, and they sold these iconic buildings where people worked. Then, of course, they sold the print functions because there was less to do and a lot of the distribution. But they also laid off and eliminated a lot of the journalists, and that is where we get our information.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 39,210 people worked as reporters and editors in the newspaper industry in 2017. This is down from 44,000, about 15 percent from 2015, and 71,645 in 2004, about a 45 percent nationwide decrease. About one-third of the large U.S. newspapers have suffered significant layoffs.

Additionally, journalists' wages remained low. In 2017, the median wage for an editor was only \$49,000, while the median wage for a reporter was about \$34,000. If you are in a place like the bay area, Los Angeles, New York, D.C., or Boston, you can imagine what the cost of living does to that kind of income for people whom we rely on to provide us information.

There is hope, however: some newspaper groups like the one in Philadelphia that has coordinated and consolidated with a nonprofit model and is refocusing its mission on producing excellent journalism to inform the public and focusing on local journalism.

There has been a spike in attendance in university journalism programs in spite of the numbers I just told you since this President took office in 2017.

Through programs to reengage citizens, particularly students, in the importance of journalism and reimagining how we fund print and electronic newspapers, we can ensure that journalism remains a bedrock of the country and a check on its power as it always has been.

As someone from the bay area who has had a relationship with our innovation and our tech companies, for Google and Facebook, they make millions of dollars off of journalists, and we think that they should contribute to that amazing asset that they have right now, largely free of charge. So we look to them to partner with us so that these platforms can be platforms not just for profit, but platforms for democracy, where local journalists can put their wares out there and be able to benefit from it just as they benefit from it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), who is my wonderful colleague from San Jose, in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman has laid out the case quite eloquently.

I simply wanted to say that, while the government could never own or should never own the news media, we may have a role to create an environment where local news can flourish without our saying in any way how or what they should cover. But we know that local news covers local stories, and without the local news, you will never find out what is going on in city hall, what is going on in the board of supervisors, and what is going on on the planning commission and the like.

So what Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CICILLINE, and others have outlined here is a very important challenge for the United States of America. If we are going to have control of our governments, we need to have information; and if we are going to have information, then we need to have a free press all the way from city hall up to the White House. We have got some holes in that coverage right now.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CICILLINE, and others for the efforts that they are making, and I look forward to supporting them as they move forward.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking Congressman DESAULNIER

not only for organizing this important Special Order hour and saving local news, but for his enthusiastic and really passionate leadership on this issue.

I think the graphs that my friend from California presented tonight are an illustration of how grave the problem is and how essential it is that we develop a solution to help preserve our local newspapers, because I think we all recognize that our democracy is strongest when we have a free and diverse press that informs citizens, holds concentrated power accountable, and roots out corruption.

There are examples all across the country of local newspapers doing heroic investigative work uncovering corruption, holding power to account, and sharing important information with folks at the local level.

As Justice Brandeis wrote in 1927, those who won our independence believed that public discussion is a political duty, that the greatest threat to freedom is an uninformed citizenry, and that the freedom of thought and speech are indispensable to the discovery and spread of political truth.

But today, as you have so eloquently argued, these bedrock constitutional values are facing existential threats by the new gatekeepers of information, the dominant platforms.

Last year, Facebook and Google amassed more than \$60 billion from online advertising, the majority of all online ad revenue. Despite record levels of online readership, news publishers have seen a steep decline in revenue during the rise of these technology giants.

This bottleneck is bleeding publishers dry.

In an editorial published last year, my local newspaper, The Providence Journal explained that: "Google and Facebook now harvest the majority of the advertising that is supposed to sustain that journalism. It's essentially parasitism: newspapers and other journalistic enterprises do all the work, while Silicon Valley sucks out the profits."

In the absence of a competitive marketplace, newsrooms across the country are laying off reporters and editorial staff or folding altogether. This is happening to legacy news companies and digital publishers alike.

There is no question that we have reached a tipping point.

If this trend continues, we risk permanently compromising the news organizations that are essential to uncovering corruption, holding the government and powerful corporations accountable, and sustaining our democracy.

That is why Mr. DESAULNIER and I have introduced the Journalism Competition and Preservation Act, a bill that would strengthen journalism by allowing news publishers to collectively negotiate with dominant platforms to improve the quality, accuracy, attribution, and interoperability of news online.

It is critical that news publishers, both large and small, have a seat at the

table and equal bargaining power when negotiating with dominant platforms. Whether it is an online publisher or your local newspaper, we cannot have a democracy without a free and diverse press. Our country will not survive if we do not have shared facts, if corruption is not exposed and rooted out at all levels of government, and if power is not held to account. It is simply not possible.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support and cosponsorship of the legislation, his passionate advocacy for moving forward with it and for organizing tonight's Special Order hour to bring attention to this really critical issue which is really at the center of preserving our access to quality, reliable, and trustworthy news information which is essential to the survival of our democracy.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. CICILLINE for the nice comments.

This bill is extremely important, and I am proud to follow the gentleman's leadership in getting it passed and getting it signed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. DESAULNIER for yielding to me. I also want to thank him and my colleague, Mr. CICILLINE, for sponsoring this important piece of legislation.

This really is a very concerning trend that is taking place in our society as more and more local news organizations in our communities are shutting down or becoming nonexistent. Maintaining a truly free and independent press is vital to our democracy.

I guess he is our favorite Founder tonight, Thomas Jefferson, also said: "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."

□ 1800

We, as a society, rely on members of the press to be our watchdogs, to sound the alarms and hold our government leaders accountable when necessary.

According to a study from the University of North Carolina, over the last 15 years, the newspaper industry has seen over 1,800 mergers or closures of print newspapers.

That is a staggering 20 percent of all newspapers in the country that have now closed since 2004.

In my home State of Colorado, we have three counties—Costilla, Baca, and Cheyenne—that have no daily or weekly papers at all.

And, in my hometown of Denver, where we have seen explosive population growth, we now only have one daily newspaper, The Denver Post. Our other newspaper, the Rocky Mountain News, published its last issue in 2009, 2 months shy of what would have been its 150th anniversary.

While it may have outlived the competition and it now serves as our city's only remaining daily paper, The Denver Post, too, has faced its share of hardships in recent years.

In 2013, The Post had over 250 employees, but today the number is less than 100. On April 8, 2018, in response to another round of devastating layoffs at the paper, The Denver Post's own editorial board published an op-ed entitled "As Vultures Circle, The Denver Post Must Be Saved."

In that op-ed, the editorial board wrote: "The smart money is that in a few years The Denver Post will be rotting bones. And a major city in an important political region will find itself without a newspaper."

These are not my words. These are The Denver Post's own employee's words. The massive decline in the number of reporters covering our local communities is not happening just in Denver. It is happening all over the country, and it is threatening to have real, tangible impacts on our communities.

Now, we heard Congresswoman LOFGREN question how we are going to get coverage of local government in our newspapers.

At The Denver Post, one of the layoffs they had was their one employee who covered Congress. So we are not only now not having coverage on local governments, but also of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Nationwide, the number of full-time reporters covering our State legislatures is down 35 percent from 2003.

And, while the reporters who remain continue as an invaluable service to our communities, frankly, they can't do it all, and, as a result, certain stories absolutely go unreported.

A joint study by the University of Notre Dame and the University of Illinois at Chicago found a connection between local newspaper closures and increased interest rates on local bonds. In fact, the study found that the closure of a local newspaper results in local taxpayers paying an extra \$650,000 in interest per loan.

That is \$650,000 in local taxpayer dollars that could otherwise go to schools, police, firefighters, potholes, or any other of a host of local needs, all lost simply because they didn't have local newspapers watching out on local government.

We often talk in Congress about the fox guarding the henhouse, but in too many small and rural communities there is no one guarding at all.

At the end of the day, for the sake of our democracy, we need local newspapers. We need local reporters. We need our watchdogs doing what they do best. We need to find ways to protect local news outlets and help them thrive.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. DESAULNIER for highlighting this pressing issue affecting our communities and for having us here to discuss this tonight.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all my colleagues who have joined me today. We started an informal group, actually, after the instance that the congresswoman talked about in Denver.

The same ownership owns the Bay Area News Group and the Los Angeles News Group, and there were similar layoffs there.

And in the Bay Area, being there, but also being there seeing the demise of local news, seeing the Chronicle in San Francisco, still owned by a local publisher, but then having the rest of the newspapers—almost the entirety of what was the bedrock of local news outside of San Francisco, for the other 7 million residents in the Bay Area—almost 7 million people—they have seen these large layoffs like Denver has.

I will say that, in my native town of Lowell, Massachusetts, the same company owns that newspaper, and a similar event has happened there.

There is nothing wrong with people making money, wanting to make a larger return on their investment; however, this is, I would argue, a very unique institution for democracy.

As Jefferson said, "Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press. . . ."

As Brandeis said: How people get their information, these are not things that you can separate. They are mutually intertwined.

So, we need the ability to have this, and particularly for local government.

When I started almost 30 years ago in the city of Concord, California, with a population of about 130,000 people, there was a gentleman named Larry Spears who had written for years for the Oakland Tribune and then for our local newspaper, The Contra Costa Times, a county of about a million people—not a small county.

He was in the front row. There are still journalists in that front row, but we need people—and more of them—in every front row. Mr. Spears knew the relationships, how people got elected to city council, who was appointed to the planning commission. Having him there made a difference.

It is human nature that, if you don't have someone watching, you are going to have human nature sometimes do things that it wouldn't if somebody who was professionally charged and trained to be able to explain to the general public what is happening and why it is happening was there.

People will talk about the truth and deep truth, "truth" being the simple explanation of what actually happened and "deep truth" being the meaning of why people took those physical actions.

This is what journalism is about. It is both being able to explain why a legislator or a city council member or a county supervisor did what they did and why they voted. But, as important is understanding why they did it. Did they do it for the reasons that they said that were part of the agenda items, or were there other influences

behind their thoughts? And, can we explain ourselves so that the public can understand why we took that choice.

And the ability of somebody to be able to communicate in an objective way what we say is important to democracy.

So, I hope that today is the beginning of a discussion. Mr. CICILLINE talked about his bill that I am proud to be a coauthor of that we introduced today. I think it is probably the most important.

We have many, many newspapers supporting it. We hope that there will be, obviously, a wave of support. Editorial boards, we ask for your help. Any interested citizen can contact my office. I have a simple name to remember as far as Googling it.

Let us know how you can help. If you are at a journalism school, if you are a journalist and you have ideas, give us ideas. These are constitutionally difficult issues.

The Congress shouldn't be, as Congresswoman DEGETTE said, deciding how the First Amendment is orchestrated, I should say, or organized. But we should be supportive because, if we are successful, it is because of independent journalism out there.

I would say that it is important that we have people who write, so that people who read and cognitively accept complicated issues will not become lazy.

We often get told that it is about our messaging, but messaging is a two-way street. It requires the person who is speaking, or writing, to be able to communicate in a succinct, profound, empathy-filled way, but it also requires us, as citizens, to be listening and understand that sometimes issues are complicated.

Well, how do you find that out? I would opine, as Mr. Postman did in 1985, that—and we know more about this now in terms of neuroscience and cognitive development and exercise—the more we read, the more we practice at our writing skills, the more we practice at our communication skills in general, the deeper our knowledge and the greater our capacity, cognitively, to understand and problem-solve.

So I would make the hope that this is the beginning of something that we will do good bipartisan work on and will allow for newspapers, as Jefferson said, to allow for democracy to exist and to prosper.

And lastly, in Lincoln's comment that I started with when he said: If you let the people know the facts, the country will be safe—our Speaker has a favorite quote where she says another Lincoln quote that says: Public opinion means everything. No statute, no public proclamation, Lincoln said, has any meaning if the people do not support it and it has their sentiment.

I would argue this other quote from Lincoln is equally as important: If the American people know the facts, the country will be safe.

We need to provide the professional journalism to make sure they get those facts.

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

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE CLIMATE CRISIS FOR THE 116TH CONGRESS

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, April 2, 2019.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER, Pursuant to Rule XI, Clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I respectfully submit the rules for the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis in the 116th Congress for publication in the Congressional Record. The Select Committee adopted these rules by voice vote, with a quorum being present, at our organizational meeting on Thursday, March 28, 2019.

Sincerely,

KATHY CASTOR,
Chair.

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The provisions of section 104(f) of H. Res. 6 (116th Congress) governing the proceedings of the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee") are hereby incorporated by reference and nothing herein shall be construed as superseding any provision of that section. The Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee to the extent that they are not inconsistent with that title.

(b) The rules of the Committee shall be made publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Committee adopts its rules.

RULE 2. MEETINGS.

(a) In General.—

(1) The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the first Tuesday of every month when the House is in session in accordance with clause 2(b) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. If the House is not in session on the first Tuesday of a month, the regular meeting date shall be the third Tuesday of that month. A regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chair of the Committee, there is no need for the meeting.

(2) Additional meetings may be called by the Chair of the Committee as the Chair considers necessary, in accordance with clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Meetings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by a member designated by the Chair to carry out such duties.

(c) Notification.—

(1) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chair shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of a Committee meeting (other than a hearing), which may not commence earlier than the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which members have notice thereof.

(2) The agenda for each Committee meeting, setting out all items of business to be considered, shall be established by the Chair and provided to each member of the Committee at least 36 hours (exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in advance of the commencement of such meeting.

(d) The requirements of paragraph (c) may be waived by a majority vote of those present, a quorum being present, or by the Chair with the concurrence of the Ranking Member. If the requirements of paragraph (c) are waived, the Chair shall notify the members of the Committee at the earliest possible time.

RULE 3. HEARINGS.

(a) Announcement of Hearings.—

(1) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chair shall announce the date, time, place, and subject matter of any hearing of the Committee, which may not commence earlier than one week after such notice.

(2) A hearing may commence sooner than specified in (a)(1) if the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Member, determines there is good cause or the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present. The Chair shall announce the hearing at the earliest possible time.

(b) Written Witness Statement; Oral Testimony.—

(1) Filing of Statement.—To the greatest extent practicable, each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the clerk of the Committee a written statement of his or her proposed testimony at least two business days in advance of his or her appearance. The clerk of the Committee shall distribute this testimony to the Members of the Committee as soon as is practicable and at least one business day before the hearing. The requirements of this subparagraph may be waived or modified by the Chair after consultation with the Ranking Member.

(2) Each witness shall limit his or her oral presentation of testimony to no more than five minutes.

(3) Truth in Testimony.—Each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include with the written statement of his or her proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of any Federal grants or contracts or foreign government contracts and payments related to the subject matter of the hearing received during the current calendar year or either of the two preceding calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness. The disclosure shall include (A) the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing; and (B) the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

(4) Availability of Information.—Statements filed under this paragraph shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

(c) Notification of Subject Matter.—As soon as practicable but no later than 36 hours before the commencement of a hearing, the Chair shall make available to the public and all Members of the Committee a concise summary of the subject matter under consideration at the hearing, any relevant reports from departments or agencies on such matters, and a list of witnesses, including minority witnesses.

(d) Minority Witnesses.—When any hearing is conducted by the Committee on any measure or matter, the minority party members on the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chair by a majority of those members, to call at least one witness, as selected by the minority members, to testify with respect to that measure or matter along with witnesses selected by the Chair.

(e) Opening Statements.—

(1) Chair and Ranking Member.—At any hearing of the Committee, the Chair and

Ranking Member shall each control five minutes for opening statements. The Chair and Ranking Member may recognize other members within their respective five minutes.

(2) Other Members.—The Chair may allow other members of the Committee to deliver oral opening statements, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the Ranking Member. Such statements shall not exceed five minutes in length and are to be equally distributed between majority and minority members to the extent practicable given the party makeup of the members present. Members not recognized by the Chair for oral opening statements may submit written opening statements for the record.

(f) Questioning of Witnesses.—The Chair shall initiate the right to question witnesses before the Committee, followed by the Ranking Member and all other members thereafter.

(1) Order of Member Recognition.—The right to question the witnesses before the Committee shall alternate between majority and minority members. A member of the Committee may question a witness only when recognized by the Chair for that purpose. The Chair shall recognize in order of appearance members who were not present when the meeting was called to order after all members who were present when the meeting was called to order have been recognized in the order of seniority on the Committee.

(2) Procedures for Questioning of Witnesses by Members.—Each member shall be limited to 5 minutes in the questioning of witnesses and shall limit his or her remarks to the subject matter of the hearing. After consultation with the Ranking Member, the Chair may recognize members who have already had an opportunity to question the witness for a second period of 5 minutes once each member of the Committee present has been recognized once for that purpose.

(3) Extended Questioning of Witnesses by Members.—Following the questioning of witnesses described in (f)(2) above, the Chair, with the concurrence of the Ranking Member or the Committee by motion, may permit a specified number of members to question one or more witnesses for a specified period of time not to exceed 60 minutes in the aggregate, equally divided between and controlled by the Chair and the Ranking Member.

(4) Questions for the Record.—Each member may submit to the Chair additional questions for the record to be answered by the witnesses who have appeared. Each member shall provide a copy of the questions in an electronic format to the Committee no later than 10 business days following a hearing. The Chair shall transmit all questions received from members of the Committee to the appropriate witnesses and include the transmittal letter and the responses from the witnesses in the hearing record. After consultation with the Ranking Member, the Chair is authorized to close the hearing record no earlier than 15 business days from the date the questions were transmitted to the appropriate witnesses.

(g) Hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by a member designated by the Chair to carry out such duties.

(h) Oaths.—The Chair of the Committee, or a member designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to any witness before the Committee. The Chair or his or her designee may administer the following oath to all witnesses prior to receiving testimony: "Do you solemnly swear or affirm, under penalty of law, that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?"

(i) Claims of Privilege.—Claims of common-law privilege made by witnesses in hearings, or by interviewees in investigations or inquiries, are applicable only at the discretion of the Chair, subject to appeal to the Committee.

RULE 4. OPEN PROCEEDINGS.

(a) Meetings for the transaction of business and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public, including radio, television, and still photography coverage, unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) The audio and video coverage of Committee proceeding permitted under clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

RULE 5. REPORTS.

(a) Approval of Official Committee Reports.—Any report completed pursuant to section 104(f)(5) of H. Res. 6 (116th Congress) that purports to express the views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the Committee must be approved by a majority vote of the Committee at a meeting at which a quorum is present, in accordance with Committee Rule 7(a)(3). The total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those voting for and against, shall be included in the Committee report on the matter.

(b) Notice of Committee Reports.—Any report described in (a) shall not be considered in the Committee unless the proposed report has been available to the members of the Committee for at least three business days before consideration of such report in the Committee.

(c) Additional Views.—If, at the time of approval of a report, a member of the Committee gives notice of intent to file supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views for inclusion in the report, all members of the Committee shall be entitled to no less than two business days after such notice to file such views following clause 2(1) of rule XI and clause 3(a)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

(d) Availability of Publications.—Pursuant to clause 2(e)(4) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form to the maximum extent feasible. Pursuant to sections 104(f)(5) and 104(f)(6) of H. Res. 6 (116th Congress), the Committee shall make its publications available to the general public in widely accessible formats not later than 30 calendar days following the respective dates for completion.

RULE 6. COMMITTEE RECORDS.

(a) Availability.—Documents reflecting the proceedings of the Committee shall be made publicly available in electronic form on the Committee's website and in the Committee office for inspection by the public, as provided in clause 2(e) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, within 48 hours of such recorded vote after each meeting has adjourned, including a record showing those present at each meeting; and a record of the vote on any question on which a recorded vote is demanded, including a description of the motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members of the Committee present but not voting.

(b) Archived Records.—The records of the Committee deposited at the National Archives shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chair shall notify the Ranking Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of such rule, to withhold a record otherwise available. Upon

written request of any member of the Committee, the Chair shall present the matter to the Committee for a determination, which shall be subject to the same requirements for conduct of Committee business under Committee Rule 2.

RULE 7. QUORUMS AND RECORDED VOTES; POSTPONEMENT OF VOTES

(a) Establishment of a Quorum.—
(1) For the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence, no fewer than two members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(2) A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for those actions for which the Rules of the House of Representatives require a majority quorum.

(3) A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for issuing an official Committee report pursuant to Rule 5 of the Committee rules and section 104(f)(5) of H. Res. 6 (116th Congress).

(4) For the purposes of taking any other action, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(b) Recorded Votes.—A recorded vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present.

(c) Postponement of Votes.—Pursuant to clause 2(h)(4) of the Rules of the House, the Chair, after consultation with the Ranking Member, may postpone further proceedings when a recorded vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment and may resume proceedings on a postponed vote at any time after reasonable notice to Members by the Clerk or other designee of the Chair. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

RULE 8. COMMITTEE STAFF.

(a) Professional and other staff of the Committee are subject to the provisions of clause 9 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Majority Staff.—The Chair shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the employees of the Committee not assigned to the minority. The staff of the Committee not assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chair, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he or she determines appropriate.

(c) Minority Staff.—The Ranking Member shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the staff assigned to the minority within the budget approved for such purposes.

The staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Member, who may delegate any authority he or she determines appropriate.

(d) The Chair and Ranking Member have the right to secure one or more detailees to assist with the work of the Committee.

RULE 9. BUDGET.

(a) The Chair, in consultation with the Ranking Member, shall prepare a budget providing amounts for staff, committee travel, field hearings, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee. Funds authorized for the Committee as provided in clause 6 of Rule X are for expenses incurred in the activities of the Committee.

(b) Consistent with clause 9 of Rule X, the Chair shall designate an amount equal to 1/3 of the amount provided to the Committee in the primary expense resolution adopted by

the House of Representatives to be under the direction of the Ranking Member for the compensation of the minority staff, travel expenses of minority members and staff, and minority office expenses. All expenses of minority members and staff shall be paid for out of the amount so set aside.

RULE 10. TRAVEL.

(a) The Chair may authorize travel for any member and any staff member of the Committee in connection with activities or subject matters under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the Committee for any member of staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chair. Before such authorization is granted, there shall be submitted to the Chair in writing the following:

- (1) The purpose of the travel.
- (2) The dates during which the travel is to occur.
- (3) The names of the states or countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each.
- (4) An agenda of anticipated activities.
- (5) The names of members and staff of the Committee for whom the authorization is sought.

(b) Members and staff of the Committee shall make a written report to the Chair on any travel they have conducted under this subsection, including a description of their itinerary, expenses, and activities, and of pertinent information gained as a result of such travel.

(c) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, and regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration.

RULE 11. WEBSITE.

The Chair shall maintain an official Committee website for the purpose of carrying out the official responsibilities of the Committee, including communicating information about the Committee's activities. The Ranking Member may maintain a minority website. To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form on the official Committee website maintained by the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 3, 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:

588. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Scrapie in Sheep and Goats [Docket No.: APHIS-2007-0127] (RIN: 0579-AC92) received March 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

589. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Amendments to the Capital Plan Rule [Regulations Y; Docket No.: R-1653] (RIN 7100-AF41) received March 29, 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.

590. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — LPTV, TV Translator, and FM Broadcast Station Reimbursement [MB Docket No.: 18-214]; Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions [GN Docket No.: 12-268] received March 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.

591. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Standards Branch, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulfur Operations on the Outer Continental Shelf-Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustment [Docket ID: BSEE-2019-0001; 190E1700D2 ETISF0000.EAQ000 EEEEE500000] (RIN: 1014-AA42) received March 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 639. A bill to amend section 327 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that National Urban Search and Rescue Response System task forces may include Federal employees (Rept. 116-29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 16. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition (Rept. 116-30). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 19. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby (Rept. 116-31). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. SCANLON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 281. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-32). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER):

H.R. 2019. A bill to provide for a smart water resource management pilot program; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee (for himself and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 2020. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to require a person that possesses or intends to possess a tableting machine or encapsulating machine to obtain

registration from the Attorney General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. YARMUTH (for himself and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 2021. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and to establish a congressional budget for fiscal year 2020; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. BUCSHON:

H.R. 2022. A bill to establish certain procurement procedures with respect to businesses wholly-owned through an ESOP, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Small Business, 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. HECK (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BARR, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COOK, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HURD of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 2023. A bill to require reports by the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence relating to construction of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. RESCIENTHALER:

H.R. 2024. A bill to require a five-year staffing plan for the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois:

H.R. 2025. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the alternative fuel refueling property credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 2026. A bill to address the needs of individuals with disabilities within the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2027. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the President to place any financial conflicts of interest into a blind trust, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2028. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to prohibit individuals who threaten to destroy the Government from participating in or attending meetings of the National Security Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Oversight and Reform, for a period

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

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COLE, Mr. COOK, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas):

H.R. 2029. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report on the response of law enforcement agencies to reports of missing or murdered Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. CURTIS, Ms. DEGLETTE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HORSFORD, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STEWART, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 2030. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to execute and carry out agreements concerning Colorado River Drought Contingency Management and Operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Mr. COLE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HECK, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 2031. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 2032. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate overpayments of income tax for disaster relief; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. HILL of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. WESTERMAN):

H.R. 2033. A bill to release to the State of Arkansas a reversionary interest in Camp Joseph T. Robinson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 2034. A bill to improve the treatment of Federal prisoners who are primary caretaker parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 2035. A bill to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 2036. A bill to provide protections for amateur and professional athletes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MALINOWSKI:

H.R. 2037. A bill to encourage accountability for the murder of Washington Post columnist Jamal Khashoggi; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to

the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2038. A bill to allow State-based, market-oriented, prescription drug negotiations to lower pharmaceutical drug prices, to encourage competition, to increase consumer choice and access, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2039. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit discrimination in the payment of wages on account of sex, race, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WENSTRUP, Ms. SPEIER, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 2040. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make fuel cells using electromechanical processes eligible for the energy tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 2041. A bill to reauthorize the weatherization assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ROUDA):

H.R. 2042. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain tax credits related to electric cars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that female athletes be paid the same as their male counterparts and organizers of world-class competitions actively take part in combating the wage gap; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. FRANKEL (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. BEYER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SCHRIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. PALONE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COX of California, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. OMAR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RASKIN, Mr.

NEGUSE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. HECK, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. COOPER, Ms. HAALAND, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. TITUS, Ms. DEAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. BASS, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. CASE):

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of equal pay and the disparity between wages paid to men and women; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself and Mr. BRADY):

H. Res. 280. A resolution protecting the health care of all Americans, especially those with preexisting conditions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H. Res. 282. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the importance of local print and digital journalism to the continued welfare, transparency, and prosperity of government at every level and the continuation and freedom of the United States as it is known today; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 283. A resolution condemning racism in sports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 284. A resolution opposing fake news and alternative facts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

15. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, relative to House Resolution No. 109, urging the United States Congress to enact comprehensive legislation to combat call spoofing; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 2019.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 2020.

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

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 2021.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18; and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 2022.

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

Art. 1 Sec. 8 Clause 3

By Mr. HECK:

H.R. 2023.

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

Clauses 3 and 18 of article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RESCHENTHALER:

H.R. 2024.

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

Article I Section 8

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois:

H.R. 2025.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 2026.

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. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2027.

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

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

“The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof” and

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

“The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;”

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 2028.

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

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 18:

“The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof” and

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

“The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;”

By Mr. GALLEG0:

H.R. 2029.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2030.

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

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Cont. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rule and Regulations respecting the Territory of other Property belonging to the United States;

By Ms. HAALAND:

H.R. 2031.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 2032.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas:

H.R. 2033.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 2034.

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 Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 2035.

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

Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. LAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 2036.

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

Article 1, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MALINOWSKI:

H.R. 2037.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2038.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 "The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce . . . among the several States . . ."

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 2039.

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

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 2040.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2041.

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;

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2042.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

- H.R. 9: Mr. PETERS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. MENG, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILD, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CASE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 94: Ms. SCANLON.
- H.R. 95: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. CORREA.
- H.R. 96: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mrs. CRAIG.
- H.R. 141: Mr. BRINDISI.
- H.R. 230: Mrs. MCBATH.
- H.R. 336: Mr. FLORES.
- H.R. 344: Mr. TIPTON, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. LONG.
- H.R. 372: Mr. VAN DREW.
- H.R. 500: Mr. STAUBER, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. LAMALFA.
- H.R. 530: Mr. BRINDISI.
- H.R. 535: Mr. SOTO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. MENG.
- H.R. 541: Mr. NEAL.
- H.R. 553: Mr. MARSHALL.
- H.R. 594: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 597: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 663: Mr. MARSHALL.
- H.R. 677: Ms. SCANLON.
- H.R. 678: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 692: Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. COLE, Mr. BOST, and Mr. MCCAUL.
- H.R. 693: Mr. STAUBER.
- H.R. 724: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
- H.R. 748: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BARR, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
- H.R. 803: Mr. BYRNE.
- H.R. 810: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LEVIN of California, and Mr. SARBANES.
- H.R. 838: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BERA, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
- H.R. 864: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. PANETTA.
- H.R. 884: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. JOHN-SON of South Dakota.
- H.R. 929: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. RASKIN.
- H.R. 935: Mr. BRINDISI and Mr. CLEAVER.
- H.R. 938: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 946: Mr. PASCRELL.
- H.R. 959: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 960: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 965: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 979: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
- H.R. 986: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

- H.R. 987: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 1002: Mr. STAUBER.
- H.R. 1006: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. GIANFORTE.
- H.R. 1007: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 1010: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SHALALA, and Mr. VAN DREW.
- H.R. 1025: Mr. RASKIN.
- H.R. 1030: Ms. SCANLON and Ms. FRANKEL.
- H.R. 1034: Mr. BYRNE.
- H.R. 1035: Mr. BUDD.
- H.R. 1043: Mr. POCAN and Mrs. LURIA.
- H.R. 1044: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SHERRILL, and Mr. PENCE.
- H.R. 1050: Mr. PAPPAS.
- H.R. 1052: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. JACK-SON LEE.
- H.R. 1096: Mr. KATKO, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. BUCSHON.
- H.R. 1101: Mr. BACON, Mr. BARR, and Mr. BUCSHON.
- H.R. 1109: Mr. VEASEY.
- H.R. 1114: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
- H.R. 1135: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
- H.R. 1139: Mr. NEAL, Mr. BRINDISI, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. KIM, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1146: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. PAPPAS.
- H.R. 1156: Mr. KATKO.
- H.R. 1175: Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
- H.R. 1182: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Ms. MENG.
- H.R. 1183: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Ms. MENG.
- H.R. 1186: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
- H.R. 1222: Mr. BUDD.
- H.R. 1223: Ms. OMAR.
- H.R. 1224: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MENG, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. WATERS.
- H.R. 1225: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. GOODEN.
- H.R. 1297: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1309: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. SHALALA, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CASE, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 1311: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 1346: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 1365: Ms. OMAR, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BACON, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
- H.R. 1370: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 1373: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
- H.R. 1379: Mr. GOSAR.
- H.R. 1385: Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. HOULAHAN.
- H.R. 1386: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 1407: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
- H.R. 1411: Mr. PASCRELL.
- H.R. 1425: Mr. CASE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. BRINDISI.
- H.R. 1426: Mr. CRENSHAW.
- H.R. 1450: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. COOPER, Ms. BASS, and Ms. FRANKEL.
- H.R. 1458: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
- H.R. 1503: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PAL-LONE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KEN-NEDY, Ms. MATSUI, and Mrs. CRAIG.
- H.R. 1520: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. VAN DREW.
- H.R. 1530: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1545: Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. BRINDISI, Ms. MENG, and Mr. JORDAN.
 H.R. 1553: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 1560: Mr. SABLAN.
 H.R. 1570: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. COX of California, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. BOST, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. STAUBER.
 H.R. 1595: Mr. BRINDISI and Mr. STEUBE.
 H.R. 1611: Mr. MEADOWS.
 H.R. 1618: Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 1629: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
 H.R. 1643: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 1673: Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 1679: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RYAN, Mr. HUDSON, and Mrs. WAGNER.
 H.R. 1682: Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1690: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mrs. MCBATH.
 H.R. 1695: Mr. PHILLIPS.
 H.R. 1713: Ms. OMAR, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. STEUBE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1722: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 1730: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 1738: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 1741: Mr. BARR, Mr. LATTA, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BOST, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
 H.R. 1748: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 1753: Mr. SCALISE.
 H.R. 1757: Ms. SCANLON.
 H.R. 1763: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. ROUDA.
 H.R. 1767: Ms. OMAR and Ms. SCANLON.
 H.R. 1771: Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 1799: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 1807: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 1832: Mr. LUJÁN and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H.R. 1854: Mr. MEADOWS.
 H.R. 1855: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 1868: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HILL of California, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 1869: Mr. ESTES, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1878: Mr. DEFazio and Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 1879: Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 1884: Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr.

SMITH of Washington, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. OMAR, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LEVIN of California, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1895: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. RYAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1904: Mr. AMODEL, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BUCK, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 1911: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 1914: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1922: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1934: Mr. QUIGLEY and Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 1935: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 1943: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1944: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. COLE, and Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 1952: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1963: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 2000: Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 2002: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2010: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. BRADY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. WRIGHT.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. HUIZENGA.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H. Res. 54: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STANTON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H. Res. 60: Mr. HORSFORD.

H. Res. 100: Mr. MAST, Mr. BOST, Mr. STANTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. WOODALL.

H. Res. 179: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H. Res. 189: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 220: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BERA, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 221: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BERA, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 222: Mr. KIND, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BERA, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H. Res. 246: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CRIST, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. WILD, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. KIM, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. MEEKS.

H. Res. 250: Mr. COHEN, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. GOMEZ.

H. Res. 254: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SHALALA, and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H. Res. 255: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 261: Mr. OLSON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 270: Mr. STEUBE.

H. Res. 271: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. COOPER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. PORTER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PAPPAS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. VELA, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TRONE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. COX of California, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. MENG, Mr. WELCH, Ms. FINKENAUER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KIM, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SIRES, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. COSTA, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. STANTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. WILD, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BASS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. DEAN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, and Ms. TLAIB.

H. Res. 276: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. PASCRELL.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative HAKEEM JEFFRIES, or a designee, to H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 2019

No. 57

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

O God, who has been our help in ages past and our hope for years to come, keep our lawmakers under the canopy of Your care. We do not ask You to separate them from life's stresses and strains but to keep them by Your grace amid sunshine and shadow.

Lord, shelter them in their coming in, in their going out, and in their daily work, that they may be Your instruments to advance Your Kingdom. May they call You during turbulent times, claiming Your promise to deliver them. Encompass them with the everlasting arms of Your love and grace that never fail.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

IMPROVING PROCEDURES FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE SENATE—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. Res. 50, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 50) improving procedures for the consideration of nominations in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

H.R. 268

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I would like to speak for 1 minute.

Senate Democrats yesterday blocked a bill that provides much needed funds for Puerto Rico's nutrition program, also, aid for the 2018 hurricanes and wildfires and, thirdly, assistance to Midwest States in the midst of a flood crisis. That includes, at least, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and maybe other States.

Now, the people who voted against it say it was because they care about Puerto Rico. The bill they blocked takes care of the urgent funding shortfalls there in that Commonwealth. Playing politics with disaster aid does a disservice to the people of Puerto Rico and the people of States like Iowa who are suffering right now from these floods.

Why would these Senators want to come to campaign in Iowa when they don't show sympathy for Iowans suffering from the floods with the vote they cast last night?

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

H.R. 268

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, last night the Senate had an opportunity to pass an important package of disaster relief funding for communities all across our country. Unfortunately, it didn't happen. Our Democratic colleagues voted down the efforts of Chairman SHELBY and Senator PERDUE to put together a comprehensive package, and it remains unfinished business.

As recently as 1 month ago, some congressional Democrats had expressed a clear commitment to immediate, bipartisan action on disaster relief, and the package considered yesterday represented a long list of priorities from actually both sides of the aisle—the only such list that had the President's explicit support.

It would have helped local schools, hospitals, and transportation infrastructure get back up and running, farmers and ranchers recoup losses, and our Nation's military restore readiness at bases and installations in harm's way. It would have been an immediate and significant step forward for the coastal communities of Florida and the Carolinas that are still picking up the pieces after a devastating hurricane season and for the western communities, as well, besieged by wildfires, for the families in Puerto Rico who rely on nutrition assistance that is dwindling, for those in the path of last month's tornadoes in Alabama and Georgia, and for large swathes of the heartland still grappling with floodwaters.

So I am disappointed that political games carried the day yesterday, but I assure the American people that our work on this subject is far from finished.

NOMINATIONS

Madam President, on another matter, 217 days—217 days—is how long has elapsed between President Trump's sending the Senate his nomination for a Federal Railroad Administrator and

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2163

this body's confirming him. For 217 days, a 45-year veteran of the railroad sat with unquestioned expertise sat and sat on the Senate calendar. He wasn't controversial. He had been voice-voted out of committee. He was the kind of nominee on which even the prospect of having to file cloture should have been laughable, but my Democratic colleagues wouldn't let him get a vote.

Finally, after about 7 months and several high-profile railway accidents, our colleagues across the aisle finally relented and let this nominee go forward. After all those months of obstruction, not a single one of them ended up recording a vote against him. No one voted against him. So it was 217 days for an unquestionably qualified nominee for a seriously important job whom literally no one really opposed.

Call it a case study in the Senate's dysfunction when it comes to President Trump's nominees. If anything, the case study actually is not extreme enough because at least this person was eventually confirmed without a completely pointless cloture vote, followed by even more time supposedly debating a nominee on whom Senators do not actually disagree.

Perhaps more illustrative might be the cases of unobjectionable district court nominees whose nominations were slow-walked through months of idle time, only to receive unanimous support when it finally came for confirmation votes.

Last January, four such nominations came before the Senate. Each was non-controversial. Each was well-qualified. Each, nevertheless, required a cloture vote. Yet after weeks on the calendar, each passed without drawing a single "no" vote. No one opposed them, and yet it took a week.

These were four of the historic 128 cloture votes on nominations we had to hold on nominations in this administration's first 2 years—128. This is comprehensive, across-the-board heel-dragging like nobody in this body has ever seen before. It is more than five times—five times—as many cloture votes on nominations as in the comparative periods—listen to this—for Presidents Carter, Reagan, Bush, Clinton, Bush, and Obama combined—combined. In other words, it is systematic obstruction, not targeted, thoughtful opposition to a few marquee nominations or rare circumstances but a grinding, across-the-board effort to delay and obstruct the people this President puts up, even if they have unquestionable qualifications and even if the job is relatively low-profile.

As I said last week, I am sure every Presidential election this side of George Washington has left some Senators unhappy with the outcome, but never before, to my knowledge, has the unhappy group so comprehensively tried to stop a new President from assembling the very basics of an administration—hundreds and hundreds of days in Senate purgatory for uncontroversial nominees to mid-level

posts and months of delay for lower court nominees who go on to receive unanimous confirmation votes.

This behavior is novel. It is a break from Senate tradition, and it is something this body needs to address, not just for the sake of this President but for future Presidents of any party, because at this rate, the Senate is flirting with a dangerous new norm.

Today it may be Senate Democrats who are intent on endlessly relitigating the 2016 election and holding up all of these qualified people, but absent a change, these tactics seem guaranteed to become standard practice for Senate minorities on both sides. I don't think any of us want that future.

We need to stop things from deteriorating further. We need to fix this. We need to let the President assemble his team and let the American people have the government they actually voted for. We need to turn back toward the Senate's institutional tradition in this vital area for the sake of the Nation's future.

My Republican colleagues and I joined with Democrats back in 2013 and supported the same sort of modest changes to our nominations process through the same sort of standing order. Were we overjoyed that President Obama had just won reelection? No, but we still thought he deserved to stand up a government. So a big bipartisan majority—I voted for it—including the leaders of both parties agreed to trim the postcloture time on lower-level nominees. I was the minority leader. It was a Democratic President. I voted for it.

Supreme Court nominees weren't touched, nor circuit courts, nor top executive branch posts, but for district court judges and lower-level executive jobs, even as Republicans were in the minority, many of us agreed to test out an abbreviated process for President Obama's nominees.

The process that we agreed to then is very similar to the resolution the Senate will vote on later today. As I have discussed, Senators BLUNT and LANKFORD have proposed a similar set of changes to fix the current mess that would also become permanent going forward. Their resolution would make the Senate more functional and more consistent. The rules that were good enough for President Obama's second term would also apply under President Trump and every other President into the future.

I would submit to my colleagues that a modest reform like this is either a good idea or it isn't. The answer can't be flip-flop back and forth depending upon which party occupies the White House.

So I will conclude this way. I believe that every one of my colleagues knows that our present situation is unhealthy for this body and for any administration. I believe every Member of this body knows that the precedent that is being set is unsustainable.

So, look, I would urge all of our colleagues on both sides: Why don't we do

the right thing for the Senate? Let's show the country that partisanship is not poison to absolutely everything. Let's demonstrate that the U.S. Senate can still take a modest step to improve its own workings on a strong bipartisan vote and do it through regular order. We did it in 2013 when the roles were reversed. We should do it again this week.

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

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

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, we have spent a great deal of time in my time in the Senate talking about immigration and the situation along the southwestern border. My State has 1,200 miles of common border with Mexico, so obviously this is very personal to me and my constituents who live and work along the border.

We have been caught up in a lot of semantics and more than a little politics in Washington, DC, debating what is a wall versus a fence, what is a crisis versus an emergency—just some of the semantics we have been caught up in—but it doesn't take a rocket scientist or an expert to see there are a lot of problems occurring at the border today. I hope, if there is one thing we can all agree on, it is that there is in fact a problem that needs to be solved at the border, whether you want to call it a crisis like President Obama did or whether you want to call it an emergency like President Trump.

Last week, the Secretary of Homeland Security sent a letter to Congress detailing the record number of apprehensions along the southern border. Secretary Nielsen noted that Border Patrol was apprehending between 50,000 and 60,000 a month late last year. Last month, it was 76,000, the highest in a decade. At the time of her letter, she said we were on track to interdict nearly 100,000 during the month of March—so almost essentially double from late last year until this coming month. Unsurprisingly, Customs and Border Protection personnel are not equipped to handle these record numbers.

Forty percent of the Border Patrol's manpower is spent processing migrants and providing care and transportation. These are, by and large, asylum seekers from Central America. In fact, while the Border Patrol, our primary law enforcement agency providing border security, should be securing the border, many of them are processing unaccompanied children or family units, handing out diapers and juice boxes instead of doing the job they are trained to perform. They have been taken off the patrol line to do this kind of work, leaving areas of the border

vulnerable to exploitation by the drug cartels. One way the cartels use this huge volume of humanity coming across the border is to distract the law enforcement agencies from doing their job interdicting the drugs that are poisoning tens of thousands of Americans. We know 70,000 Americans died of drug overdoses last year—about half of those from opioids, including synthetic fentanyl and heroin—90 percent of which comes from Mexico.

The amount of people coming across now is so overwhelming that the El Paso Border Patrol Sector has temporarily shut down its highway checkpoints in the interior so agents can help process these individuals. Most of our Members may not realize, we not only have Border Patrol working at the border but also in the interior at checkpoints on major highways because frequently what will happen is people are smuggled through or drugs are smuggled through, and they have to go through checkpoints for a double check, at which time a lot of drugs and a lot of illegal immigrants are discovered.

Additionally, detention facilities are at or over capacity. These are relatively small because they are built to house single adults for a short period of time. The record surge of children and family units combined with the impact it has had on processing time has put a serious strain on their resources. As a result, the Department of Homeland Security has been forced to release families and adults from custody.

I was on a radio program last week in San Antonio, my hometown. It was said Border Patrol is so overwhelmed, they are essentially just putting people on buses and shipping them into the interior of the State and the country, not even processing them.

I have heard from officials at DHS and throughout the ranks of the Border Patrol that in order to keep up with this pace, they need our help. They need more personnel so law enforcement agencies can respond to the crisis, secure the border, and keep our country safe, as well as adequately and efficiently processing individuals who illegally cross the border. We also need additional facilities to house illegal immigrants in custody so we don't engage in the failed catch-and-release policy, which is just another pull factor to encourage more people to come. If they know they are not going to be detained and they are going to be released, that is an incentive for them to come and join this wave of humanity coming across the border. We should be able to enforce the law and properly care for migrants in custody, but inadequate resources are limiting DHS's ability to do both.

Ours is a compassionate country. We are a nation of immigrants. Everybody—almost everybody came from somewhere else at some point in their family history, but the only way we are going to be able to maintain that compassion and generosity, when it

comes to immigration, is by bringing some order out of chaos.

Many illegal immigrants know we are compassionate and generous, and they will take full advantage of the gaps in our border security and flaws in our immigration laws. The cartels—the criminal organizations that get rich moving people from Central America, across Mexico, into the United States—know for sure because they are exploiting those gaps and flaws in our immigration laws. It is not just the sheer numbers of people crossing the border that is concerning, it is the makeup of the people coming across.

We used to see primarily single adult males arriving from Mexico, and our current detention facilities reflect that, but now, because of the gaps and flaws in our immigration laws that are being exploited, people coming across are family units and unaccompanied children from Central American countries who almost uniformly claim asylum. That means they have to appear in front of an immigration judge at some point to have their claim assessed and adjudicated.

While there absolutely are legitimate families coming to our country for legitimate reasons, that is not the case for all the 36,000 family units apprehended last month alone.

Individuals crossing illegally know about the loopholes in our laws, as I said, and they know how to exploit them. For example, in 1997, the Flores settlement agreement determined that the Department of Homeland Security can only detain unaccompanied children for 20 days before releasing them to the Department of Health and Human Services, which in turn places them with sponsors—usually family members in the interior of the United States. Then they are given a notice to appear at an immigration hearing at some point in the future, but because of the backlog of cases, 98 percent of them don't show up. While this was unquestionably well-intentioned at the time, it has turned into a pull factor for illegal immigrants hoping to game the system, as well as the transnational criminal organizations that get rich engaging in this sort of trade.

In 2016, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals expanded the Flores agreement, effectively applying the settlement to family units and not just unaccompanied children. So now, rather than single adults arriving at the border alone, they are bringing children with them so they can pose as a family unit. They realize they can bring a child—any child—and pose as a family unit so they will be released within 20 days.

Sadly, Flores is not the only loophole being exploited. Another well-intentioned piece of legislation that is being abused is the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act or TVPRA. This legislation limits our ability to return unaccompanied children from countries other than Mexico or Canada to their home country.

These loopholes are an attraction or pull factor and encourage parents to send their children on the dangerous journey to our southern border alone or sometimes with a single parent or sometimes with a smuggler or human trafficker posing as a parent.

This isn't a symbiotic relationship, where the smuggler gets an honest day's pay and the migrant gets a comfortable ride to the United States. These smugglers are called coyotes for a reason; they are predators.

Children are being kidnapped to serve as a free ticket into the United States. They are often abused or raped along the way, and many arrive at our border in terrible health. We simply cannot allow these practices to continue with no response by Congress. We need to close the loopholes that are being used to unlawfully enter and remain in the United States and provide much needed protection for these vulnerable children.

If a pipe burst and caused your kitchen to flood, you wouldn't start by cleaning up the mess; you would start by fixing the pipe first. If we want to have any sort of impact on the massive numbers of people crossing our border, which will only grow, we have to look not just at the problem but at the root cause.

I would urge all of our colleagues on the other side to stop viewing this through a purely political lens. This is not a question of Trump wins, you lose or Trump loses and you win. I am afraid that defines a lot of our politics in Washington today. That is a terrible mistake and a disservice to the people we represent, and it is an embarrassment to an institution which is supposed to be the world's greatest deliberative body.

We need to view this together as the humanitarian crisis it is—President Obama called it that—and view it as a problem that will only continue to grow without our intervention, which it has. We need to view it as an urgent issue that requires our cooperation and, yes, our compromise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

BUDGET PROPOSAL

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I have a couple of matters I want to discuss.

Today, the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science is holding its annual hearing on the President's budget request, with the Department of Commerce, with representatives from the Department.

The representative from the Department that is invited, in my experience, has always been the Secretary—in this case, Wilbur Ross. This year, for as long as I can remember, with no public explanation, Secretary Ross declined the Subcommittee's invitation.

The Department of Commerce has a budget request for over \$12.2 billion but couldn't send over its Secretary to defend it. It is extraordinary that the

Secretary provided no justification to the Republican chairman of the committee for his actions. It is extraordinary to me that this Secretary believes he should be treated differently from other Secretaries. He believes he may not be held accountable before the American people.

Secretary Ross's absence is especially concerning to me, given the last time he appeared before the subcommittee. He blatantly, objectively, irrefutably misled me about a critical issue facing the Commerce Department. Perhaps he knew he would be asked about what he said last time and would be asked to tell us what is the truth.

A year ago, I asked Secretary Ross why he had marketed the proposed addition of a controversial citizenship question to the census as being necessary to enforce the Voting Rights Act. To claim that question was needed to enforce the law when the administration had no interest in enforcing it was actually laughable at the time. So I asked Secretary Ross why he had such a sudden interest in adding the question when the Department of Justice had not brought a single suit under section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

This was his response, and, remember, it is a crime to lie in your testimony before the Congress. He claimed the Justice Department is the one that made the request of the Commerce Department. He made similar claims before the House. He testified that Commerce was responding solely to the Department of Justice's request, and the Department of Justice made the request for the inclusion of the citizenship question.

Those are the claims Secretary Ross made, and all of those claims are false. This was proven as a result of emails obtained through a FOIA lawsuit. It was not something he was willing to bring forth, but they had to have a lawsuit to get the truth. We now know, Secretary Ross himself made the initial request to include the citizenship question. We know it was Secretary Ross who pressured the reluctant Justice Department to claim that such a question would be helpful to enforce the Voting Rights Act.

And now we know that the inclusion of this question, as many of us suspected from the beginning, was a nakedly political act, one that involves none other than Kris Kobach and Steve Bannon. The proof of all of this is in the emails. Just 1 year before I asked Secretary Ross about this issue, he wrote that he was "mystified why nothing had been done in response to my months old request that we include the citizenship question."

Well, I am mystified how Secretary Ross's testimony can be construed as anything other than blatantly misleading Congress. His testimony earned him four Pinocchios from the Washington Post.

Two courts have now declared that Secretary Ross's attempt to include

the citizenship question was illegal. One of them found that "in a startling number of ways, Secretary Ross's explanations for his decision were unsupported by, or even counter to, the evidence before the agency." That is a remarkable, but not surprising, declaration from the court.

So today I have a simple message for Secretary Ross: You are not an investment banker anymore. You serve the American people, and part of your job is being accountable to Congress and to the public. Trying to run from Congress will not solve your problems, and trying to hide from the truth will not either. The truth has a way of catching up with you. If you don't tell the truth, it eventually becomes obvious. Secretary Ross did not tell the truth.

S. RES. 50

Madam President, to say it is disappointing that the Senate is going to vote today in relation to the resolution to reduce postcloture debate on nominations is an understatement. This is actually a resolution in search of a problem. This is an erosion of the Senate's responsibility—in fact, our sworn constitutional duty—to advise and consent to the President's—any President's—nominations. It is a removal of one of the last guardrails for quality and bipartisanship in our nomination process. It is short sided. It is a partisan power grab, and it is motivated by the far right's desire to flood the Federal judiciary with young, ideological nominees, many of whom, as we have seen time and again in the Judiciary Committee, are simply unqualified to serve on our Nation's courts. We have seen nominees who have never been in a courtroom, and they are being nominated for lifetime judgeships.

Postcloture time is a critical tool for Senators, especially those who do not sit on the Judiciary Committee, to vet nominees for lifetime judgeships. In fact, last Congress, more than one nominee had to withdraw after scrutiny during this time led the Republicans withdrawing their support. We actually took the time to ask questions—an extra 20 minutes of questions, or an extra hour of questions. For somebody who is up for a lifetime appointment, I think that is what the American public pay us to do.

Unfortunately, for the Republican leadership the nominations process in the Senate is about quantity not quality. Let me give you an example. In the past 2 years, Republicans have disregarded the important role of the ABA. They denied them the time they needed to evaluate judicial nominees, or when they have evaluated them and they have come back saying they are unqualified, they have ignored that.

Republicans routinely stacked hearing panels with multiple circuit court nominees over Democrats' objections—something Democrats never did to Republicans. Republicans have even held several hearings over recess despite our objections. That is certainly something

I would never do when I was chairman if any Republican asked me not to.

Upon the White House's changing hands from a Democrat to a Republican, the Republicans abruptly changed the policy of the blue slips. There has been a long-held tradition of honoring blue slips from home State Senators on circuit court nominees. When I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I respected the input of all home State Senators, no matter whether we had a Democrat or Republican in the White House and no matter whether the Senator was a Republican or a Democrat. Republicans only seem to insist on honoring blue slips when a Democrat is in the White House.

When I was chairman with a Democratic President, every single Republican wrote a letter saying the blue slip was so sacred, and every single one of them wanted it to be upheld. It had to be upheld. Whoops, a Republican comes into the White House, and we don't need it any more. Look no further than the Judiciary Committee's markup this week, where they ignored the opposition of two home State Senators who are also members of the committee, including the Ranking Member, and will advance two circuit nominees for whom blue slips were not returned.

When Democrats were in charge, no Republican would condone that and no Democrat would make them have to face that. Yet they have turned it into a partisan rubberstamp. We are not being the conscience of the Nation.

Opponents to this resolution can say it is necessary to do this because of the slow pace with which President Trump's judicial nominations are being confirmed. Let's quickly review that. In his first 2 years, President Trump had more judicial nominations confirmed than President Obama did in his first 4 years. In just 2 years, we almost doubled the number of circuit court nominations confirmed compared to President Obama's first 4 years. In fact, President Trump had more circuit nominees confirmed in his first 2 years than President Obama, President George W. Bush, President Clinton, or President George H. W. Bush.

So I don't need lectures from Senators in this Chamber about the importance of judicial nominations or the methods by which Members could frustrate the confirmation process. I lived it. I have seen it. I have served here longer than any other Member of this body.

Regardless of whether it was a Republican President or a Democratic one, I respected the role of home State Senators, the role of the Senate as a whole, and our roles as individual Senators to evaluate the nomination before us.

In 2013, in a bipartisan vote, the Senate agreed to a resolution to reduce postcloture debate that was supposed to be good for the life of the 113th Congress, not the permanent rule change proposed by S. Res. 50. Let's remember

the facts, not just some of them. All the other guardrails of the nomination process were intact at the time. Nominations were thoroughly vetted by both the administration and the committees here in the Senate. Nominees were still subject to a 60-vote threshold for judicial nomination, including circuit nominees. Cloture was never filed on a day in which a nomination was reported on the floor. For judicial nominations, hearings were not continually stacked with multiple circuit court nominees, something both Republicans and Democrats agreed on. The prerogative of home State Senators and their in-State judicial selection committees—most of which are bipartisan—were respected both before and after the resolution.

I understand the Republican majority now wants to cry foul and accuse Democrats of needlessly holding up our confirmation process. I wish people had been here more than 2 years. I look back at the glacial pace with which Republicans allowed us to process judicial nominations for the first 6 years of the Obama administration.

From the very beginning, in 2009, Republicans inexplicably withheld their consent to consider President Obama's very first circuit nominee and one that was supported by his Republican home State Senator, the highly respected Richard Lugar.

I always look back at the shameful treatment of Merrick Garland to fill a critical vacancy on the Supreme Court. Never in the history of this country have we refused to allow a Supreme Court nominee to at least have a hearing and a vote until Merrick Garland. That was a political power grab that undermined the legitimacy of the Senate and the courts. This claim was made: We don't vote on Supreme Court nominees in an election year.

Well, of course we do. I remember almost all of us Republicans and Democrats voting on a nominee that President Ronald Reagan made in an election year when he was going to be leaving the Presidency. Looking back might provide a glimpse of history, but it will do little to restore the comity that was a hallmark of the Senate when I first came here—a hallmark which made the Senate seem like the conscience of the Nation, not a partisan political stamp.

Looking forward, this resolution will do little to restore the comity and will further polarize the Senate, which is supposed to be the world's greatest deliberative body. It will only further contribute to the politicization of our courts. The Federal courts are perceived throughout the world as above politics and are now being seen, more and more, as a political rubberstamp for President Trump.

When the Senate Rules Committee held a hearing to evaluate the proposal back in 2017, I remarked that the word "obstruction" had become a term thrown about in the Senate whenever unanimous consent was not provided.

"Duty," unfortunately, is a word we hear too little in this body.

Vermonters, time and again, give me their trust not only to represent Vermont values here in Washington but to protect the centuries-old institutions that have sustained our democracy and that made us the longest existing democracy currently in the world. The Senate is part of why that democracy still exists. The Senate should reject this resolution. We cannot abandon the traditions that made the Senate, at its very best, the conscience of the Nation in exchange for short-term political gain and going from the conscience of the Nation to a partisan rubberstamp. That is not the Senate that I admire. It is not the Senate that has been led by some of the best Republicans and Democrats I have known over my decades here. It is not the Senate we want to see in the history books.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Democratic leader is recognized.

H.R. 268

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the Senate failed to pass emergency relief funding yesterday to help the American families recovering from natural disasters. It failed for one reason—the Republicans removed critical aid for Puerto Rico and other territories from the House bill after President Trump told them to do it. Under this administration and with Leader MCCONNELL's blessing, even disaster relief has now become political.

I don't need to litigate why we are here. Over the last 2 years, the American people have endured staggering natural disasters that have devastated communities across the country. These Americans need help. They need help now. I would parenthetically add, if there were ever evidence of global warming or of climate change, this would be it despite the fact that just about every Republican has his head or her head in the sand and will not admit it.

Regardless of what you think the causes were, Americans have always stood together when American citizens have been hit by disaster. We band together and say we are going to help one another—all American citizens, all. Yet one part of America is not being treated like the others, and why not? It is because President Trump, for reasons that defy decency, harbors an apparent contempt for the people of Puerto Rico. He tweeted again last night and erroneously claimed that \$91 billion has been afforded the people of Puerto Rico. He ridiculed the leadership that has desperately tried to rebuild the island in the wake of these megastorms.

Let's get the facts straight.

The Republicans know the storms that hit Puerto Rico over a year ago were not ordinary storms; they know these were historic catastrophes. We

are talking about the deadliest disasters to hit American soil in over a century. We are talking about the worst power outage in American history. We are talking about 3,000 lives lost. Yet here we are, 18 months later, and the island hasn't recovered.

It is surreal that a disaster so awful has been met with a Presidential response that is so tepid and so heartless. It is surreal that our Republican colleagues go along with this and say we are not going to help Puerto Rico in the way that is needed. Billions in funding for recovery and mitigation efforts right now remain locked in the Treasury. Congress already appropriated \$20 billion that the administration has not allocated. All we want to do is make sure the money is allocated. That is one of the things we want to do.

Are our Republican colleagues opposed to that? That is what it sounds like. Some of them say it is political. What is political is President Trump's saying no aid for Puerto Rico and having the Republicans jump in line, even those with many Puerto Ricans in their States. Make no mistake, we have reached this impasse because the President has said himself he opposes help for Puerto Rico, and the Republicans follow along.

Some of my colleagues from the other side came up with another shibboleth; that we opposed the House bill because it didn't provide funding for the Midwest. First of all, the House bill was aimed at disasters in 2018, not in 2019. Second, Senator LEAHY offered an amendment that would have added funding for the Middle West and funding for Puerto Rico. What did the Republicans do? They blocked it anyway. So this undoes their fantasy that the Democrats are opposed to aid for the Middle West. Senator LEAHY and I will be offering an amendment that will give aid to the Midwest and to Puerto Rico. Let's see where our Republican colleagues stand. Will they block that too?

Yesterday's vote boiled down to a simple question: Do the Republicans believe the people of Puerto Rico deserve relief for their natural disasters as do all Americans? Do they believe the families of Puerto Rico—whatever you think of this elected official in Puerto Rico—deserve to be helped just like the families of the Midwest and California?

Do they believe the statement of the Governor of Puerto Rico, Rossello, that the House bill is much preferable to Puerto Rico than what the Senate has proposed or do they make their own judgment based on what President Trump said and then call it political?

What a shame.

Let me be clear as day: Without objection, the Democrats support funding for all regions of the United States that have been affected by natural disasters, which is any State or territory that needs to rebuild. That list should include the Middle West, and it should

include Puerto Rico because our fellow citizens on that island have yet to recover from the deadliest of storms in our recent history.

I will let this Chamber know that Senator LEAHY and I will be offering a new amendment to the disaster bill in order to provide billions of new additional dollars for the Midwest's 2019 disasters.

The Senate Republicans say they care about Iowa and Nebraska, but they didn't put an additional penny in for that aid. They said to let them compete with the 2018 disasters and the same amount of money. We are going a step further. We are going to say we need additional aid for the Middle West—for Iowa and Nebraska—as well as aid for Puerto Rico. It is not an either-or.

If we get into an either-or, the next time, it will be your State, my Republican colleagues, when people will not want to vote for aid or it will be for mine or another's. I experienced it, incidentally, with Sandy, when a lot of Republicans didn't want to vote for aid after Sandy because it was for New York. That was so wrong.

So I say to all who are suggesting that the Democrats aren't willing to help the people of Iowa and Nebraska and other States that we are calling their bluff.

Are you ready to actually appropriate new money—more money—for what the people in the Midwest who are struggling need? The Democrats are. Let's see where you stand.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, on healthcare, the Republicans have failed to advance any of their healthcare plans through Congress, so they are trying to repeal healthcare through the courts. This reeks of desperation, for they do not have a backup plan.

Last night, the President tweeted that the Republicans will come up with their plan in 2021. Translation: The Republicans have no healthcare plan. Translation: President Trump has no healthcare plan. It is the same old song the Republicans and the President have been singing. They are for repeal, but they have no replacement. President Trump confirmed he will hold Americans hostage through the 2020 election when it comes to healthcare. He promises with "re-elect me, and maybe you can take a peek at my backup plan after that," which he doesn't have. What a ruse. What a shame. What a disgrace.

People are suffering. When their children have cancer, people need protection so the insurance companies will not pull away the healthcare. Seniors need protection from the rising costs of prescription drugs. Women need protection so they will not be treated differently than men when they have healthcare needs that are particular to women. Young people need protection to be allowed to continue to stay on their parents' plans until they are 26 if they start new lives after high school

or college. All of these folks need protection.

President Trump and our Republican friends say: Rip all of those things away, and trust us. Maybe in 2021, we will have a plan.

With a stubbornness that would impress a mule, President Trump has waged a manic war on the American healthcare system that shows no sign of stopping. Now we are asked to believe that President Trump has a wonderful but secret healthcare plan but will, for some reason, not reveal it until the next election. What a transparent ruse.

Snake oil salesmen, take notes.

Here is why we can't believe the President's punt and promise.

In May 2017, after the Republicans voted to repeal the healthcare law, on national television, the President celebrated in the Rose Garden with House Republicans. He celebrated the passage of a bill that would result in 23 million fewer people having health insurance and would result in gutting the protections for Americans who have pre-existing conditions. He celebrated his own broken promise to never cut Medicaid and to always protect people with preexisting conditions, and he did it on national TV. So don't tell me this time will be different. Don't tell me there is a secret plan, when we know what the Republicans' healthcare plan will be—increased premiums, a loss of coverage, and the elimination of protection for preexisting conditions. The markets will be stabilized, but families will be tossed into an abyss of inferior care.

President Trump's lawsuit seeks to wholly undo the progress we have made, but he wants the American people to just wait for a magic plan to appear 2 years from now?

If successful, the President's lawsuit will mean skyrocketing costs for families. The President wants the American people to just wait and see.

President Trump's lawsuit will mean massive increases in prescription drug spending for seniors who are on Medicare. The President wants the American people to just wait and see.

President Trump's lawsuit will mean women will be charged more because they are women. The President wants the American people to just wait and see.

So, when President Trump insists he has a silver bullet plan that we will only be able to see if the American people reelect him, we know what a sham that is. For a President who has perpetrated lots of shams, this one takes the cake.

I am asking: Which one of our Republican colleagues will stand up for healthcare for the American people?

Senator SHAHEEN has a resolution that simply reads to the Justice Department: Withdraw your suit that would do all of these awful things.

How many of our Republican colleagues will go on that proposal? Let's see. Are they going to say it is politics too? With regard to the healthcare of

millions of Americans, any time the President does something horrible and the Democrats resist, are they going to say it is politics? Oh, no. That is what we are supposed to do whether it comes to Puerto Rico or whether it comes to healthcare.

CHINA

Mr. President, I have one final word on China.

The New York Times reported yesterday that a trade agreement with the United States and China is nearly 90 percent complete, with a deal being potentially finalized later this month. Yet it alarms me that the President, for all his bluster, will likely settle on a deal that will be devoid of any meaningful reform to China's economy and trade practices. Instead, he will settle for the purchases of American goods by the Chinese state. This move will only strengthen China's leverage while it will do little to help us long term.

We want to protect our farmers, but we don't want a soybean sellout where, in exchange for soybeans, we trade away America's family jewels—our intellectual property, our industrial know-how, our hard-working labor force being able to compete in a reciprocal way in China the way China can compete here. If it is just the purchases of product, the Chinese Government can always turn off the tap. So we are entering treacherous territory.

I have a simple message for President Trump and praise him for standing up to China more than President Bush or President Obama did on this issue. I say to him: We have made progress in making China see it has abusive practices. Stand firm. Don't back out. I cannot think of a worse end for us than to say "uncle" at the last minute. Skip the political photo op and make good on your promise to stand up for American business and workers when China takes advantage.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S. RES. 50

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, sometimes attempting to block a Presidential nominee is justified. If a President nominates a candidate who clearly is unfit for the office for which he or she has been nominated, then, as Senators, we should try to stop the confirmation of that nominee. But that is the exception. The Senate's advice and consent power is not supposed to be used to slow-walk all of a President's nominees simply because one party doesn't like the President who is doing the nominating.

In the past, once Presidential nominees had been vetted and approved by the appropriate committee, their confirmation was pretty painless. Cloture

votes designed to end filibusters of candidates and allow their nominations to come to a vote were rare because Senators only tried to block nominees in extreme cases. But that is no longer the case. Since President Trump took office, Democrats in the Senate have engaged in a systematic campaign of obstruction, pointlessly delaying qualified nominees for no reason other than the fact that Democrats dislike this President.

But wait, you say. Not so fast. Maybe Democrats obstructed all of these nominees because they didn't believe any of them were qualified for the positions for which they had been nominated—except we all know that is not the case because again and again Democrats have delayed and obstructed nominees they have ultimately supported.

One egregious example occurred in January of 2018, when Democrats forced the Senate to spend more than an entire week considering four district court judges even though not one single Democrat voted against their confirmation. That is right—Democrats forced the Senate to spend more than a week of our floor time considering the nomination of four judges even though not one single Democrat opposed their confirmation. These judges could have been confirmed in a matter of minutes by voice vote, but Democrats forced the Senate to spend more than a week on their consideration—time that could have been spent on genuinely controversial nominees or on some of the many important issues facing our country.

Another ugly example occurred during my chairmanship of the Commerce Committee last Congress, when Democrats pointlessly delayed the confirmation of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy, Derek Kan. Mr. Kan, who had been confirmed by voice vote just 2 years earlier as a member of the Amtrak board of directors, was delayed for months in 2017, with Democrats ultimately requiring the filing of cloture—but not because Democrats had any problem with his qualifications. When the vote on his nomination finally came, he was confirmed by an overwhelming margin of 90 to 7. Once again, Democrats obstructed for obstruction's sake.

During President Obama's first 2 years in office, his nominees were subjected to a total of 12 cloture votes. Do you want to know how many cloture votes President Trump's nominees faced during the President's first 2 years in office? One hundred and twenty-eight—more than 10 times as many cloture votes as President Obama's nominees faced over the same period—128 to 12.

Democrats' slow-walking of nominees is obviously a problem for this President and his administration. Essential positions have stayed vacant for months longer than they should have, making it more challenging for the administration to carry out its respon-

sibilities. But Democrats' actions are not just a problem for this administration; they are setting a terrible precedent that could derail the work of the Senate and inhibit the President's ability to govern for many years into the future. Just imagine if Democrats' behavior over the past 2 years becomes the norm. Presidents could be waiting years to adequately staff their administrations, and the Senate would be perpetually tied up on unnecessary cloture votes, leaving less and less time to actually do the business of governing.

Democrats and Republicans need to curb this rampant obstruction before it becomes a permanent precedent here in the Senate. Later today, we will have a chance to do so when we vote on the Blunt-Lankford resolution.

Back at the beginning of President Obama's second term, Democrats and a number of Republicans, including me, passed a measure streamlining the confirmation process for lower level positions, such as district court judges and Assistant Secretaries. This was obviously something that benefited President Obama and only President Obama since the rules change expired at the end of that Congress, but Republicans signed on because we believe that Presidents should be able to staff their administrations in a timely fashion. So we worked with Democrats to streamline consideration of lower level administration nominees.

The Blunt-Lankford resolution is very similar to the rules change we passed in 2013. Like the 113th Congress rules change, the Blunt-Lankford resolution would streamline the process for consideration of lower level nominees, while preserving the current rules for high-level nominee positions, such as Cabinet officials and Justices.

Thirty-four currently serving Democratic Senators also served in the 113th Congress and voted for that rules change, and I am hearing that Democrats would be willing to support the Blunt-Lankford resolution as well. But there is one catch: Democrats apparently would only support the rules change if we delay the effective date of the resolution to 2021—in the hopes that they will have a Democrat in the White House by then.

That is an outrageous demand, this “We will take the rules change when it helps us, but we will do everything we can to make sure the other party doesn't get its share of the benefits, but that “The rules don't apply to us” attitude has unfortunately become pretty typical of the Democratic Party lately. Think about recent Democratic support for packing the Supreme Court. Why has that long-dead idea come back to haunt us? Because Democrats are angry that President Trump has gotten two individuals confirmed to the Supreme Court. Apparently, the only good Supreme Court Justices are the Justices nominated by Democrats. Take the Democratic proposal to abolish the electoral college. Democrats are still mad about their loss in the

2016 Presidential election. We get that. Their solution is not working harder to win in 2020 but changing the rules to favor their party.

Simple intellectual honesty would dictate that the 34 current Democratic Senators who voted for the rules change in the 113th Congress vote for the rules change today. I hope they will. Nothing less than the future of the Senate is at stake here.

Democrats have a choice to make: They can vote to restore the Senate's tradition of efficiently confirming non-controversial nominees so the work of the government can get done, or they can continue to pursue a damaging, virulent partisanship that will negatively affect the Senate's ability to function for decades to come.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

MR. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, over the past 2 years, some in this body have decided that they will oppose any nominee suggested by President Trump. There isn't a Senator who serves their State's interest when qualified, noncontroversial nominees are prevented from being confirmed; however, some Members continue to do just that by slow-walking the President's nominees for partisan purposes.

This concern about the speed of confirming nominees is not anything new. For the benefit of those who were not here at the time, I would like to take this opportunity to review some of the history on this subject and how we got where we are today with all this stalling.

Since the rejection of the Robert Bork nomination for the Supreme Court in 1987, Republicans have felt like we are living under two sets of rules. Republican Supreme Court nominees could be rejected by Democrats on ideological grounds if they didn't pass their litmus test, but Republicans continued to vote to confirm otherwise qualified Democrat nominees who had what we might consider very radical views about interpreting the Constitution to mean things that the Constitution plainly does not say.

Then all of a sudden in 2003, to contrast with what the practice had been from 1789, Democrats entered the Senate as a minority party under a Republican President. Prior to 2003, there was simply no history of systematically opposing cloture to prevent judicial nominees from ever getting a final vote.

However, coaxed on by leftwing activists, Senate Democrats embarked in 2003 on an unprecedented campaign of obstruction by filibustering several of President Bush's judicial nominees to keep them from being confirmed.

When Senate Democrats began to use the cloture rule to block George W. Bush's circuit court nominees, we made it very clear that we Republicans were done living by two sets of rules. We warned Democrats that, if they continued down that path, we would

follow their precedent when the tables were turned, but the Democrat obstruction continued anyway.

Not long after—and as they often so do in this Chamber—the tables were turned. President Obama entered office with a Democrat majority in the Senate. True to Republican promises to not live by two sets of rules, we began to follow the precedent established by the Democrats and blocked a proportional number of President Obama's judicial nominees.

Despite the fact that Republicans were holding Democrats to the same standard that the Democrats established, Senate Democrats made a big show of being outraged at that time and being indignant about this equal treatment. Senate Democrats began threatening to invoke the nuclear option to ram through President Obama's nominees on a simple majority vote.

However, the minority and majority parties reached an agreement—yes, we actually reached an agreement—and this was at the beginning of the 113th Congress where Senate Republicans agreed to institute a temporary standing order to limit postcloture debate for sub-Cabinet and U.S. district court nominees. This agreement was made explicitly as a bipartisan compromise, and that bipartisan compromise was there to avert the use of what we call a nuclear option. Then-Majority Leader Harry Reid stated on January 24, 2013:

I know that there is a strong interest in rules changes among many of my caucus. In fact, I would support many of these changes through regular order. But I agree that the proper way to change Senate rules is through the procedures established in those rules, and I will oppose any effort in this Congress or the next to change the Senate rules other than through regular order.

That is the end of Senator Reid's, who was then majority leader, quote.

Despite this statement by Senator Reid and despite the bipartisan agreement, the Democrat leader decided to pursue the nuclear option just a few months later. At the same time, Senate Democrats thought that Secretary Clinton would be President and that forcing this rules change would benefit their agenda for the foreseeable future.

Our side saw this for what it really was, a power grab that sought to steamroll the minority party. At that time, the minority party was my party.

Before Senator Reid invoked the nuclear option, we actually urged the Democrats to take a longer view. We were trying to get them to think in terms of what can happen in the future if you do something now. So we again warned that we were not about to play by two sets of rules and that they, the Democrats, would regret their decision when the tables were turned.

I was on the Senate floor on the day that Majority Leader Reid broke the rules to change the rules—let me emphasize it—broke the Senate rules to change the rules and made the following comment. This is this Senator speaking in 2013:

If there is one thing that will always be true, it is this: Majorities are fickle. Majorities are fleeting. Here today; gone tomorrow. So the majority has chosen to take us down this path. The silver lining is that there will come a day when the roles are reversed.

When that happens, our side will likely nominate and confirm lower court judges and Supreme Court nominees with 51 votes, regardless of whether the Democrats actually buy into this fanciful notion that they can demolish the filibuster on lower court nominees and still preserve it for Supreme Court nominees.

That is the end of my quote from about 6 years ago when Senator Reid was doing the nuclear option.

It so happens that very day did come, and the American people elected President Trump with a Republican majority in the Senate and the House in November 2016. Senate Democrats have since engaged in an unprecedented campaign to prevent a whole range of government positions from being filled by President Trump. It used to be understood that it was in the American people's interest to have a functioning government, even if your candidate didn't win the Presidency.

The norm around here for hundreds of years used to be that a new President's Cabinet positions were filled as soon as possible. I know that the 2016 election aroused strong feelings and that many people were deeply disappointed when the candidate they expected to win did not win to the point of not being able to accept the outcome under our Constitution of who was elected and elected constitutionally.

A similar attitude arose when President Obama was elected with some people latching on to the birther conspiracy theory that President Obama was secretly born in Kenya and that this somehow made his Presidency illegitimate. However, this was always a fringe movement that Republicans in Congress did not take seriously and many refuted it.

The arms race of partisan grievance has now escalated where U.S. Senators pander to the "resistance" by preventing President Trump from filling out his administration more than halfway through the first term.

Senate Democrats insist on going through the lengthy motion to end debate even for nominees which there is little or no opposition. This means that, after being vetted by the White House, vetted by the Office of Government Ethics, answering a detailed questionnaire probing every aspect of the nominee's life, meeting with Senators in person, going through a nomination hearing, and being voted out of committee, nominees must wait and wait—sometimes for months and years—before there is time in the Senate schedule to file a cloture motion as the first step to getting to finish approving or disapproving that nominee.

The Senate must then allow for an intervening day to pass before it can vote to end the debate, which often passes overwhelmingly. Yes. You filibuster something. You have to file a motion,

and yet a lot of times, there is no disagreement that that nominee should be approved. After all that, the cloture rule allows for an additional 30 hours of postcloture debate.

I strongly support the Senate exercising its constitutional power, and that power is about advice and consent. If there are any concerns about any nominee's ability or willingness to do his job and whether that nominee is willing to follow the law, Members should come to the floor to hash through the merits of the nominee.

However, Members on the other side of the aisle have obstructed the confirmation of a large number of actually noncontroversial sub-Cabinet nominees and even lower court judges who were not controversial. In a great many cases, the demand for a cloture vote appears to be solely about delaying and about obstructing, not anything about the specific nominee or his qualifications.

As chairman of the Committee on Finance this session, I want to highlight the experience of some of the nominees considered by the Finance Committee. So far this Congress, the Finance Committee has reported seven nominees that were originally reported last Congress but were not confirmed last Congress because of the obstruction.

I want to make clear that the Finance Committee has a very thorough as well as bipartisan vetting process. Any nominee that has been reported by the Finance Committee can verify that we do not rubberstamp nominees.

However, with the exception of one of the seven nominees that were re-reported, all of them have been reported unanimously or with a maximum of two no votes. Only one of those seven, however, has been confirmed.

The U.S. Tax Court is a place where taxpayers are able to challenge an assessment of tax before actually paying the amount that they are challenging. It is important that we keep the full roster of 19 Tax Court judges as full as possible. I don't think any member of my committee or this Senate would disagree with what I just said. I also am not aware of any criticism of the nominee currently on the Executive Calendar for the Tax Court.

That nominee has been reported unanimously from the Finance Committee twice now, last Congress and this Congress; yet there is no certainty about when that nominee will be able to consider—or when the Senate will be able to consider that nomination.

This is very unfair to nominees who submit to an extensive vetting process and put their professional lives on hold so that they can serve. And it is also unfair to the American taxpayer who needs these people to be working.

It is also unfair to the American taxpayers who need these people to be working. After all, government is a service.

In 2013, the liberal Brennan Center for Justice issued dire warnings about

a judicial vacancy crisis. At that time, there were 65 unfilled seats on the U.S. district courts, and this was crippling the ability of those courts to dispense justice and to protect the rights of the American people. Senate Democrats picked up on these talking points and forcefully made their case.

There are now 129 vacancies on the district courts—129. The concern from Democrats has somehow disappeared. Last Congress, I was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. By the end of last year, I had moved more than 30 highly qualified district court judges to the floor. Most of them had languished there for months. A few had been in the confirmation process since 2017. This is all because Democrats insist on 30 hours of debate for every nominee even though they often end up voting for them. Some of these who had been filibustered were passed almost unanimously by the Senate.

In the Judiciary Committee, when I was chairman, we had several more judges ready to be reported out of committee, but they were likely to face similar obstruction. I haven't been Judiciary chairman for 3 months. We are in a new Congress, and I assumed a different chairmanship. Do you know how many of those district court nominees have been confirmed in the new Congress, meaning the same ones we had voted out last Congress? Zero. The vacancy crisis, by the Brennan Center's definition, has nearly doubled because of this obstruction.

Clearly, it is a waste of this body's time to use all 30 hours of debate after the cloture vote for almost every nominee who comes before the Senate. The Senate was intended to be a deliberative body. If Senators want to engage in debate on a nominee, then by all means have that debate; however, don't make the Senate go through the motions if you have no intention of actually engaging in debate.

There is now before the Senate a proposal to limit postcloture debate on sub-Cabinet-level nominees. This proposal was very similar to one that passed the 113th Congress with overwhelming bipartisan support. A number of Senators from the other side of the aisle supported that measure at that time. If they can't support it this time around, what is their justification? Again, we cannot have a different set of rules depending on which party is in the majority. We need to agree on a common set of rules and a common set of norms that apply regardless of which party has the White House and/or the majority in the Senate.

I note that there are quite a number of Senators who see themselves in the White House in 2020. They are coming to Iowa every week. Do they really want to live under the precedent they are setting now? If a Senator who votes against virtually every Trump nominee gets into the White House, how should this Senator proceed? If one of the current Senate Democrats running for President gets elected in 2020, I, of

course, will be disappointed, and I surely won't agree with most of their policies. So then should I vote against all of their nominees?

I would ask each of these Presidential candidates: Do you expect this Senate to behave differently than you are right now if in the future the shoe is on the other foot?

I don't want to be part of a resistance against a future Democratic President. I don't want to live by two sets of rules. The solution is to end now this partisan total war where the other side must be stopped at all costs. We need to come to a bipartisan agreement to end this tit-for-tat, cut-off-our-nose-to-spite-the-face environment. That is the environment we find ourselves in today.

Senator LANKFORD's resolution builds on the bipartisan agreement from 2013, but it is not perfect. If Democrats have legitimate concerns, let's work together on something better.

I have heard that the only change the Democratic leadership has proposed is to delay the effective date of the standing order until the start of the next Presidential term. Presumably, that is due to the same hubris that led them to invoke the nuclear option without imagining that they would soon regret it, as now they do regret it. We had two Supreme Court nominees to prove that they regret it. We actually approved those two Supreme Court nominees. It is impossible to defend their position on principle.

Surely there are some Members on the other side of the aisle willing to work in good faith with Republicans to resolve this impasse in a way that takes into account the legitimate concerns of Senators on both sides of the aisle. I don't believe it is too late to bring the Senate back to the deliberative body the Framers of the Constitution intended the Senate to be. It is in all of our interests to have a more functional Senate. I hope my colleagues will join me in working toward that goal.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

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

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, most Americans don't wake up every day thinking about the arcane rules of the Senate. They might think the debate we are having today is just another example of a legislative body they see as out of touch on the issues they care about most, issues on which a large majority of Americans agree action should be taken.

For example, the Republican Senate hasn't done anything about the epi-

demic of gun violence. The Republican Senate hasn't taken action to expand access to affordable, quality, universal healthcare. Instead, Republicans have tried to take healthcare away from millions of people. The Republican Senate hasn't passed comprehensive immigration reform, let alone offered the blameless Dreamers a path to citizenship and a life in the only country they know. The Republican Senate hasn't taken decisive action to combat climate change. The Republican Senate hasn't taken steps to empower our middle class. Instead, it passed a huge tax cut for the wealthiest Americans and corporations.

We should be having a real debate about all the issues I just mentioned. Instead, Republican leadership is proposing a resolution to, among other things, change Senate rules to reduce the number of hours of postcloture debate time from 30 hours to 2 hours for district court nominees.

Let me just mention, by the way, that there is a world of difference in requiring 51 votes to put people on the district and circuit courts versus what the Senate majority leader did in changing the vote requirements for people on the U.S. Supreme Court, changing that to a bare majority—a huge difference in putting in a 9-member Supreme Court with a bare majority of votes versus some 800 circuit and district court judges. If we can't see that difference, I have no words for that. We should see that difference.

Getting back to what is before us today, the significant rule change will help Donald Trump and his Republican enablers in the Senate to more swiftly pack our district courts with ideologically driven judges—judges who will make biased rulings in line with their personal ideological beliefs and not based on the law or the Constitution.

Our district court judges, appointed by Democratic and Republican Presidents alike, have been at the frontline of resisting Donald Trump's abuses of power. They have, for example, ordered the government to reunite parents with the children ripped from their arms at the border. They have rejected attempts to deny Federal funds to cities refusing to be drawn into the Trump administration's war on immigrants. They stopped Executive orders aimed at kneecapping public sector unions. They blocked the implementation of an ugly ban on transgender Americans serving in our military. They stopped the Commerce Department from putting a citizenship question in the census. They ruled that public officials cannot block citizens from their Twitter feeds. They stopped the government from banning Muslims from entering the United States. They stopped a decision that would have allowed States to require Medicaid recipients to work in order to receive benefits.

These exercises of judicial independence by our district judges are precisely why Donald Trump and his congressional enablers want to make it

easier to pack our courts with nominees handpicked by the far-right Federalist Society and Heritage Foundation. These organizations have spent decades and millions of dollars opposing universal healthcare, strengthening corporate interests, and undermining voting. They have also spent decades and millions putting their kinds of judges on the courts, with their lifetime positions.

If we aren't able to take as much time to examine their records and publicize their lack of fitness, Trump's nominees will soon occupy more and more of the lifetime appointments on the bench. Once they do, they will not only be more inclined to side with his extreme view of Executive power, they will also start ruling in cases consistent with the ideologies they bring to their jobs—for example, that abortion should be illegal; that Americans don't have a right to healthcare; that voter suppression is OK; that families with same-sex parents should be discriminated against; that transgender teenagers should be forced to be someone they are not; that Presidents can ban people from our country based on their faith; that one person's religious beliefs can trample the civil rights of everyone else. Trump's nominees have extensive records of their positions on these kinds of issues.

It used to be that appointees to the Federal district courts generally did not generate a lot of controversy. They were typically experienced trial lawyers or prosecutors with solid reputations in their hometowns, but they weren't typically activists or ideologues. There was a time when they were mostly White and mostly male, but starting in the Carter administration and building steam through the Clinton and Obama administrations, district court nominees presented to the Senate were increasingly diverse, with an emphasis on qualifications, not ideology. But Donald Trump's judicial nominees are, once again, mostly White and mostly male. They are now much more ideological and agenda-driven. He has also nominated a disproportionate number of lawyers who do what is called impact litigation, where they pursue cases to make political points and undo legislative decisions.

Some examples of Trump's dangerous circuit court nominees include Patrick Wyrick, who was solicitor general of Oklahoma and who, together with his close ally, then-Oklahoma attorney general Scott Pruitt, tried to dismantle Obama-era protections of clean air, clean water, and public land.

He was counsel of record on an amicus brief in *Sebelius v. Hobby Lobby*, challenging the Affordable Care Act's contraceptive coverage requirement.

He also submitted a brief in *Humble v. Planned Parenthood of Arizona*, challenging medication-induced abortion procedures commonly used by Planned Parenthood.

As deputy general counsel for the First Liberty Institute, Matthew

Kacsmayk filed briefs opposing same-sex marriage, supported a Virginia school board's anti-transgender bathroom policy, and opposed the right of all women to have their healthcare coverage include contraceptives.

Michael Truncale, another example, was a former congressional candidate and an ideological activist against voting rights, abortion, and immigration, who gave public speeches using the widely debunked myth of in-person voter fraud to justify Texas's draconian voter ID laws.

Another example is Wendy Vitter, who promoted fraudulent claims about abortion, birth control, and women's health at an appearance she initially failed to disclose to the committee. These fraudulent claims included the position that there is a connection between using birth control and getting cancer. She has been a public advocate for extreme restrictions on reproductive rights.

As deputy solicitor general in the Office of the Texas Attorney General, J. Campbell Barker represented *Texas and Whole Women's Health v. Hellerstedt*, urging the Supreme Court to uphold Texas's restrictive anti-abortion statute. The Supreme Court declined to do that, thankfully. He also supported Donald Trump's Muslim ban, advocated for the invalidation of DACA and DAPA, supported restrictive voter ID laws, opposed the right of all women to have their healthcare coverage include contraceptives, and I could go on and on.

These nominees have deeply held personal, ideological views who want to be judges for life to make these views into law.

During their confirmation hearings, these nominees told us, to a person, he or she would "follow the law" and "follow precedent," but do they really expect us to believe they can set aside their careers of ideological activism? I don't think so. They were nominated precisely because they are advocates for an ideologically conservative agenda—just the kind of nominees who would get the stamp of approval from the Federalist Society and Heritage Foundation. That is why my Republican colleagues support them, and that is why they want to pass this resolution—to pack the courts with these types of judges even faster.

Many Americans are awakening to the fact that court-packing is a clear and present danger to a woman's right to choose, voting rights, healthcare access, environmental protections, civil rights, and individual rights. Not content with the court-packing damage they have already done, Republicans are using this resolution for court-packing to happen even faster.

I cannot support this resolution.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today I rise to discuss the importance of upholding the Senate's constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent on nominations.

Many people refer to the Senate as the world's greatest deliberative body because the Senate is designed for the careful consideration and debate of proposed laws and nominations. That is why we have so many people sitting up in the Gallery today, because they are here to hear debate.

How we deliberate is governed, of course, by a set of Senate rules. I am sure some of them seem archaic when our visitors hear about quorum calls being vitiated, but it is very important to have rules because rules stay in place no matter who is in charge and no matter what matter is before us. Rules create a sense of decorum and fairness not only in this Chamber but for our country.

Only once in the history of the cloture process in the U.S. Senate has the Senate voted to permanently reduce the time we have to debate an issue. That happened in 1986, when we went from 100 hours of something that is called postcloture debate time to the current rule of 30 hours. That basically means there are 30 hours to debate something really important, such as the nomination of a Supreme Court Justice, an ambassador, or who is going to be a Cabinet member. That is the way the rules are now. While there have been contemporary changes to the rules, we have not seen a permanent rule change since 1986.

The resolution we are considering asks us to make a second permanent change. What is the backdrop? Last Congress, the Rules Committee considered a proposal from Senator LANKFORD to cut off debate on the Senate floor. The resolution before us is even more damaging because it would reduce debate time from 30 hours to 2 hours for about 80 percent of the nominees who come before the Senate—including Federal district court judges—giving only 2 hours on this floor to debate.

We have time to debate these judges on the Judiciary Committee, but only a small percentage of the Senators are on that committee, right? Over 75 percent of the Senators aren't on that committee. We also know we have had some judges come before us, and we don't find out things about them until the debate on the floor occurs or Senators haven't decided how they are going to vote until they actually come to the floor. We have had judges who were thrown out—who were rejected, basically—before they came up for a vote because of things that were discussed among Senators when they were on the floor.

Let's face it. Most Americans are understandably unfamiliar with the term "postcloture" debate. They don't exactly have the book on Senate procedures on their reading list, but the issue before us has a real impact on the daily lives of every person in this country, and we should be sounding the alarm bells about it.

Healthcare—think of what we just learned this last week when suddenly the Justice Department for this administration announced they were going all out to repeal the Affordable Care Act. What does that mean? Well, for every American—not just Americans who are on the exchanges under the Affordable Care Act—for every American, it would mean they would lose their protection for preexisting conditions. It would mean, if someone has diabetes, if someone has a child with Down syndrome, if someone in their family had a preexisting condition, their healthcare coverage would be subjected to the whims of the insurance companies.

Right now we have protections in place. What does this mean for the rule we are talking about? In the case that started in Texas, that was a Federal district court judge who made the decision on that case. The people who announced it out of the Justice Department at the higher levels actually went through confirmation on this Senate floor so people could debate whether they should be confirmed. The people implementing it at the Department of Health and Human Services, at the management levels, also go through this Senate for confirmation.

Guess what, America. Now not only is this administration trying to ram through the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, which would mean you would lose your insurance if you have a preexisting condition, but now they are trying to ram through the people who would make the decision—the people who would do the work.

Instead of having 30 hours to debate a Federal district court judge just like the one who made the decision in Texas or instead of having 30 hours to debate employees at the Justice Department—managers who would make decisions or higher supervisors who would make the decisions—we would get 2 hours. To me, what is this about? It is about ramming nominations through just like they tried to ram the Affordable Care Act repeal through the justice system in that announcement last week.

For every Congress, there are 1,200 to 1,400 positions in the executive branch requiring the Senate's advice and consent. Under this resolution, 277 of those would get the full 30 hours of debate, including the Supreme Court, circuit court, and the Cabinet-level positions, as well as some of the people who serve on the Securities and Exchange Commission and some of the Commissions we have. That accounts for 277, but that leaves many more—over 1,000—who would only get 2 hours of debate, 2 hours for what are lifetime appoint-

ments. Hundreds of these positions—hundreds of these positions—are lifetime appointments.

I believe in this place, once called the world's greatest deliberative body, it is our constitutional duty to fully vet the most senior people in our government—the people who help ensure our air and water are clean, the people who lead our military, and the people who oversee our justice system. It is our constitutional duty to fully vet our Federal judges, those men and women who receive lifetime appointments to uphold the rule of law in America.

On behalf of every American, it is our job to make sure the people nominated to the most senior positions in our government are competent and qualified. These roles are so important that the rules of the Senate are designed to ensure that Senators come to a bipartisan consensus. They don't always do that, but guess what. Sometimes we do. The purpose of these rules is to reject partisanship so we can get nominees who will put the good of the country before politics.

If we eliminate this crucial check on our democracy, allowing the majority party to ram through these appointments, we will undermine our democracy and our government.

Some of our friends on the other side of the aisle who are trying to push this through point to the fact that in 2013, the Senate voted 78 to 16 to temporarily change the postcloture rules on debate time, but it is very important to note that in 2013, the circumstances were very different from what they are today. Nominations required a 60-vote threshold. The blue-slip process for all judicial nominees was respected—unlike now, where it is no longer respected—for the highest courts in the land, such as the circuit courts. A thorough process—and this is important—to select qualified judicial nominees was in place but no longer. Have you seen the statistics that President Trump has had more unqualified nominees than past Presidents who have been rejected by this body?

Despite all of this, important Federal positions remained unfilled, even though qualified nominees were waiting to be confirmed. To address the issue, a bipartisan supermajority of the Senate supported a temporary change in the rules, but that is not what is happening today.

The idea that we are facing similar circumstances in this Congress is unsupported by the facts as well as statements made by some of my Republican colleagues. The truth is—as we have heard the majority leader of this body boast—nominees are getting confirmed, some at paces faster than we have seen in U.S. history.

In 2017, Leader MCCONNELL himself highlighted this fact. He said: "Senate Republicans are closing in on the record for the most circuit court appointments in a president's first year in office."

Last year, President Trump said:

We have the best judges. We put on a tremendous amount of great federal district court judges. . . . We are setting records.

He was right about setting records. In the first 2 years of his Presidency, President Trump had 85 judges confirmed. That is because they focused on getting them through, compared to just 62 for President Obama in the same time period.

President Trump has had 30 circuit court nominees confirmed during his first 2 years in office. This is more circuit court nominees confirmed than any President in history.

That is why they have talked about getting these nominees through like on a conveyor belt. So then the question becomes, why change the rules? Why change the rules? Why change the rules for lifetime appointments and give only 2 hours of debate?

This change is not just unnecessary, it would allow fundamentally unqualified candidates, from judges to administration officials and Ambassadors, to be confirmed.

The American Bar Association has rated six of the judicial nominees put forward by the administration as "not qualified," including three who received that rating unanimously, two of whom were confirmed. In 2 years, more than 30 executive branch nominees and 5 Federal judges have been withdrawn after initial vetting. Because nominees are being rushed through the committee process, postcloture time is critical to our job of evaluating nominees and fulfilling our duty to advise and consent.

For the 78 Senators who do not serve on the Judiciary Committee, this is a critical time to talk to colleagues and staff about a judicial nominee's record. Maybe we don't use the whole time debating them, but guess what happens when you are not marching through these 2 hour blocks of time. You have more time to talk about nominees to each other and evaluate their records.

Last year, two nominees were withdrawn from consideration after their cloture votes had been taken—Thomas Farr, for the Eastern District of North Carolina, and Ryan Bounds, for the Ninth Circuit, Oregon. The withdrawal of these nominees happened on a bipartisan basis. Senators SCOTT, Flake, and RUBIO voiced their disapproval. Bounds' nomination failed and was withdrawn partly because Senator RUBIO changed his mind during that postcloture debate time. These cases show how critical postcloture debate time is for considering nominations. He found out new information that he didn't know before.

Nominees like these clearly demonstrate the importance of carefully and thoroughly considering nominees for executive branch positions and lifetime appointments to the bench. The American people deserve qualified nominees, and it is our job to ensure that we take the time and care necessary to confirm people who will serve their country with distinction.

I appreciate Senator LANKFORD. We work together on many issues—most notably, on election security. But this legislation will remove important checks and balances on a permanent basis, not just on a temporary basis. It happens at a time when we have seen unprecedented numbers of judges confirmed on the circuit basis and a total number of judges much higher than we saw during the same first 2 years of the Obama administration. We also know that we are getting a slew of unqualified nominees.

Finally, we know that this administration just keeps trying to push things through that I consider—and the courts have considered—unconstitutional.

Right now, we have the President going around Congress and the \$1.3 billion of appropriated money that was given for security and saying: I am just going to take money away what this Congress has appropriated for other things and use it to build an \$8 billion wall.

Not only does that create legal and constitutional issues of eminent domain at the border, but it also creates constitutional issues about the separation of powers and the role of this Congress.

We are at a time when this administration has decided to wreak havoc on people's healthcare by pushing for the repeal of not just part but of the entire Affordable Care Act, which I noted includes those provisions that protect people from being kicked off their insurance for preexisting conditions. The people who make these decisions at the highest levels—at that sub-Cabinet level, which is right under the Cabinet level, the judges who are making these decisions on the district court level, and the workers who are at the higher sub-Cabinet levels at the Justice Department and at Health and Human Services, who would make decisions directly about people's healthcare—are the ones we are talking about with this resolution. These are real issues for real people. While this may all sound esoteric, this is not a time in history to be permanently changing the rules and ramming through a bunch of nominees.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to speak for up to 10 minutes.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, the Senate is in a bad spot. In the first 2 years of President Trump's Presidency, there were 128 times that the President sent over a nomination and the minority party has said: We want additional time to be able to debate those folks.

These are individuals who have already gone through vetting at the White House. They have already gone through FBI checks. They have already

come to the committee. They have done full vetting at the staff level, then had a full hearing at the Member level, and then had questions for the RECORD. They passed out of the committee, then had a lapse of time, and then a majority vote was set up to be able to move them. At that time, there was a request for additional time 128 times.

Just to do a quick comparison of how common that is—because folks say this is normal and this is the way the Senate functions all the time—for President Obama, in his first 2 years, that happened 12 times. For President Bush, that happened a total of 4 times. For President Clinton, that happened a total of 8 times. But for President Trump, it happened a total of 128 times.

This is a new way of operation for the Senate, and I really should say it is a new way of not operating for the Senate. It is an issue that has to change. It is not just about President Trump. It is about this body, who we are going to be, and how we are going to operate.

In the past, when there was a nomination from a President, there was the assumption that the President was elected and they could hire their staff. Now the resistance has stepped up and said: The President is elected, but we will not let you hire a staff, and we will not let you put your policies in place because we want to prevent you from getting any people into a spot.

Guess what. As soon as there is a Democratic President elected—and at some point in the future, there will be—Republicans will retaliate back to that and say: We will do the same thing. You can't hire your staff.

This is a new precedent that has been set. If we don't correct it, it is damaging to our Republic. A President should be able to hire their staff. All of the Agencies need Senate-confirmed individuals to be able to actually conduct their business. We need judges to be able to execute across the country. Those are basic things that need to occur.

I have heard folks say: Well, there has been no problem getting judges through. In fact, Republicans have bragged about the total number of judges coming through.

Let me give you a comparison. If we stay on the same pace right now with judges—just for the district court judges, which are the most common judges across our country—and President Trump is in office for 8 years, he will have put in 193 judges. President Obama put in 272 judges. It is factually not true that we are able to ram through all of these judges to be able to work through the process. We are not on an epic pace.

There has been a higher number for circuit court judges, which is correct, because this Senate has prioritized working on circuit court judges, but that is to the detriment of everything else because you can't do all of it because there is this constant request for additional time at the end of it.

Again, I have heard folks say that two hours is not enough time to be able to debate. That would be true only if 2 hours was the only thing that was allocated for debate. These individuals have already been through vetting at the White House and vetting in committee. They have gone through the process and have been approved. This is not 2 hours of time. It is actually 26 hours of time because people are conveniently leaving out the fact that there is an intervening day required. We are talking about nominees moving from 54 hours of floor debate time to 26 hours of floor debate time. It is just convenient to leave out that extra day that happens to be in there, if you want to make the argument.

Our simple conversation is this: How can we get the Senate back to work again? In 2013, Harry Reid led a movement, which 78 Senators approved of, to be able to say that for 2 years—2013 and 2014—we would fix the nominations process in the Senate. There was wide agreement to be able to do that. At the time, Harry Reid stood on the floor and said: Now, let me make this clear. We shouldn't have all of these nominees go through postcloture and all the debate on the floor anyway. Most of these passed through committee. They should be done by voice vote. In the rare exception that someone has to come to the floor, let's limit the floor time because it is not really used anyway. It is just a tactic to delay.

If you need evidence of that, there is all of the conversation that has recently been held on this floor about debate and about how we need to have all of this additional time for debate because these are lifetime appointees, these are essential people, and so they need to have a debate on the floor about them. Let me tell you what that really looks like in real life. That sounds very sanctimonious here on the floor.

In real life it looks like this. Here are the circuit court judges we have confirmed this session of Congress so far. These are for the circuit court. This is the appellate court. These are very important folks in the process. These folks currently have 30 hours, and for all of these folks, there was a demand to get 30 hours of extra debate time on the floor because they were so important.

Here is the actual problem. When that 30 hours of debate time was done and was blocked off, and that was respected, the first of the circuit court nominees actually got on the floor 1 hour and 16 minutes of actual debate, not 30 hours. People actually coming to the floor and debating that nominee was 1 hour and 16 minutes. The next nominee had 18 minutes and 57 seconds total of debate on this floor, although 30 hours of debate was blocked off, which meant most of the time the floor was empty, waiting for someone to actually debate. The next nominee was 1 hour 23 minutes.

Then, there is one my favorites. A circuit court judge had 4 minutes and

22 seconds of actual debate when 30 hours of debate was demanded for this lifetime appointment. The next circuit court judge was 23 minutes and 6 seconds.

The next one for the DC Circuit was actually very controversial. There was lots of noise about this nominee: 47 minutes and 28 seconds.

It is one thing for folks to say these are lifetime appointments so we need to make sure we block off a significant period of time on the floor. It is another thing to actually see the facts. These folks have gone through committee and we all know it. They have gone through background checks and we all know it. Every one of these individuals has been cleared and we know the outcome of all of these. We should respect each other and acknowledge that if this body is going to do legislation and personnel, no one can lock up the body and demand 30 hours of time on a nominee when we actually use 4 minutes and 22 seconds.

If we want to shift it off of judges and shift it onto executive nominees, recently we had a demand for 30 hours of additional debate time from our Democratic colleagues for the Bureau of Labor Statistics nominee. They demanded extra time because they were so controversial. On this floor, there was exactly zero minutes and zero seconds of debate on that nominee.

You see, this is not about actually debating whether people are qualified or not qualified. This is about preventing President Trump from getting nominees by locking up the floor and making sure he can't actually hire staff or can't actually put people on the court.

This will be reciprocated in the days ahead for every Democrat, and it will be done to every Republican President in the future if we don't fix this now. We had 2 years and 3 months of bad muscle memory on a process that should not be like this and has not been like this in the past. We can fix this.

When there was a Democratic President and a divided city, led by Democrats at the time, Republicans joined Democrats to be able to fix that nomination process for a Democrat President. The mistake we made was to do it only for a 2-year time period. We should learn from our mistake, and we should fix this from here on out. This is doable.

To give an example, in the last session of Congress, 386 nominees were never heard on this floor. They were sent back at the end of Congress and told: You have to start all over again. Those are folks who quit their job, went through FBI background checks, went through reviews, went through hearings, and confronted all the questions that were brought at them, and 386 of them were then stalled out and never heard. They were sent back to the White House.

That means that in the future we will have less opportunity to get more

people who are qualified to be able to apply for this. We want the best of the best to actually come and serve in our government. We will not get that if people have to quit their jobs to go through the nomination process, wait a year or 2 years, and then get sent back and told: You have to start all over again to go through the process.

Who will want to go through that process in the days ahead? We need to fix this both for the nominees who are going through the process and the Senate, which needs to have a better process of actually expediting nominees through. Quite frankly, we need to fix it for the country.

It is a simple process. It is not trying to gain partisan advantage. Regardless of who is in the White House, it is trying to fix it for the long term. Let's fix it this week. We have talked about this for 2 years. We have floated different proposals. Let's fix it this week and, from here on out, have a better process in the Senate.

Why in the world are we arguing about our rules of the Senate when we should be worrying about the issues the American people face? Of all places, of all people, we should have fair rules in the Senate to actually have a debate, have a vote, finish, and then move on to the next thing. There is more to be done.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on the floor for no more than 15 minutes.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there is an issue coming up before the Senate this week which really goes to the heart of this institution and why it exists. The Constitution spells out responsibilities for Congress and specific responsibilities when it comes to this Chamber. The 100 men and women who serve today, among other things, have a responsibility to advise and consent on nominations that have been sent by the President for our consideration. The Constitution assigns the Senate the role of questioning these nominees, of checking into their backgrounds, and then of deciding whether to approve or disapprove their nominations.

Over the past 2 years, we have seen many of the guardrails in this process disappear. For example, the Republican majority has stopped respecting blue slips on circuit court nominations. Blue slips, which are a Senate tradition, say that if a person is nominated to serve on the circuit court, which is the second highest court in the land, the Senators from the State within

which that person would serve would decide with a thumbs up or a thumbs down as to whether the nomination will go forward—the so-called blue slip. For a number of years now, that has been the U.S. Senate's standard practice, its tradition. The Republican majority has decided to stop the blue-slip process when it comes to circuit court nominations.

It also has stopped moving bipartisan board and commission nominations in pairs. We used to say: We have a more trusting relationship if you get your Republican nominee and if we get our Democratic nominee. Let's do it together. That used to ensure that both parties would be equally represented on important Agencies, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, to name a few.

Now we have a rules change before us that is being proposed by the Republican side of the aisle—again changing the rights of Senators by limiting the debate time on nominations. This would further tilt the balance of power away from the Senate, away from Congress, and back towards 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, the Executive. It runs the risk, of course, of diminishing our constitutional responsibility.

When it comes to executive branch nominations, this administration has had a different approach than what we have seen before. We have a President who says he likes to have administration officials serve in an acting capacity.

In January, President Trump said:

I sort of like acting. It gives me more flexibility. Do you understand that? I like acting.

Given that approach, perhaps it is no surprise that we have seen long delays in filling leadership positions in important Agencies and ambassadorial posts. We have also seen the highest rate of turnover in modern time with these administration positions. People aren't placed in these positions, and if they are, they are looking for the exit way too soon.

We also have suffered from a lack of proper vetting and examination of a person's background before a nomination is approved, and we have seen a lack of bipartisan cooperation in moving board nominations when there is supposed to be an equal number of Democrats and Republicans. Despite that, we are trying to do the work we were assigned by the Constitution to advise and consent.

If the majority wants to move Executive nominations faster, it can do what all administrations have done in the past and start working with the minority to negotiate packages of nominees. As long as I have been here, that has been done by the leaders of both political parties—fair, bipartisan packages of Executive nominees who have been well vetted. None of us wants the embarrassment of putting a person in the position for which one is not qualified or when there is any question of one's ethical standards. That bipartisan

work can lead to less debate time on the floor if we agree at the outset to work together.

I am particularly opposed to the Republican proposal before us to shorten the time for debate on President Trump's nominees who will serve lifetime appointments in Federal district court. Imagine serving a lifetime appointment on a court—beyond this administration—and making day-to-day decisions, some fundamental to the criminal justice system and some to the civil justice system.

We understand what is really going on here. We understand when the other side says we are obstructing it from confirming judges. The facts don't tell the same story. In fact, my Republican colleagues have been bragging for months about what Senator MCCONNELL called the "record number" of judges the Senate has confirmed under this new President Trump.

In President Trump's first 2 years in office, the Senate confirmed 85 article III judges. During the first 2 years of President Obama's Presidency, it was 62. Eighty-five to sixty-two. The number of judges confirmed in the last Congress was nearly four times as many as the number confirmed under President Obama in the previous Congress.

The pace of judicial nominations and confirmations has been extremely fast. So why are the Republicans now pushing for a change to the Senate rules to make it even faster? It is not like the Senate has been busy with legislation here on the floor.

Senator MCCONNELL had a moment of candor last November after the election.

He said:

I think we'll have probably more time for nominations in the next Congress than we've had in this one. . . . I don't think we'll have any trouble finding time to do nominations.

Senator MCCONNELL, McClatchy News, November 7, 2018.

Of course, Senator MCCONNELL was frustrated that one Senator put a blanket hold on judicial nominees at the end of last year, and he expressed his frustration publicly. That Senator, incidentally, was not a Democrat; he was Republican Senator Flake of Arizona.

It seems the real reason the Republicans want to change the rules now on district court nominations is so, in the words of Senator MCCONNELL, they can "plow right through" with confirming nominees whose records and views are incomplete or extreme.

The reality is that all too often, these judicial nominees just don't stand up to scrutiny. Already, under President Trump, we have had six judicial nominations in which the American Bar Association's peer-review process found these nominees sent by President Trump to be "not qualified." I might add that there were no—zero, none—"not qualified" nominees under President Obama.

Last year, two nominees, Thomas Farr and Ryan Bounds, were withdrawn on the floor by the Republicans after

the Senate had voted to move forward on their nominations. Disclosures about their backgrounds led Members even on the Republican side of the aisle to say they wouldn't vote for them. They were withdrawn because information came to light that caused these Senators to change their minds about confirming them to lifetime appointments. That shows the importance of having some time—30 hours currently—to debate these nominations and to make sure that a lifetime appointment is not going to someone who is unqualified or who shouldn't be in that position.

So who are the district court nominees for whom Senator MCCONNELL wants to change the rules so as to move them through more quickly? Let me tell you about a few of them.

There is Texas district court nominee Michael Truncale, who called President Obama an "un-American impostor" and described the Shelby County case, when it came to voting rights, a "victory."

There is Nebraska nominee Brian Buescher, who ran for elected office in 2014 and said: "I will focus on fighting ObamaCare."

There is Texas district court nominee Matthew Kacsmiryk, who has repeatedly written in his personal capacity about his opposition to LGBTQ rights and the Obergefell case.

There is Oklahoma district court nominee Patrick Wyrick, who is a protégé of disgraced former EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt's. He allowed an energy company to ghost-write a letter from Pruitt's office when he was Oklahoma's attorney general.

These are just a few. There are many other Trump judicial nominees whose views are far outside the legal mainstream, and Republicans are determined, with these rule changes, to speed up the process so we don't ask questions.

I have to say it is stunning to listen to Republicans complain about obstruction of judicial nominees after watching the unprecedented Republican obstruction of nominees under President Obama.

Under Senator MCCONNELL, Republicans would not even give an appointment for an interview, let alone a hearing, to a well-qualified Supreme Court nominee—Merrick Garland.

In 2013 Republicans pledged they would filibuster anyone who President Obama nominated to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, the second highest court in the land. No matter how qualified the nominee, they pledged to block him or her because President Obama was making the choice.

Republicans filibustered President Obama's judicial nominees 82 times in the first 5 years. Under all Presidents before President Obama, there had been a total of 86 judicial filibusters combined with all Presidents. Under President Obama, in the first 5 years, there were 82, and throughout history leading up to that, 86.

Now that the Republicans control the White House and the Senate, they want to rip up the rules and change the traditions and guardrails on the judicial nomination process on a regular basis.

They are pushing through nominees who have not been found qualified by the American Bar Association. They are pushing through nominees over the objection of home State Senators. They are pushing these nominees without making sure that they have seen their complete records.

In the case of a North Carolina district court nominee, Thomas Farr, his nomination was pulled when critical documents were finally disclosed while his nomination was pending on the floor of the Senate.

It is no secret what is happening here. There is no emergency that justifies changing the Senate rules. Senator MCCONNELL himself admitted the Senate has plenty of time to consider nominees. This is all about avoiding close scrutiny for extreme ideological nominees that Republicans want to pack onto the Federal courts for lifetime appointments.

I oppose the rules change. Let's do our job when it comes to conducting due diligence and providing informed advice and consent for lifetime appointments to the Federal bench. It can be done.

I will tell you that in the first years of the Trump administration, we have been able, by and large, to work out bipartisan agreement on filling judicial vacancies in the State of Illinois, even at the circuit court level, to the point where Senator DUCKWORTH and I gave blue-slip approval to circuit court nominees based out of our own State, and to the point where we have reached a basic agreement when it comes to filling the district court vacancies to this point. It has been bipartisan all the way, and I believe we have found qualified people. It took some time and some bipartisan cooperation, but we did. It can be done. We didn't ask to have the rules changed in the Senate. We used the existing rules to do our job under the Constitution.

All the issues we care about are impacted by these nominees in my State and others. The Senate deserves to take the time to make sure we get this right. We should not be putting men and women into lifetime appointments without close scrutiny as required by our Constitution.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:48 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m., and was reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

IMPROVING PROCEDURES FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE SENATE—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Udall Warner Whitehouse
Van Hollen Warren Wyden
NOT VOTING—1
Harris

the wage gap grows, and it is far past time we close the loopholes in the Equal Pay Act and give women the tools and the protections they need to be sure they are being paid fairly.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 24, S. Res. 50, a resolution improving procedures for the consideration of nominations in the Senate.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Mike Crapo, Richard C. Shelby, Johnny Isakson, Lamar Alexander, Pat Roberts, Ron Johnson, John Barrasso, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, John Thune, Mike Rounds, John Boozman, Shelley Moore Capito, Tom Cotton, David Perdue.

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 motion to proceed to S. Res. 50, a resolution improving procedures for the consideration of nominations in the Senate, 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 57 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Table with 3 columns of names: Alexander, Barrasso, Blackburn, Blunt, Boozman, Braun, Burr, Capito, Cassidy, Collins, Cornyn, Cotton, Cramer, Crapo, Cruz, Daines, Enzi, Ernst, Fischer, Gardner, Graham, Grassley, Hawley, Hoeven, Hyde-Smith, Inhofe, Isakson, Johnson, Kennedy, Lankford, McSally, Moran, Murkowski, Paul, Portman, Risch, Roberts, Romney, Rounds, Rubio, Sasse, Scott (FL), Scott (SC), Shelby, Sullivan, Thune, Tillis, Toomey, Wicker, Young

NAYS—48

Table with 3 columns of names: Baldwin, Bennet, Blumenthal, Booker, Brown, Cantwell, Cardin, Carper, Casey, Coons, Cortez Masto, Duckworth, Durbin, Feinstein, Gillibrand, Hassan, Heinrich, Hirono, Jones, Kaine, King, Klobuchar, Leahy, Lee, Manchin, Markey, McConnell, Menendez, Merkley, Murphy, Murray, Peters, Reed, Rosen, Sanders, Schatz, Schumer, Shaheen, Sinema, Smith, Stabenow, Tester

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51 and the nays are 48.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The Senator from Washington.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 7

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I come to the floor today not in celebration but in frustration to once again mark Equal Pay Day. It has now been 50 years since Congress passed the Equal Pay Act. It is a bipartisan law signed by President Kennedy and intended to ensure equal pay for equal work. While this was a strong step in the right direction, the sad reality is that today the gender wage gap still very much exists.

Today women, on average, make 80 cents for every dollar a White man makes, meaning the average woman has to work up until today to earn what her male colleagues made in 2018. For women of color, the pay gap is even worse. African-American women working full time only make 61 cents for every dollar a White man makes, meaning they have to work until August to earn what a White man made in 2018. American Indians make only 58 cents for every dollar, meaning they have to work until September to catch up with their White male colleagues. Latinas, on average, are paid 53 cents for every dollar their White male colleagues make. They will have to work until November—almost a full year—to earn what White men made last year.

The wage gap also hurts mothers who, on average, only make 71 cents to every dollar fathers earn. The gender pay gap starts when women are entering the workforce, and it widens throughout their careers. Pay inequity will cost the typical woman more than \$400,000 over the course of a 40-year career. Sadly, by the way, that number tops \$1 million for Latina women, meaning women have to work longer and still have less to save for retirement.

The gender wage gap doesn't just hurt women; it hurts families, communities, and the economy. Women are the primary or sole breadwinner in more than 40 percent of American families, meaning families have less money to pay for groceries, childcare, support businesses in their communities, and stay financially secure and independent.

That is why it is so important that we pass the Paycheck Fairness Act today—not tomorrow, not next year. We need to pass this now. Every year

This should not be a partisan issue. The Equal Pay Act was passed with bipartisan support. The Paycheck Fairness Act passed the House last week with Republican support. Women across the country, regardless of their skin color, where they live, or whether they are Republican or Democratic, deserve to be paid the same as their male colleagues doing the same work.

I hope my colleagues across the aisle will join us today in supporting this critical legislation. Our economy can only succeed if women can succeed.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 7, which is at the desk; that the bill be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, the distinguished Senator from Washington and I often agree on issues, and for the most part we agree on this. We agree that equal pay for equal work is the right thing to do. What I would add is that equal pay for equal work is already the law.

Paycheck discrimination on the basis of gender is wrong. It is already illegal in the United States. Congress prohibited discrimination based on gender in the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Equal Pay Act is very clear: "No employer . . . shall discriminate . . . between employees on the basis of sex by paying wages to employees . . . less than . . . he pays . . . employees of the opposite sex . . . for equal work . . . which requires equal skill, effort, and responsibility, and which are performed under similar working conditions. . . ."

Equal pay for equal work. That already is the law; therefore, it is unnecessary to have yet another law saying basically the same thing. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, let me just respond by saying the Paycheck Fairness Act that we are asking to go today and have been denied the opportunity to do so makes very important updates to the Equal Pay Act.

It reaffirms that every worker in America has the right to receive equal pay for equal work. It protects women from retaliation for talking about salary information with coworkers. It allows women to join together in class action lawsuits, and, importantly, it prohibits employers from seeking salary history so the cycle of pay discrimination cannot continue.

This bill has the support of Republicans and Democrats and millions of

workers in this country, and I really hope this Senate can reconsider and bring this important piece of legislation up that has passed the House.

I thank my colleagues who are out here today supporting this effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I want to associate myself with the comments of the Senator from Washington. She is exactly right.

We are rising today to speak about a very disturbing annual milestone that we are once again marking today. Today is known as Equal Pay Day, and here is what it means.

The average woman has to work 15 months just to get paid what the average man earns in 1 year alone. The reason today is Equal Pay Day is that it is today in the new year when the average woman finally gets paid what the average man earned the year before. If you are a woman of color, on average, you have to work even longer just to get paid what the average man earns in 1 year.

It is outrageous that we still don't actually have equal pay for equal work in this country, and it is the year 2019. It is shameful that women all across this country are being underpaid for the hard work they are doing every day. It is disgraceful that the gender wage gap is as wide as it is. This is happening in a moment in our Nation's history when women, more than ever before, are working outside the home, when many women are the actual primary breadwinner or the sole breadwinner for their family.

This is an alarming, glaring reminder of how badly our economy is failing so many workers and their families all over the country. Above all else, it is a reminder to all of us that as a country, we are still struggling to value women. We are still struggling to protect women from wage discrimination, pregnancy discrimination, workplace harassment, and unfair minimum wage; that we are still struggling to ensure that women and their families have access to paid leave, affordable daycare. All of these things add to the gender wage gap and make it even worse.

If a woman isn't getting paid a fair wage, the way she actually deserves, the wage she earned by putting in the hours of hard work, then that hurts her, her family, her children. It hurts our entire U.S. economy. It weakens the middle class. It is bad for our country.

There is no excuse for any of this. It is something all of us should be thinking about what we can do to correct, using our power to correct, because the fact that we still don't have equal pay for equal work in this country is an embarrassment.

We need equal pay for equal work, and we need it now. In this Chamber, we have a responsibility to make sure our workplace policies and our laws are actually protecting women, protecting

their families, and protecting our economy as a whole. One of the best ways we can actually solve this problem is by finally passing this law. It is common sense. It guarantees equal pay for equal work once and for all.

The good news is we already have a bill, and it is ready to go right now. It is even bipartisan. It is called the Paycheck Fairness Act. It has already passed the House, and the only thing stopping it right now is the Senate. This bill would ban retaliation against workers who discuss their wages. It would give the Department of Labor the tools needed to enforce equal pay around this country.

Although the Senator claims we already have laws, they are not working. So we need better enforcement. It would prohibit employers from relying on a salary history of prospective employees when they are deciding how much to pay them.

This bill would help end wage discrimination. It would actually make our families, our country, and our economy stronger. Don't you want that, Madam President?

So what are we waiting for? Congress needs to step up right now. We need equal pay for equal work.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 137

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I rise today, along with my colleagues, to bring attention to an issue that I think is important for all of us women. Today, we are 4 months—92 days, to be exact—into the new year. Today is the day that American women catch up in earnings to what their male counterparts made last year. In 2019—almost 100 years after women won the right to vote and 56 years after the passage of the Equal Pay Act—it still takes women 15 months to earn what a man makes in 12. That is the significance of today, Equal Pay Day.

Women make up half of the U.S. workforce. We are small business owners, entrepreneurs, doctors, lawyers, and community leaders. Yet women in the United States still make an average of 80 cents for every dollar earned by a man. For women of color, women with disabilities, and transgender women, the gap is even more jarring. Black women earn an average of 61 cents on the dollar, Native American women earn 57 cents, and Latinas earn 53 cents for every dollar the average White man makes. This means that Latinas, who face the highest pay gap in the country, must keep working until November 20 this year in order to earn what their White male colleagues made in 2018. Women with disabilities

are paid an average of 83 cents for every dollar a man with a similar disability makes at a full-time job, and transgender women can expect their average yearly earnings to fall by almost one-third after their transitions. In 2019, this is still the reality for American women. These women are often the sole breadwinners for their families.

This type of systemic discrimination has no place in our country. It is having a negative economic impact on families. As long as the wage gap exists, women face unfair barriers to success and have to fight hard for economic security for themselves and their families.

Full-time working mothers trying to provide for their families are paid, on average, \$16,000 less per year than fathers. That threatens their ability to put food on the table or save for their children's education. Older women are likely to have to work longer—by an average of 10 years—than their male counterparts to make up their lifetime wage gaps and earn enough for a secure retirement. Young women just entering the workforce can expect to see their wage gap grow, not shrink, over the course of their careers.

All of these factors hurt Nevada women, Nevada families, and our country. It undercuts American women's ability to get ahead, provide for their families, and save for retirement. In Nevada alone, women who are employed full time lose a combined total of nearly \$5 billion each year due to the wage gap.

It is past time American women earn equal pay for equal work. Women in our country will no longer accept being held back. As a Nevada Latina, it is my responsibility to use my seat at the table to ensure that future generations of women are able to have the support they need to succeed so that their families can thrive. It is time women receive the same paycheck as a man for doing the same job.

I am fighting alongside a longtime leader for women in Congress, Senator MURRAY, as well as my Senate Democratic colleagues, to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act and provide women with the opportunities and resources they need to succeed. I look forward to the day when equal pay for equal work is a reality for every woman in Nevada and across this country.

America's women are leading the economy of the future. They are building the infrastructure that fuels commerce, developing the scientific breakthroughs that improve our way of life, and driving political change. America's women are heading America's companies, and we need more. That starts with ensuring equal pay for equal work. Until we pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, I will continue to fight for women and their families, to level the playing field for them, because nothing less than their future is at stake.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from Utah.

FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. LEE. Madam President, as the deadline for Britain's withdrawal from the European Union fast approaches, there is an enormous opportunity before us—an opportunity for free trade with the United Kingdom. Such an agreement would provide tremendous economic and trade benefits to both nations and would strengthen and preserve our special relationship.

As this deadline approaches, the United States should stand ready and willing to negotiate a free-trade agreement with Britain, which is the purpose of the resolution before us today. This resolution simply declares that it is the sense of the Senate that, one, the United States has and should have a close and special relationship—one that is mutually beneficial as a trade partnership and otherwise—with the United Kingdom and that that relationship should continue without interruption; and two, that the President, with the support of Congress, should lay the groundwork for a future trade agreement with the UK.

Some of my colleagues have raised objections to it. Some have objected, for example, that this resolution didn't go through the Senate Finance Committee. First, it is important to point out here that the vast majority of resolutions expressing a sense of the Senate normally don't go through the committee process at all. Second, a straightforward assertion of friendship, of support, and of economic partnership with one of our oldest and closest allies is not by its nature and should never be controversial.

Others have claimed that the point of this measure is somehow to lambast the EU. This misses the point entirely, which is simply to preserve a unique and important alliance and promote America's economic interests.

Others have said that by encouraging a free-trade agreement with Britain, we would be "picking sides" or somehow affirming Brexit. Significantly, however, this resolution says precisely nothing about whether Brexit should or should not happen. That decision is up to the British people. But it is up to us to decide whether to stand with Britain—the nation that has been one of our greatest partners, not only in trade but also in the fight for freedom, peace, and prosperity throughout the world. We should stand with the UK and strengthen this special partnership by supporting this resolution today.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 137, submitted earlier today. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I would like to raise a few key points on this whole matter.

First, this is a question of international trade, which is a subject that has been handled by the Senate Finance Committee for literally decades. The full committee has not been consulted on this resolution. It is less than a week old, which, in my view, has not given Senators an adequate amount of time to consider it. Suffice it to say, the prospect of reshaping the American economy with sweeping trade deals is not something that ought to just rocket past the committee of jurisdiction.

Second, with respect to the substance of the request, I simply do not believe it is the role of the United States to give aid and comfort to the UK's nationalist right while it inflicts irreparable harm on the UK's own economy and citizens.

Third, thinking kind of objectively about the future, I don't believe anybody can pretend to know what the UK and its relationship with Europe is going to look like even in the near future. The Senate simply cannot make promises about trade talks months or years down the line when the May government doesn't even know what is coming down the pike in a matter of days.

Finally, there are serious issues that need consideration with respect to our trade relationship with the UK and Europe. That cannot happen if the debates play out in a slapdash process here on the floor of this Senate.

For example, European governments are in the process of implementing a new copyright regime that provides an easy way to chill free speech online with bogus copyright claims. A number of European governments, including the UK's, have proposed new digital services taxes. Let me repeat that. A number of these governments have proposed new digital services taxes. What they are attempting to do is loot American technology companies with discriminatory taxes—slapping what is essentially an extra tariff on American firms.

The UK would need to commit to abandoning these unfair policies, which, in my view, are serious barriers to trade, as a precondition of negotiations in the future. Otherwise, if the Senate were to, in effect, make promises on trade in the dark, we would risk surrendering our negotiating positions on these key issues which I have outlined without getting anything in return.

For the life of me, I just can't see the case for undermining our American businesses and American jobs for the benefit of the UK's nationalist right as they steer their own economy and international stature off a cliff.

For those reasons, Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, this isn't complicated. All we are trying to do here is to say that the United States has and probably should have without interruption an ongoing, special, vitally important trade relationship with the United Kingdom and that the President and the Congress of the United States should work toward an agreement to that end.

That isn't rocket science. It is not complicated. It is not even in itself a framework for a specific statute or for a specific trade bill. It is laying out a very broad principle—one that I would hope every one of us would accept and would embrace.

We have to remember that one of the reasons we are a country, one of the reasons we don't fly the Union Jack or sing "God Save the Queen," one of the reasons we declared independence nearly two and a half centuries ago has a lot to do with the fact that, as Americans, we understand that what we need access to is not so much proximity to government, proximity to the Crown, as proximity to other people. It is how human thriving occurs. It is how the human condition is able to be elevated. It is a free market system that has elevated more people out of poverty than any government program ever has, ever could, or ever will.

Yes, what we need is access to markets. That is part of what prompted the American Revolution, the fact that our merchants, our manufacturers, and our farmers were being excluded from markets and were being discriminated against by the Crown. We understood that would necessarily limit economic mobility within the country and was artificially holding us back. That is why we became our own country. That has a lot to do with why we declared independence.

Over time, we have benefited substantially from free markets, from free trade. We have seen the greatest economy—in fact, the greatest civilization the world has ever known—in the United States of America. That occurred not because of a government; it is not a result of who we are; it is a consequence of what we do, the decisions we have made. A lot of those decisions have been based on free markets.

With respect to my distinguished colleague, my friend, the Senator from Oregon—with respect to his suggestion that this is somehow weighing in on the merits of a political cause that he might not like in another country, that is really not our business, and this resolution is completely agnostic on that point. This resolution doesn't require us to hold hands with Great Britain. This resolution doesn't require us to say that the United Kingdom can do no wrong. This is not a bill calling for us to make America Great Britain again. No. This is here only to protect and promote free trade because free trade makes us free. Free trade makes us prosperous. We should not walk

away from one of the greatest trade partnerships we have on this planet.

Thank you.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate recess from 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. today.

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 5:30 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:30 p.m., recessed until 5:30 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ROUNDS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

PROTECT STUDENTS ACT

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN, to discuss the work we are doing to protect students and taxpayers from predatory higher education practices. I want to thank Senator DURBIN for his incredible and steadfast leadership on this issue.

All hard-working students deserve the opportunity to receive a quality education that will prepare them to compete in this 21st-century economy. Education is the cornerstone of expanding opportunity, and it is vital that we ensure that more students have access to quality, affordable higher education that will help them thrive.

Unfortunately, too often, hard-working students, including our veterans and servicemembers, are taken advantage of by predatory for-profit colleges. We have seen this issue time and again.

Years ago, we witnessed the collapse of Corinthian Colleges, Inc., and ITT Tech. Recently, we saw the collapses of Education Corporation of America, Vatterott College, and Dream Center Education Holdings. Students attended these institutions with the hope of furthering their education and building better lives for themselves and their families.

In reality, though, these companies were raking in billions of taxpayer funds that enriched their executives and investors, all while their students were receiving subpar degrees at high costs even though they were often recruited with the promise of a good-paying job after graduation. This has left tens of thousands of student borrowers with huge amounts of debt that they will never be able to repay, credits or degrees of little value, and few job prospects.

Unscrupulous actions by for-profit colleges have also widely impacted our country's veterans who bravely fought in defense of our freedoms and then, in turn, were taken advantage of by predatory, corrupt schools.

Our current system has done little to stop these bad actors. Students and taxpayers have been exploited in as-

ounding ways and to an outrageous degree. We need to do more to address and to stop these predatory practices. That is why I was pleased and honored to join with Senator DURBIN last week to introduce the Preventing Risky Operations from Threatening the Education and Career Trajectories of Students Act of 2019, otherwise known as the PROTECT Students Act.

This legislation would implement a number of commonsense protections to hold predatory institutions, including for-profit schools, accountable when they engage in unfair, deceptive, and other fraudulent practices.

To start, the PROTECT Students Act would safeguard our veterans and servicemembers from predatory practices. It would close a loophole in existing law that allows colleges to count GI benefits as non-Federal dollars toward a required 10 percent of their revenues that must be from a non-Federal source. This has led some predatory for-profit schools to deliberately and aggressively recruit veterans and even provide false information to them regarding their programs, including the expected level of student debt and what kinds of jobs would be available to the students once they graduate. By closing that loophole through the PROTECT Act, we can eliminate the incentive for these schools to prey on veterans and prevent veterans from going into significant debt for a credential or degree of little practical or economic value.

Next, this legislation would add a new review process for for-profit institutions that seek to convert to non-profit or public status—something they have been doing as a strategy to escape key accountability requirements.

Our bill would also take steps to ensure that career education programs actually prepare students for good-paying jobs because if students invest thousands of dollars in their education, they should be able to find a job that will help them pay back their loans.

The PROTECT Students Act would also codify the 2014 gainful employment regulation that helps prevent students from enrolling in low-quality programs that charge more than what a student can reasonably pay back after they graduate. This provision requires improvement by schools whose students are found to have too much debt compared to their earnings, and it cuts off Federal financial aid for those schools that don't improve. The measure also has the obvious benefit of preventing Federal taxpayer dollars from being wasted on worthless programs.

The PROTECT Students Act would help student borrowers who have been cheated or defrauded by predatory institutions, including for-profit colleges, by improving the process for borrowers to have their loans forgiven if the school they attend engages in fraud.

This legislation would increase consumer protections by banning the practice of mandatory arbitration, which

has limited students' ability to seek legal action if they have been defrauded.

These are just some of the vital steps the PROTECT Students Act would take. This bill would be a strong step forward for both students—including veterans and servicemembers—and taxpayers.

We are at a time when the Department of Education, led by Secretary Betsy DeVos, is doing everything in its power to undermine protections for students on these issues. Secretary DeVos has done a disservice to students by hiring into the Department officials who have close ties with companies that have defrauded students. They then, unsurprisingly, have supported her mission of rolling back student protections in favor of predatory companies. Secretary DeVos has worked to gut key consumer protections and weakened relief for students who were victims of fraud. This is unacceptable. By supporting the PROTECT Students Act, Members of the Senate can send a message to Secretary DeVos that we will not stand for these actions.

I want to take a moment to thank my friend and colleague, Senator DURBIN, for his consistent leadership on this issue. For years, Senator DURBIN has been sounding the alarm about the dangers of for-profit colleges, introducing legislation, and taking to the Senate floor and bringing much needed attention to this matter. It is time that more of our colleagues listen to his calls to stop these predatory institutions from taking advantage of students all across the country.

Senator DURBIN, thank you again for leading on this issue. I am thrilled that we have been able to work together to introduce the PROTECT Students Act, and I look forward to working with you to pass this legislation as part of the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

Thank you.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague from New Hampshire for being my ally in showing real leadership on this issue.

As a member of the HELP Committee, you will be sitting there in those key hearings when we discuss the reauthorization of higher education. That will be our opportunity to bring in some of these reforms that make a difference in terms of this industry of for-profit colleges and universities. I thank you for that, and I join you in this PROTECT Students Act, as I have come to the floor so many times to talk about this sector.

Most Americans don't know what we mean by for-profit colleges and universities. Who are they? Well, some of the familiar names are the University of Phoenix, DeVry University and others like it, which portray themselves as institutes of higher education, and in

some respects, they bear similarity. Yet when it comes to the actual performance of these schools, it is much different. Many families don't know the difference.

I find in the city of Chicago, IL, that students—particularly when they reach their junior and senior years—are inundated with all this advertising on social media about for-profit colleges and universities.

I would say to Senator HASSAN, there was a time in Washington before she arrived where you could find television ads that showed a young lady who appeared to be about 20 years old, in her pajamas, saying: I am here in my pajamas going to college at a for-profit college and university.

They tended to make it sound like it was a pretty easy formula. All you needed to do was log on, and the next thing you knew, you had a diploma, a certificate, and you were off for employment. That is not the real-world of for-profit colleges and universities. The real world is a much starker place.

I have often said that you can define this issue between for-profit colleges and universities and non-profit and public universities and colleges in America with two very simple numbers. This will be on the final. The numbers are 9 and 34. For-profit colleges enroll 9 percent of all postsecondary students. Nine percent go to for-profit schools. Thirty-four percent of all Federal student loan defaults are students from for-profit colleges and universities.

Nine percent of the students and 34 percent of the loan defaults. What is going on here? The answer is very obvious, and it really tells the story about for-profit colleges and universities.

They charge too much. All the surveys we looked at say their tuition is higher than you might run into at a local community college or a public university or a not-for-profit school. They charge too much tuition.

Secondly, too many students drop out before they finish. They are in so much debt, they can't continue.

Third, those who do finish and get a diploma find out it isn't worth much. They don't really end up in a job where they can pay off their student loans, so they stumble and fall despite their best efforts, deep in debt from these for-profit colleges and universities. Along the way, they learn something interesting: These credits they are supposedly earning at the for-profit colleges and universities often can't be transferred anywhere. No one recognizes them.

These students have been lured into something called a "college" or "university," lured into deep debt, and if they finish, they find they have something that isn't worth a job in the future. Senator HASSAN and I are trying to protect these families and these students from this type of exploitation.

We know and I think most Americans know that going to college can be an expensive experience, but it can be a

life-changing experience for the better. If you pick the right school and get yourself a college education, you will be in a better position, in most cases, when it comes to your future life. Right now, we are finding that when it comes to these schools, there is a much different outcome.

Throughout this higher education debate, you are going to hear a common refrain from this industry. They often say that different types of institutions of higher education shouldn't be treated differently under the law, that everybody should play by the same rules. They go on to say that any regulations or requirements that apply only to for-profit colleges discriminate on the basis of tax status.

Last week, Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos accused me of discriminating based on tax status, for-profit versus nonprofit. I couldn't care less, from my point of view, whether it is for-profit or nonprofit; the question is, What are they giving to these students? What are the students receiving for the money that is being paid?

In her final report to Congress, retired Department of Education Inspector General Kathleen Tighe wrote: "The [for-profit college] sector continues to be a high-risk area for the department." She went on to say that the industry's own practices and performances "provide a clear demonstration of the need for particular accountability."

Let's start with the basics. As I said, 9 percent of the students; 34 percent of the student loan defaults. Students at for-profit colleges graduate with an average debt of nearly \$40,000; students at nonprofit and public colleges and universities, \$28,000. In 2014, more than half of the top 25 schools whose students held the most cumulative student loan debt were for-profit colleges. Eight of the top 10 students with the most debt were for-profit colleges. The average cohort default rate over 5 years at these eight colleges was 33 percent. Over 5 years, a third of the students were going to default on their student loans.

The average, incidentally, for the two not-for-profit institutions in the top ten was 6 percent. So, at the end of 5 years, one-third of the students who graduated from for-profit schools in the top ten for cumulative student debt had defaulted. For the students from the nonprofit schools in the top ten for cumulative student debt, it was only 6 percent. These for-profit schools are notorious for luring these students and sometimes their families into debt, and then the students can't find the jobs to pay off the debt.

A basic reminder: Of all of the debt you can incur in the United States of America—think about it—that being for your home, your car, your boat, whatever it happens to be—there is one category of debt you can never discharge in bankruptcy: a student loan. You are going to carry student loan debt with you for the rest of your life.

We have a case in which a grandmother literally cosigned a note so her granddaughter could go to college, and the granddaughter defaulted on the student loan. Guess what happened to the grandmother's Social Security payment. The government came and took part of it in order to pay off that student loan.

It never, ever goes away. It is a loan—a debt—for life. That is why it is different. We can make a mistake on a home; we can lose a job or have an illness in the family and default on a mortgage and have the debt we owe discharged in bankruptcy, but it is not so when it comes to student loans.

In a 2017 letter to Secretary DeVos and congressional leadership, 19 State attorneys general, led by then-Illinois Attorney General Lisa Madigan, wrote: "Over the past 15 years, millions of students have been defrauded by unscrupulous for-profit postsecondary schools."

These chief State law enforcement officers noted the specific risks to students from the for-profit college sector.

The recent closures of so many of these schools have left these students stranded. Imagine if your son or daughter were going to one of these for-profit colleges or universities, and then it went out of business. Would that mean you would have to pay off your student loan? Technically, yes. In order to be relieved from your student loan, you would have to submit a borrower defense claim to the U.S. Department of Education.

How often do these schools fail? Let me read to you a list of some of these for-profit colleges and universities that have gone failed: Corinthian, ITT Tech, Education Corporation of America, Vatterott, and Dream Center.

How many students who attended these schools were left high and dry when the schools went out of business? There were 140,000 students. Of the more than 218,000 borrowers who have sought discharges from the Department of Education as a result of being defrauded by their institutions, the vast majority have been students from for-profit colleges.

The for-profit colleges promised them jobs that never materialized. The for-profit colleges said: If you take the following course, you can become a computer technician of some kind. It never happened. They were defrauded by these schools. They signed up for the loans, and then the schools went out of business. So here they are with the loans and no jobs.

We have this borrower defense process by which the students can go through the Federal Government to try to be relieved of their student debt. Yet I can't understand this. The U.S. Department of Education is not processing these students' borrower defense applications. When we said to Secretary DeVos, "Come on. Give these young kids a break. Their lives are on hold until they figure out what has happened to their student loan debt

from their for-profit schools," she hasn't gotten around to it, and we have been waiting patiently for that to happen. I thank Senator HASSAN for putting a finger on it.

The people who are running this Department of Education are former executives of these for-profit schools. So, it's no surprise.

So, no, Madam Secretary. Meeting our obligation as lawmakers to focus accountability and protections where there is the greatest risk to students and taxpayers is not discriminating based on tax status; it is acknowledging reality.

The bill we are talking about today doesn't target for-profit colleges, and it doesn't seek to put an end to for-profit education. It is not a witch hunt or a liberal conspiracy; it is a response to the objective risks to students and taxpayers that the for-profit college industry represents today.

The PROTECT Students Act would close the 90/10 loophole. Incidentally, can you imagine that these are so-called for-profit colleges and universities and that they are the most heavily federally subsidized businesses in America? We took a look around. We looked at defense contractors and everything we could think of. The highest level of Federal subsidy goes to this industry.

Imagine, a student signs up. The student may first qualify for a Pell grant of \$6,000. The for-profit college takes that Federal money in. Then the student still owes some debt. They say: Well, you need a government loan. So the student borrows from the government. At that point, all we have seen across the table are Federal dollars that are directly out of the Treasury. The student still carries the debt, but the money to this so-called private business is all straight out of the Federal Treasury—hardly a hearty example of capitalism at work.

The 90/10 rule was designed to prevent for-profit colleges from depending on more than 90 percent of their revenue coming straight from the Federal Treasury. It didn't work. Unfortunately, a loophole in the law only counts the Department of Education's title IV funds as Federal revenue while counting billions from the Department of Veterans Affairs' GI bill and the Department of Defense tuition assistance as non-Federal funds.

Here is what it means: If you are serving in our military and are entitled to GI bill education benefits that are going to help pay for your education, for-profit colleges have a financial incentive to aggressively target and recruit you. It turns out they can take virtually 100 percent of their revenue directly from the Treasury by enrolling large numbers of students eligible for Federal benefits that are not included in the 90/10 rule. We think that is wrong. We think the 90/10 rule should count these veterans' benefits and other Federal education benefits as Federal funds.

I see there are others on the floor, and I am not going to make this any longer. I will bring it to a close because Senator HASSAN has covered the elements of this bill that I think are very important.

To my friends who serve with me in the U.S. Senate, here is what it boils down to: Do we care about these students and their families? Are we worried about the fact that 9 percent of the postsecondary students end up at for-profit schools and account for over one-third of all student loan defaults? Are we willing to hold these schools accountable and every school accountable so they treat students fairly?

Are we willing to say, for example, the University of Illinois has a relationship with its students who enroll? The University of Illinois does not have a mandatory arbitration clause, but many for-profit schools do. What does it mean? If you feel you have been mistreated by the school, those at the school will sit down and decide your fate through an arbitration process, which students virtually always lose. Most schools don't do that to their students, but these schools look at them as cash-paying customers, and that is how they treat them when it comes to arbitration.

There are a lot of things we can do in this bill to protect the students who are currently being exploited. What is more important than making sure these students don't get off to a bad start in life but are treated fairly and honestly and not exploited at the expense of their families and the expense of American taxpayers?

I thank Senator HASSAN for being the lead sponsor of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I want to comment briefly on the proposed constitutional amendment to eliminate the electoral college that my colleagues are introducing this week. It is just the latest radical proposal by the Democrats to upend our constitutional system of government.

Why all the sudden interest in these changes? It is very simple.

The Democrats and their media wing still can't get over that they lost the 2016 election, so they have spent the last 2 years looking for scapegoats. First, it was the collusion hoax, but the Mueller report has put an end to that. Now they blame the Constitution itself and want to eliminate the electoral college, which they claim robbed the so-called popular vote winner of her rightful office.

Let's be clear about something up front: We have never had a Presidential election with a popular vote winner or loser in the genuine meaning of those words. It is not how we contest the Presidency, and it never has been. Campaigns organize their entire strategies around the electoral college. Guess what. Hillary Clinton did too. She just

didn't do it very well. For the losers to complain afterward that they really won is like a football team that gets outscored but says it won the game because it made more first downs or like a basketball team that got outscored but says it won the game because it made more free throws.

Yet let's suppose that we do change the rules of the game. Let's suppose we get rid of the electoral college. What would we get?

Get ready for nationwide recounts and election contests. If you thought Bush v. Gore was a circus or that California's ballot harvesting operations were a fraud, wait until you see a nationwide recount. Getting rid of the electoral college would also encourage fringe third parties with all of the instability we see in European parliamentary elections. Neither candidate received 50 percent of the vote in 2016. Imagine an election in which a winner would not even get 40 percent of the vote. How would the Democrats respond to that?

Of course, getting rid of the electoral college could further reduce the role of the States in our elections. The Founders believed, rightfully, that the States were sovereign political communities that had real interests and real views that deserved to have a voice in the national government apart from simple, nationwide majority rule. The Founders didn't want our vast continental Nation to be ruled like colonies from a few coastal capitals. They wanted our one, true national officeholder to understand and account for the diverse ways in which we work and live and think.

Under the electoral college, which I hasten to add is just like in the Senate, the States can express their will as States. Hawaiians get to speak as Hawaiians about whom the President ought to be. The same goes for Vermonters and Arkansans. Doing away with the electoral college would be especially harmful to the small States while it would concentrate power in big States and in a few megacities. So it is not surprising to see Senators from California and New York and Illinois supporting this radical proposal. They have obvious reasons to weaken the smaller States.

I have to confess that I am a little surprised that my colleague from Hawaii is joining their effort because it would relegate his small island State to the status of a colony—ruled from afar by a few vast cities on the mainland. Hawaii, with its 1.4 million people, would have less say in our Presidential elections than would San Diego. It would barely outpace Dallas, TX.

Politicians who support abolishing the electoral college say it would break the supposed stranglehold that rural red States have on our elections, but this isn't really a red or blue issue. Hawaii, Rhode Island, Vermont, and the District of Columbia all have a greater say about who leads our country,

thanks to the electoral college, and the last I checked, none of those places are Republican strongholds nor does one party ever have a so-called stranglehold on the electoral college. It is far from it. In the 1980s, people spoke about the Republicans' electoral college lock. In more recent times, they have spoken about the Democratic Party's blue wall in the electoral college.

My State and New Mexico, for instance, were fiercely contested in the Bush era—not so much anymore. In 2008, Barack Obama won Pennsylvania's 20 electoral votes in a cakewalk. Eight years later, Donald Trump eked out a victory in the Keystone State. Next year, Ohio might not be a competitive Presidential election State, but Texas may be. Politics can change fast, and the electoral college changes with it, which forces candidates to consider our entire vast country. Without it, a candidate could actually ignore Wisconsin, yet still win.

I should also point out that my colleague's amendment this week is not the only proposal to scrap the electoral college. A number of States have also signed on to a so-called interstate compact that would require those States to ignore the express will of their voters and award their electoral votes to whoever wins the national popular vote.

It is called the National Popular Vote Interstate Compact. I would prefer to call it the "Small State Suicide Compact."

It is designed to circumvent the difficult process of amending our Constitution, which of course means it is unconstitutional. There is already a process for changing the Constitution. It is called the amendment process.

So I will give some praise to my colleagues this week for filing a constitutional amendment to change the electoral college legally, but I would point out that the Democratic Party's willingness to bypass our Constitution to eliminate the electoral college reveals that what is at stake here is not really democratic principle but one single thing—power, seizing it and holding on to it.

Me? I think I will stick with the Constitution. Alexander Hamilton said of the electoral college: If it be not perfect, it is at least excellent.

I am with Hamilton.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 87.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark Anthony Calabria, of

Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency for a term of five years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The 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 Mark Anthony Calabria, of Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency for a term of five years.

Mitch McConnell, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Mike Rounds, Marco Rubio, John Barrasso, Pat Roberts, John Thune, John Boozman, James E. Risch, Richard C. Shelby, Roger F. Wicker, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY, Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH, Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 19-15, concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of India for defense articles and serv-

ices estimated to cost \$2.6 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER, Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-15

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

- (i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of India.
- (ii) Total Estimated Value: Major Defense Equipment* \$1.6 billion. Other \$1.0 billion. Total \$2.6 billion.
- (iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: Major Defense Equipment (MDE): Twenty-four (24) MH-60R Multi-Mission Helicopters, equipped with the following: Thirty (30) APS-153(V) Multi-Mode Radars (24 installed, 6 spares). Sixty (60) T700 GE-401C Engines (48 installed and 12 spares). Twenty-four (24) Airborne Low Frequency System (ALFS) (20 installed, 4 spares). Thirty (30) AN/AAS-44C(V) Multi-Spectral Targeting System (24 installed, 6 spares). Fifty-four (54) Embedded Global Positioning System/Inertial Navigation Systems (EGI) with Selective Availability/Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) (48 installed, 6 spares). One thousand (1,000) AN/SSQ-36/53/62 Sonobuoys. Ten (10) AGM-114 Hellfire Missiles. Five (5) AGM-114 M36-E9 Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM). Four (4) AGM-114Q Hellfire Training Missiles.

- Thirty-eight (38) Advanced Precision Kill Weapon System (APKWS) Rockets. Thirty (30) MK 54 Torpedoes. Twelve (12) M-240D Crew Served Guns. Twelve (12) GAU-21 Crew Served Guns. Two (2) Naval Strike Missile Emulators. Four (4) Naval Strike Missile Captive Inert Training Missiles. One (1) MH-60B/R Excess Defense Article (EDA) USN legacy Aircraft. Non-MDE: Also included are seventy (70) AN/AVS-9 Night Vision Devices; fifty-four (54) AN/ARC-210 RT-1990A(C) radios with COMSEC (48 installed, 6 spares); thirty (30) AN/ARC-220 High Frequency radios (24 installed, 6 spares); thirty (30) AN/APX-123 Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) transponders (24 installed, 6 spares); spare engine containers; facilities study, design, and construction; spare and repair parts; support and test equipment; communication equipment; ferry support; publications and technical documentation; personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support.
- (iv) Military Department: Navy (IN-P-SAY).
- (v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.
- (vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.
- (vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.
- (viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: April 2, 2019.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

India—MH-60R Multi-Mission Helicopters

The Government of India has requested to buy twenty-four (24) MH-60R Multi-Mission helicopters, equipped with the following:

- India—MH-60R Multi-Mission Helicopters
- The Government of India has requested to buy twenty-four (24) MH-60R Multi-Mission helicopters, equipped with the following:

thirty (30) APS-153(V) Multi-Mode radars (24 installed, 6 spares); sixty (60) T700-GE-401C engines (48 installed and 12 spares); twenty-four (24) Airborne Low Frequency System (ALFS) (20 installed, 4 spares); thirty (30) AN/AAS-44C(V) Multi-Spectral Targeting System (24 installed, 6 spares); fifty-four (54) Embedded Global Positioning System/Inertial Navigation Systems (EGI) with Selective Availability/Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) (48 installed, 6 spares); one thousand (1,000) AN/SSQ-36/53/62 sonobuoys; ten (10) AGM-114 Hellfire missiles; five (5) AGM-114 M36-E9 Captive Air Training Missiles (CATM); four (4) AGM-114Q Hellfire Training missiles; thirty-eight (38) Advanced Precision Kill Weapons System (APKWS) rockets; thirty (30) MK 54 torpedoes; twelve (12) M-240D Crew Served guns; twelve (12) GAU-21 Crew Served guns; two (2) Naval Strike Missile Emulators; four (4) Naval Strike Missile Captive Inert Training missiles; one (1) MH-60B/R Excess Defense Article (EDA) USN legacy aircraft. Also included are seventy (70) AN/AVS-9 Night Vision Devices; fifty-four (54) AN/ARC-210 RT-1990A(C) radios with COMSEC (48 installed, 6 spares); thirty (30) AN/ARC-220 High Frequency radios (24 installed, 6 spares); thirty (30) AN/APX-123 Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) transponders (24 installed, 6 spares); spare engine containers; facilities study, design, and construction; spare and repair parts; support and test equipment; communication equipment; ferry support; publications and technical documentation; personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated cost is \$2.6 billion.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to strengthen the U.S.-Indian strategic relationship and to improve the security of a major defensive partner which continues to be an important force for political stability, peace, and economic progress in the Indo-Pacific and South Asia region.

The proposed sale will provide India the capability to perform anti-surface and anti-submarine warfare missions along with the ability to perform secondary missions including vertical replenishment, search and rescue, and communications relay. India will use the enhanced capability as a deterrent to regional threats and to strengthen its homeland defense. India will have no difficulty absorbing these helicopters into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Lockheed Martin Rotary and Mission Systems, Owego, New York. The purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require the assignment of 20-30 U.S. Government and/or contractor representatives to India.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

d. Communications security devices contain sensitive encryption algorithms and keying material. The purchasing country has previously been released and utilizes COMSEC devices in accordance with set procedures and without issue. COMSEC devices will be classified up to SECRET when keys are loaded.

e. Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) (KIV-78) contains embedded security devices containing sensitive encryption algorithms and

keying material. The purchasing country will utilize COMSEC devices in accordance with set procedures. The AN/APX-123 is classified up to SECRET.

f. GPS/PPS/SAASM—Global Positioning System (GPS) provides a space-based Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) that has reliable location and time information in all weather and at all times and anywhere on or near the earth when and where there is an unobstructed line of sight to four or more GPS satellites. Selective Availability/Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) (AN/PSN-11) is used by military GPS receivers to allow decryption of precision GPS coordinates. In addition, the GPS Antenna System (GAS-1) provides protection from enemy manipulation of the GPS system. The GPS hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. When electrical power is applied, the system is classified up to SECRET.

g. Acoustics algorithms are used to process dipping sonar and sonobuoy data for target tracking and for the Acoustics Mission Planner (AMP), which is a tactical aid employed to optimize the deployment of sonobuoys and the dipping sonar. Acoustics hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. The acoustics system is classified up to SECRET when environmental and threat databases are loaded and/or the system is processing acoustic data.

h. The AN/APS-153 multi-mode radar with an integrated IFF and Inverse Synthetic Aperture (ISAR) provides target surveillance/detection capability. The AN/APS-153 hardware is unclassified. When electrical power is applied and mission data loaded, the AN/APS-153 is classified up to SECRET.

i. The AN/ALQ-210 (ESM) system identifies the location of an emitter. The ability of the system to identify specific emitters depends on the data provided by Indian Navy. The AN/ALQ-210 hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. When electrical power is applied and mission data loaded, the AN/ALQ-210 system is classified up to SECRET.

j. The AN/AAS-44C(V) Multi-spectral Targeting System (MTS) operates in day/night and adverse weather conditions. Imagery is provided by a Forward Looking Infrared (FUR) sensor, a color/monochrome day television (DTV) camera, and a Low-Light TV (LLTV). The AN/AAS-44C(V) hardware is UNCLASSIFIED. When electrical power is applied, the AN/AAS-44C(V) is classified up to SECRET.

k. Ultra High Frequency/Very High Frequency (UHF/VHF) Radios (ARC-210) contain embedded sensitive encryption algorithms and keying material. The purchasing country will utilize COMSEC devices in accordance with set procedures. The

the Asiatic Pacific Service Medal, the Philippine Liberation Ribbon with one service star, the World War II Victory Medal, and the Good Conduct Medal during his time in the service to this Nation.

Every day, men and women in uniform like Private First Class Pantleo heroically serve on the frontlines of our Nation's defense. I stand with Coloradans today to honor his sacrifice and his memory.●

TRIBUTE TO DANIELLA BOYD

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I am pleased to recognize Daniella Boyd, the Palm Beach County Teacher of the Year from Royal Palm Beach High School in West Palm Beach, FL.

Daniella received this award in front of her students with a surprise visit from Palm Beach County Superintendent Donald Fennoy, her husband, parents, grandparents and her 7-week-old son. Her students credit her style of teaching that allows them to learn with ease.

Teaching has long been a part of Daniella's ambitions, originally focusing on social science in college. Her time with Teach for America allowed for her first assignment in a math class, leading to where she is today. In order to meet that challenge, Daniella had to relearn math and considered it a great opportunity to better understand how to teach her future students.

Daniella has been a mathematics teacher at Royal Palm Beach High School for 7 years and founded the school's math honor society and the Girls Who Code Club. She earned her master's degree from Harvard University. She is the eldest child of Ecuadorian immigrants.

I extend my sincere gratitude to Daniella for her tireless efforts to help her students succeed in math. I look forward to learning of her continued success in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO MAKEDA BROME

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I honor Makeda Brome, the St. Lucie County Teacher of the Year from Fort Pierce Westwood High School in Fort Pierce, FL.

After receiving this important recognition, Makeda said everything she does is to serve others and see them experience success in all aspects of their lives. She takes to heart the fact that her students must learn mathematics and retain what she has taught in order to be successful in their next courses, in college, and beyond.

Makeda models the best practices she has seen into her classroom to provide students with the best opportunity to succeed. Her colleagues note her expertise in a wide array of mathematics practices and keen ability to share this knowledge with others makes her an energetic educator and a leader among her school.

Makeda is an instructional mathematics coach and leads collaborative

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING FRANK K. PANTLEO

● Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I wish to pay tribute to the bravery and service of PFC Frank K. Pantleo, a recently passed World War II veteran from Pueblo, CO, who served with honor in the Pacific Theater.

Private First Class Pantleo served in the U.S. Army in World War II from 1943 to 1945 with the 132nd Engineer Combat Battalion. He fearlessly aided in the Bismarck Archipelago Campaign, the Eastern Mandates Campaign, the Southern Philippines Campaign, and the Ryukus Campaign.

Private First Class Pantleo was awarded the American Service Medal,

planning sessions, tutors students, and participates in her school's algebra 1 and geometry boot camps before and after school.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Makeda for her dedication to helping her students succeed in mathematics. I look forward to learning of her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO HOLLIE CUNNINGHAM

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I recognize Hollie Cunningham, the Marion County Teacher of the Year from West Port High School in Ocala, FL.

After Hollie received the teacher of the year award at the Circle Square Cultural Center, she credited God with leading her on this journey. When she first started college, she was an education major and contemplated earning degrees in teaching or nursing. One of her professors, Dr. Osteen, gave her advice she considered an impactful pearl of wisdom: Dr. Osteen advised her to become a nurse as she would always have the chance to teach. She earned her bachelor of science in nursing from Florida State University in 2002 and her master of science in family practice from the University of South Alabama, College of Medicine in 2011.

Hollie said she left the nursing profession because God put it on her heart to become a high school teacher as her students are worth the effort and sacrifice. Hollie teaches certified nursing assistant, electrocardiograph technician tech honors, health science foundations II honor, and medical skills classes and is the department chair for the vocational department.

She has the opportunity to instruct young students interested in nursing. She believes great teachers are always on call, like doctors and nurses, and that teaching is a gift, not a degree.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Hollie for her medical work and dedication to teaching her students. I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO SARAH HALL

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I am pleased to honor Sarah Hall, the Seminole County Teacher of the Year from Longwood Elementary School in Longwood, FL.

In receiving this award, Sarah's colleagues described her as an energetic and inspiring teacher who radiates positivity to her students each day. She believes every student should have the opportunity to learn, and she devotes time to assisting her colleagues.

Sarah has been a teacher for 15 years and has made it her mission to build relationships with her students and their families by creating a literacy program, Roaring Readers: How to Train Your Cub. The program invites parents of kindergarten and first graders to the school each month for dis-

cussions on how they can better support their young readers at home.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Sarah for her dedication. I look forward to learning of her continued success in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO SHANNON KRAELING

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I honor Shannon Kraeling, the Brevard County Teacher of the Year from Eau Gallie High School in Melbourne, FL.

Shannon enjoys showing her students how to use their imagination to create art and guides them through the learning experience. She loves teaching the concept that success comes from perseverance, reevaluation, revision, refinement, and failure. Her greatest appreciation is seeing her students' pride when they master a skill with which they initially struggled.

Shannon is responsible for developing and implementing a curriculum for her classes and organizes lessons, units, and daily activities as a model for teachers throughout the district. She also provides training to integrate fine arts into the curriculum and co-teaches a biology unit.

Shannon has spent her 13-year teaching career at Eau Gallie High School. She is the ceramics teacher and department chair for the fine arts program. Shannon also mentors new teachers on classroom management and is a faculty member for the University of Phoenix, supervising local interns and teaching arts integration classes for its College of Education.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Shannon for her work to help her students succeed in school. I look forward to hearing of her continued work in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH MALFARA

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I am pleased to recognize Joseph Malfara, the Osceola County Teacher of the Year from Poinciana High School in Kissimmee, FL.

Joseph challenges his students each day toward success. His influence on the school's campus is seen with all students; from those considered at-risk to the highest achieving, they all note how tirelessly Joseph works to help them learn.

Joseph is credited with implementing several teaching strategies that led to significant gains in his students' performance in class and on the SAT. In his classroom, 78 percent of students met their reading and writing graduation requirements, compared to 57 percent for other classes. According to the school district, the average student scores increased from 442 to 476 in his content area for the SAT. They also saw an increase in the percentage of students meeting their concordance score after junior year, rising from 47 to 73 percent in one year.

Joseph is an English III, Honors, Advanced Placement English language

and composition teacher. He also leads a mentorship group called Suit Up Society that is dedicated to mentoring young men who have grown up without a positive male influence and to help improve their lives academically, behaviorally, and socially.

I would like to thank Joseph for the good work he has done for his students over the years. I extend my best wishes to him and look forward to hearing of his continued success.●

TRIBUTE TO NICOLE MOSBLECH

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I recognize Nicole Mosblech, the Indian River County Teacher of the Year from Vero Beach High School in Vero Beach, FL.

When named teacher of the year, Nicole noted the amount of support, enthusiasm, encouragement, and love she received from her students and colleagues.

Nicole has been an AP and Honors-level environmental science and honors chemistry teacher at Vero Beach High School since 2012. She educates students to better serve the planet and is also the sponsor for the Green Team and the Q+ Acceptance Club. Earlier in her career, Nicole took a 5-year hiatus from teaching to earn a doctor of philosophy degree from the Florida Institute of Technology.

I express my sincere thanks and best wishes to Nicole for her work to educate her students in science. I look forward to learning of her continued success in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO KRISTIN MURPHY

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I recognize Kristin Murphy, the Broward County Teacher of the Year from Nova Middle School in Davie, FL.

In Kristin's classroom, being respectful and never lying are the only two rules. She considered it a high honor to have been among her peers that were also nominated for this award. She was taken aback after learning of their backstories and the great strides they are achieving for their schools.

Kristin has been at Nova Middle School for 3 years and teaches world history and pre-law. She has been an educator for more than 20 years. She credits the school with providing several programs that present opportunities for students to improve their learning potential. In the law program, students work with the Public Safety Institute at Broward College to help future police officers prepare to testify in their careers.

I am thankful to Kristin for her dedication to teaching her students and look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO SARAH PASION

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I am pleased to recognize Sarah

Pasion, the Duval County Teacher of the Year from Sadie Tillis Elementary School in Jacksonville, FL.

Sarah considered this recognition an unexpected blessing from God. She believes teaching is more than a profession; its role is to serve as an inspiration for students to learn and become productive members of society. To Sarah, education is the key to a better life.

Sarah likes to engage her students in conversations to help them understand mathematical concepts, which results in the students discussing the concepts amongst one another. When she sees them agree or disagree with their ideas, she knows this is a more effective and efficient strategy to teaching and helps them to fully grasp the concepts.

Sarah is a 4th grade teacher at Sadie Tillis Elementary School and is a 15-year veteran educator in Jacksonville. Her teaching philosophy has been credited with improving her school's grade from an F to a C through personalized instruction for each student and by developing strong professional relationships with her colleagues. Both students and teachers take notes from her instructions and lessons.

I express my sincere thanks and appreciation to Sarah for her dedication to her students and colleagues. I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO SHELLI RHODEN

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I recognize Shelli Rhoden, the Baker County Teacher of the Year from Baker High School in Glen St. Mary, FL.

Shelli was shocked and humbled to be named teacher of the year and considers it to be a great honor. Originally a civil engineer, Shelli became a teacher because she wanted to have more interaction with the local youth and influence their growth. She enjoys the opportunity to build relationships with her students and says that while it can be challenging, seeing their success makes it worthwhile.

Each of her students come to class with different academic and emotional needs. Shelli tries to meet with them individually, but knows they can be distracted with life outside of the classroom. Though she finds this frustrating, humbling, and heartbreaking, she also finds the relationship and their questions fulfilling and always worth the effort.

Shelli is a math and science teacher and she teaches pre-calculus, algebra 2, and physics. Aside from teaching, Shelli cochairs the Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports, PBIS, team and cosponsors the Mu Alpha Theta math honor society.

I convey my sincere thanks and gratitude to Shelli for her work with her students over the years and look forward to hearing of her continued success.●

TRIBUTE TO KATHARINE WILLIAMS

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I recognize Katharine Williams, the Okeechobee County Teacher of the Year from the Okeechobee School Board in Okeechobee, FLA.

Katharine believes God has led her to the position she is in today, where she is able to help students with serious emotional or mental distresses. She teaches them they are lovable, can love others, and can learn how to have successful emotional regulation.

Helping students has inspired her every day, and it represents PRIDE—perseverance, respect, integrity, dependability, ethics—to her. This teaches students to be active listeners, how to have emotional regulation, and also serves as the foundation of the school district's work for its students.

Katharine has a master's degree in counseling psychology and is a licensed mental health counselor. She has worked with the Okeechobee County School District for 16 years and as a crisis counselor for 13 years. She is involved in the development and management of district protocol for both threat assessment and safety planning for students. Katharine is also one of six instructors for youth mental health first aid.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Katharine for her dedication in helping her students succeed in life. I look forward to learning of her continued success in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO BRAYDEN HILTON

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Brayden Hilton, an intern in my Aberdeen, SD, 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.

Brayden is a graduate of Roncalli High School in Aberdeen, SD. Currently, he is attending Northern State University in Aberdeen, where he is majoring in 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 Brayden for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JACOB TARRELL

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Jacob Tarrell, an intern in my Aberdeen, SD, 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.

Jacob is a graduate of Hot Springs High School in Hot Springs, SD. Currently, he is attending Presentation College in Aberdeen, where he is majoring in sports and event management. 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 Jacob for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:13 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1433. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve morale within the Department of Homeland Security workforce by conferring new responsibilities to the Chief Human Capital Officer, establishing an employee engagement steering committee, requiring action plans, and authorizing an annual employee award program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1589. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1590. An act to require an exercise related to terrorist and foreign fighter travel, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1593. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a school security coordinating council, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1433. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve morale within the Department of Homeland Security workforce by conferring new responsibilities to the Chief Human Capital Officer, establishing an employee engagement steering committee, requiring action plans, and authorizing an annual employee award program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1589. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1590. An act to require an exercise related to terrorist and foreign fighter travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1593. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a school security coordinating council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 7. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-818. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sulfometuron-methyl; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9989-65-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-819. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the increase in the Average Procurement Unit Cost (APUC) for the Offensive Anti-Surface Warfare Increment 1 (Long Range Anti-Ship Missile) (OASuW Inc. 1 (LRASM)) program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-820. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Modification of DFARS Clause 'Utilization of Indian Organizations, Indian-Owned Economic Enterprises, and Native Hawaiian Small Business Concerns'" (RIN0750-AK06) (DFARS Case 2018-D051) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 29, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-821. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of Certain Defense Acquisition Laws" (RIN0750-AK20) (DFARS Case 2018-D059) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 29, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-822. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Consent to Subcontract" (RIN0750-AK24) (DFARS Case 2018-D065) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 29, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-823. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of DFARS Clause 'Oral Attestation of Security Responsibilities'" (RIN0750-AK41) (DFARS Case 2019-D006) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 29, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-824. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Director, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Repeal of Congressional Notification for Certain Task - and

Delivery - Order Contracts" (RIN0750-AK45) (DFARS Case 2018-D076) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 29, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-825. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Margin and Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities" (RIN1557-AE29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-826. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Council's 2018 Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-827. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility; Alabama: Adamsville, City of, Jefferson County, et al." ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2019-0003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 1, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-828. 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; Connecticut; Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program Certification" (FRL No. 9991-34-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-829. 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; District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia; Maryland and Virginia Redesignation Requests and District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia Maintenance Plan for the Washington, DC-MD-VA 2008 Ozone Standard Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 9991-44-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-830. 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; Massachusetts; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9991-35-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-831. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; North Dakota; Revisions to Air Pollution Control Rules" (FRL No. 9991-25-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-832. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York Ozone Section 185" (FRL No. 9991-50-Region 2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 27, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-833. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to the United Kingdom and Spain to support the production of the United States Army's Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System (GMLRS) weapon systems for use by the United States Army in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-081); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-834. 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 Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-835. A communication from the Chairman of the United States International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2018 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-836. A communication from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2018 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-837. A communication from the General Counsel and Acting Chief Executive and Administrative Officer, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board Annual Performance Report for FY 2018 and Annual Performance Plan for FY 2019 (Revised) and FY 2020 (Proposed)"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-838. A communication from the Report to the Nation Delegation Director, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the organization's 2018 annual report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-839. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Seafarers' Access to Maritime Facilities" (RIN1625-AC15) (Docket No. USCG-2013-1087) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 28, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-23. A concurrent memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona urging the United States Congress to provide full long-term funding for the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE CONCURRENT MEMORIAL 1002

Whereas, the authority of state and local governments to promote the highest value and use of land is critical to funding education and other essential government services; and

Whereas, under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, federal land

policy changed from one of disposal, in which land would enter the state tax rolls, to permanent federal retention as untaxable public land; and

Whereas, the State of Arizona is composed of 113,417 square miles of land, of which 42% is federally owned, nontribal land that is unavailable for economic development and not part of the property tax base. Less than 17% of the land in Arizona is private land; and

Whereas, recognizing the substantial burden this policy change imposed on the ability of state and local governments to fund education and other essential government services, Congress established the Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program in 1976 to compensate for the tax revenue that these governments otherwise would have generated from the land; and

Whereas, the national average PILT payment in fiscal year 2018 was \$0.91 per acre, which is far below the amount that federal lands would return through both value-based taxation and economic development; and

Whereas, for more than a decade, Congress has been erratic in the amount and timeliness of PILT payments to Arizona counties; and

Whereas, funding for fiscal year 2018 PILT was included in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018, totaling \$553 million, but the fate of fiscal year 2019 and future years is still unknown; and

Whereas, a lack of PILT funding places the large, unsustainable burden of providing services squarely on the backs of Arizona taxpayers and critically impacts the local budget process and structural solvency of counties and public school systems; and

Whereas, without regard to the longstanding debate whether the federal government should relinquish control of Arizona lands, Congress should pay the full amount in lieu of tax revenue that is denied this state's taxing entities as long as the federal government does withhold state lands from being subject to tax; and

Whereas, an estimated \$9.4 billion provided by state, county and local monies, including 43% of the state general fund budget, funds K-12 education in Arizona. The state and local governments struggle to provide this and other essential government services, and proper payment of PILT will help this imbalance; and

Whereas, the federal government has the duty to reimburse local jurisdictions for the presence of federally managed public lands in a reliable and consistent manner.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, the House of Representatives concurring, prays:

1. That the United States Congress establish, in coordination with this state, an objective standard for calculating the value of PILT payments that are equivalent to the tax revenue this state, political subdivisions and school districts would otherwise be able to generate but for federal control of Arizona lands.

2. That the United States Congress provide full, timely and sustainable long-term funding for the PILT program to help create financial stability within Arizona's counties and public school system.

3. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit a copy of this Memorial to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona.

POM-24. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Iowa urging the United States Congress to enact legislation to implement a multilateral trade agreement between the United States, Canada, and Mexico; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 10

Whereas, Iowa is a world leader in agricultural production and industrial manufacturing, and depends on international trade to market its products; and

Whereas, Iowa prospers from multilateral trade with Canada and Mexico, its two largest international export markets, which purchase nearly half of the value of Iowa's total exports; and

Whereas, a multilateral trade agreement between the United States, Canada, and Mexico will support high-paying jobs for Iowans and build the entire North American economy; and

Whereas, a multilateral trade agreement between the United States, Canada, and Mexico should provide safeguards for United States products to create a more level playing field for America's workers, modernize agriculture trade in North America to benefit America's farmers, and establish new protections with respect to United States intellectual property, digital trade, anticorruption, and good regulatory practices; and

Whereas, multilateral trade agreements negotiated with bipartisan efforts enjoy overwhelming support from the United States business community and farm groups; and

Whereas, a multilateral trade agreement between the United States, Canada, and Mexico will reinforce the close relationship we uphold with our neighbors to the north and south; and

Whereas, a multilateral trade agreement between the United States, Canada, and Mexico must be ratified by all three governments before it can come into effect, including a congressional vote on legislation to implement the multilateral trade agreement: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, That the Iowa General Assembly recognizes that a multilateral trade agreement between the United States, Canada, and Mexico will strengthen Iowa's economy and benefit Iowa's farmers and workers, and urges Congress to enact legislation to implement such a multilateral trade agreement; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Concurrent Resolution be distributed to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and each member of Iowa's congressional delegation.

POM-25. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota relative to abortion; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3029

Whereas, a bill prohibiting abortions from being performed 20 weeks postfertilization passed in the United States House of Representatives in 2013, 2015, and 2017; and

Whereas, in 2017, the bill prohibiting abortions from being performed 20 weeks postfertilization failed to pass in the United States Senate by only nine votes, and

Whereas, over twenty states, including North Dakota, have implemented laws, with varying exceptions, prohibiting abortions from being performed 20 weeks postfertilization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein: That the Sixty-sixth Legislative Assembly urges the Congress of the United States to pass a federal prohibition on abortions performed 20 weeks postfertilization; and be it further

Resolved, that the Secretary of State forward copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representa-

tives, the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, and each member of the North Dakota Congressional Delegation.

POM-26. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Ohio urging the United States Congress to enact a Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act as expeditiously as possible; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 41

Whereas, If an abortion results in the live birth of an infant, the infant is a legal person and must be entitled to all the protections of United States law available to a legal person; and

Whereas, Any infant born alive after an abortion or within a hospital, clinic, or other facility should have the same claim to the protections of the law that would arise for any newborn or any person who comes to a hospital, clinic, or other facility for screening and treatment or otherwise becomes a patient within its care; and

Whereas, Without special protection for infants born alive after an abortion provided in law, these infants are exposed to serious injury or harm and possible death; and

Whereas, A Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act would provide the protections needed so that an infant born alive after an abortion is treated as a legal person under, and is protected by, United States law: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Senate of the 133rd General Assembly of the State of Ohio, hereby urge the Congress of the United States to enact a Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act as expeditiously as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit duly authenticated copies of this Resolution to the members of the Ohio Congressional delegation, to the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to the President Pro Tempore and Secretary of the United States Senate, and to the news media of Ohio.

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. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 978. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the work opportunity credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. JOHN-SON, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 979. A bill to amend the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 to incorporate the recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office relating to advance contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 980. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DURBIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 981. A bill to establish a public health plan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 982. A bill to increase intergovernmental coordination to identify and combat violent crime within Indian lands and of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 983. A bill to amend the Energy Conservation and Production Act to reauthorize the weatherization assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 984. A bill to address the needs of individuals with disabilities within the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 985. A bill to require annual reports on allied contributions to the common defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 986. A bill to release to the State of Arkansas a reversionary interest in Camp Joseph T. Robinson; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. ROMNEY, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 987. A bill to implement the recommendations of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Mr. TESTER):

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; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 989. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to require a person that possesses or intends to possess a tableting machine or encapsulating machine to obtain registration from the Attorney General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 990. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the implementation of the Platte River Recovery Implementation Program First Increment Extension for threatened and endangered species in the Central and Lower Platte River Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 991. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the reissuance of Social Security account numbers to young children in cases where confidentiality has been compromised; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 992. A bill to improve the treatment of Federal prisoners who are primary caretaker parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs.

FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 993. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain tax credits related to electric cars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 994. A bill to establish a National and Community Service Administration to carry out the national and volunteer service programs, to expand participation in such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 995. A bill to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 996. A bill to modify the microloan program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S.J. Res. 17. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. REED, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. KING, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. Res. 134. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Department of Justice should reverse its position in Texas v. United States, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 135. A resolution expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the acts of heroism and valor by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending those individuals for leadership and bravery in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. FISCHER, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 136. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Safe Digging Month; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE:

S. Res. 137. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should work with the Government of the United Kingdom to prepare for a future free trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. Res. 138. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of The Dental College of Georgia at Augusta University; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 139. A resolution to authorize the production of records by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 151

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors 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. 178

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

S. 208

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 208, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 283

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and utilization of, bone mass measurement benefits under part B of the Medicare program by establishing a minimum payment amount under such part for bone mass measurement.

S. 343

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 343, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to terminate the credit for new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicles and to provide for a Federal highway user fee on alternative fuel vehicles.

S. 386

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 386, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes.

S. 497

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to improve diversity and inclusion in the workforce of national security agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 521

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 521, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens associated with criminal gangs, and for other purposes.

S. 651

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 651, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 738

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 738, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to make the provision of Wi-Fi access on school buses eligible for E-rate support.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 866, a bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part.

S. 867

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors 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. 879

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) 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. 931

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 931, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable.

S. 971

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 971, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify that during a lapse in appropriations certain services relating to the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program are excepted services under the Anti-Deficiency Act, and for other purposes.

S. 973

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 973, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to continue supplemental dental and vision benefits and long-term care insurance coverage for Federal employees affected by a Government shutdown, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 9

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 9, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. RES. 85

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 85, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of Easterseals, a leading advocate and service provider for children and adults with disabilities, including veterans and older adults, and their caregivers and families.

S. RES. 98

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 98, a resolution establishing the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program for the placement in offices of Senators of children, spouses, and siblings of members of the Armed Forces who are hostile casualties or who have died from a training-related injury.

S. RES. 120

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 120, a resolution opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel.

S. RES. 123

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 123, a resolution supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and recognizing its 70 years of accomplishments.

AMENDMENT NO. 234

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 234 intended to be proposed to H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 994. A bill to establish a National and Community Service Administration to carry out the national and volunteer service programs, to expand participation in such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today is National Service Recognition Day, when we take a moment to honor AmeriCorps and Senior Corps members for the many contributions they make

in communities across the nation. As Americans, we take inspiration from those who have answered the call to serve, whether in defense of our Nation abroad or to strengthen our communities at home. The willingness to serve a purpose greater than ourselves is a hallmark of our Nation and those who commit themselves to the betterment of our country deserve and have earned our support. That is why this year, on National Service Recognition Day, I am joining Senators COONS and DUCKWORTH and Congressman LARSON and other colleagues in introducing the America's Call to Improving Opportunities Now (ACTION) for National Service Act of 2019. Our legislation calls for a great expansion of the number of service opportunities and an increased investment in those who serve.

Since 1994, over one million individuals have served through the AmeriCorps program. Annually, roughly 220,000 seniors over the age of 55 volunteer through the Senior Corps programs. These individuals have addressed critical community needs in education, economic development, health, and many other areas. They are among the teams of first responders when disaster strikes. Unfortunately, we have not created the capacity to support all Americans who want to serve.

The question of service is vital to our Nation. I was proud to have joined my friend and colleague, the late Senator John McCain, in laying out a vision and plan to support and encourage service—military, national and public—by establishing the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service. After meeting with communities across the country, the Commission submitted its interim report, which highlighted that Americans value service and are interested in pursuing transformative efforts to involve many more Americans in service. Yet, the Commission also reported that there are many barriers to service, particularly financial ones. Furthermore, there is a lack of awareness about existing programs and opportunities.

The ACTION for National Service Act will honor our national value of service, while addressing the barriers that limit citizens' opportunities to serve. Our legislation will set us on a path to one million national service positions within ten years. It will increase the educational award so that an individual completing two full years of service will earn the equivalent of four years of the average in-state tuition at a public institution. Those who are willing to serve should not have to carry a heavy burden of student loan debt to achieve their educational goals. The ACTION for National Service Act will also ease other financial barriers to service, increasing the living allowance and eliminating the tax liability for the education awards and living stipends. The bill calls for a robust outreach campaign, requiring that all eligible individuals be notified of their

options to serve. Finally, the ACTION for National Service Act calls for elevating the Corporation for National and Community Service to a cabinet-level agency and establishes a National Service Foundation to leverage private sector resources to support national service activities.

Mr. President, it is time we reinvigorate the social contract between America and its citizenry. Americans have a deep tradition of national service, starting with the dedicated men and women of our armed forces and including all those who have served in AmeriCorps, Senior Corps, and the Peace Corps. However, as more Americans wish to serve, it is important that they be given the opportunity to do so. Just as critical is investing in the education and professional development of those who have sacrificed and given so much to our Nation. Developing the talents of our most committed citizens pays life-long dividends. Our investment in the GI Bill not only honors our service members, but also enriches our Nation. Similarly, the education awards for those who have served through our national programs have economic impacts beyond the individuals who earn them. That is the new deal that the ACTION for National Service Act offers.

All AmeriCorps members take a pledge to get things done for Americans, to make communities safer, smarter and healthier, and to bring us together. I'd like to thank Senators COONS, DUCKWORTH, GILLIBRAND, KLOBUCHAR, BLUMENTHAL, BROWN, BALDWIN, and BLUMENTHAL for signing on as original cosponsors and urge our colleagues to join us in pledging to ensure that all who want to answer the call to serve can do so by cosponsoring the ACTION for National Service Act and working for its passage.

By Ms. COLLINS:

S. 995. A bill to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation with my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator BALDWIN, to reauthorize the Lifespan Respite Care Program. Respite care provides full-time caregivers with the much-needed opportunity to take a temporary break from their responsibilities caring for aging or disabled loved ones.

Every day, an estimated 43 million family caregivers attend to loved ones who are experiencing chronic, disabling health conditions. While many of these individuals care for an older adult, almost one-third of caregivers attend to persons under the age of 50. Caregivers help their loved ones remain at home, often delaying the need for nursing home or foster care placements. The value of their efforts is tremendous, amounting to more than \$470 billion in uncompensated care.

This compassionate task, however, can take a toll. Caregivers experience higher mortality rates and are more likely to acquire acute and chronic health conditions. Respite care, which provides temporary relief to caregivers from their ongoing responsibilities, helps to reduce mental stress and physical health issues they may experience, keeping caregivers healthy and families intact. Yet, almost 80 percent of America's caregivers have never received any respite services.

As a senator representing the State with the oldest median age in our Nation and as Chairman of the Senate Aging Committee, the well-being of our seniors and their caregivers is among my top priorities. Since the Lifespan Respite Care Act was enacted in 2006, 37 States and the District of Columbia have received grants to increase the availability and quality of respite services. Still, the need for respite care continues to increase and outpace available resources.

When I ask family caregivers about their greatest needs, the number one that I hear is respite. The Maine Department of Health and Human Services recognized this urgent need in a report released in December 2018 on children's behavioral health services. The report recommended expanding access to respite care services for families. One Maine mother shared, "Respite has helped our family because we have been able to take other children to doctors appointments without everyone having to go. My husband and I have been able to have a little time away. I have been able to attend to my own mental health needs." From families caring for children with disabilities to those caring for older adults, the need for respite care today continues to grow.

Our legislation will help to close the resource gap experienced by our nation's caregivers. Specifically, the Lifespan Respite Care Act will authorize robust funding for this program over the five years, through 2024, to assist states in establishing or enhancing statewide Lifespan Respite systems. It would authorize \$20 million for fiscal year 2020, with funding increasing by \$10 million annually, in order to reach \$60 million for fiscal year 2024. This bill is widely supported by leading caregiver and respite organizations, including the ARCH National Respite Network and Resource Center, the American Psychological Association, the Arc, and the Elizabeth Dole Foundation. Mr. President, I ask to include letters from these supporting organizations in the RECORD.

Mr. President, there is a large gap between caregivers who need respite services and those who receive it. Our legislation would provide the necessary resources to state respite agencies to ensure that more caregivers have access to the respite services they need. I urge all of my colleagues to join in support of this important bipartisan legislation, the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act of 2019.

APRIL 1, 2019.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. TAMMY BALDWIN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. JIM LANGEVIN,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS, SENATOR BALDWIN, REPRESENTATIVE LANGEVIN AND REPRESENTATIVE MCMORRIS RODGERS: We, the undersigned national organizations representing all ages and disabilities, are writing to offer our fervent support for and endorsement of the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act to reauthorize the Lifespan Respite Care Program at \$200 million over five years. We also want to thank you for your leadership in supporting the nation's family caregivers.

Every day, millions of American families are faced with unexpected illness, disease, or disability. A soldier is injured in war, a spouse develops multiple sclerosis or Alzheimer's disease, or a child is diagnosed with a developmental or physical disability or chronic illness. These are but a few examples of events that can forever change an individual's and family's trajectory.

While each situation is unique, the one thing that they often have in common is the incredible value of family caregivers. Forty-three million family caregivers provide a vast majority of our nation's long-term care, permitting individuals of all ages to remain in their communities and avoid or delay nursing home or foster care placements. AARP has estimated that in 2013, family caregivers provided \$470 billion in uncompensated care to adults, a staggering statistic that exceeds federal and state spending on Medicaid health services and long-term services and supports that same year.

While the benefits of family caregiving are plentiful, caregiving can take its toll—with older spousal family caregivers experiencing higher mortality rates, rates of acute and chronic conditions, and depression than non-caregivers. Respite—short-term care that offers individuals or family members temporary relief from the daily routine and stress of providing care—is a critical component to bolstering family stability and maintaining family caregiver health and well-being. Respite is a frequently requested support service among family caregivers, but 85% of family caregivers of adults receive no respite and the percentage is similar for parents caring for their children with special needs. Not surprisingly, high burden family caregivers (defined as those who assist their loved one with personal care such as getting dressed or bathing) cite lack of respite as one of their top three concerns.

To help provide family caregivers the support they need, the Lifespan Respite Care Program was enacted in 2006 with strong bipartisan support. The program provides competitive grants to states to establish or enhance statewide Lifespan Respite systems that maximize existing resources and help ensure that quality respite is available and accessible to all family caregivers. With more than half of care recipients under age 75 and more than one-third under age 50, Lifespan Respite rightly recognizes caregiving as a lifespan issue and serves families regardless of age or disability.

Though the program has been drastically underfunded since its inception, thirty-seven states and the District of Columbia have received grants and are engaged in impressive work such as identifying and coordinating respite services available through various state agencies, including veterans caregiver services; helping unserved families pay for respite through participant-directed voucher programs or mini-grants to community and

faith-based agencies; building respite capacity by recruiting and training respite workers and volunteers; and raising awareness about respite through public education campaigns. Originally authorized through Fiscal Year 2011, enactment of the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act is necessary to continue this excellent momentum, better coordinate and supply respite care to our nation's 43 million family caregivers through statewide Lifespan Respite programs and ensure that states are able to sustain the great work they have begun and still allow new states to receive a grant.

We thank you for your commitment to individuals living with disabilities, older individuals in need of assistance and support, and the loved ones who care for them and we look forward to continuing to work with you as the bill moves forward. If you would like more information, please contact Jill Kagan.

Sincerely,

AARP; Alzheimer's Association; Alzheimer's Foundation of America; Alzheimer's Impact Movement; American Association of Caregiving Youth; American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (AAIDD); American Dance Therapy Association; American Music Therapy Association; The Arc of the United States; Association of University Centers on Disabilities (AUCD); Autism Society of America; Brain Injury Association of America; Caregiver Action Network; Caring Across Generations; Christopher & Dana Reeve Foundation; Easterseals.

Elizabeth Dole Foundation; Epilepsy Foundation; Family Caregiver Alliance, National Center on Caregiving; Family Voices; Generations United; The Jewish Federations of North America; Justice in Aging; LeadingAge; Lupus Foundation of America; The Michael J. Fox Foundation for Parkinson's Research; National Alliance for Caregiving; National Alliance of Children's Trusts and Prevention Funds; National Association for Home Care and Hospice; National Association of Area Agencies on Aging (n4a); National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities; National Association of Social Workers (NASW).

National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disabilities Services; National Association of State Head Injury Administrators; National Association of States United for Aging and Disabilities; National Down Syndrome Congress; National Down Syndrome Society; National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization; National Military Family Association; National Multiple Sclerosis Society; National Respite Coalition; Paralyzed Veterans of America; Program to Improve Eldercare, Altarum; Rosalynn Carter Institute for Caregiving; Sibling Leadership Network; TASH; United Spinal Association; Well Spouse Association.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 134—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE SHOULD REVERSE ITS POSITION IN TEXAS V. UNITED STATES, NO. 4:18-CV-00167-O (N.D. TEX.)

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. REED, Mr. TESTER, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr.

LEAHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. KING, and Ms. HARRIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 134

Whereas, on February 26, 2018, 18 State attorneys general and 2 Governors filed a lawsuit in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, *Texas v. United States*, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.) (in this preamble referred to as "*Texas v. United States*"), arguing that the requirement of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) (in this preamble referred to as the "ACA") to maintain minimum essential coverage is unconstitutional and, as a result, the court should invalidate the entire law;

Whereas, in a June 7, 2018, letter to Congress, then Attorney General Jefferson Sessions announced that the Department of Justice—

(1) would not defend the constitutionality of the minimum essential coverage provision; and

(2) would argue that provisions protecting individuals with pre-existing medical conditions (specifically the provisions commonly known as "community rating" and "guaranteed issue") are inseparable from the minimum essential coverage provision and should be invalidated;

Whereas, in the June 7, 2018, letter to Congress, Attorney General Sessions also advised Congress that "the Department will continue to argue that Section 5000A(a) is severable from the remaining provisions of the ACA", indicating a difference from the plaintiffs' position in *Texas v. United States*;

Whereas, on December 14, 2018, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas issued an order that declared the requirement to maintain minimum essential coverage unconstitutional and struck down the ACA in its entirety, including protections for individuals with pre-existing medical conditions;

Whereas the decision of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas was stayed and is pending appeal before the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit;

Whereas, on March 25, 2019, the Department of Justice, in a letter to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, changed its position and announced that the entire ruling of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas should be upheld and the entire ACA should be declared unconstitutional;

Whereas, prior to 2014, individuals with pre-existing medical conditions were routinely denied health insurance coverage, subject to coverage exclusions, charged unaffordable premium rates, exposed to unaffordable out-of-pocket costs, and subject to lifetime and annual limits on health insurance coverage;

Whereas as many as 133,000,000 nonelderly people in the United States—

(1) have a pre-existing condition and could have been denied coverage or only offered coverage at an exorbitant price had they needed individual market health insurance prior to 2014; and

(2) will lose protections for pre-existing conditions if the ruling of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas is upheld in *Texas v. United States*;

Whereas, as of March 2019, employers cannot place lifetime or annual limits on health coverage for their employees, and if the ruling of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas is upheld, more than 100,000,000 people in the United States who receive health insurance through their employer could once again face lifetime or annual coverage limits;

Whereas, prior to 2010, Medicare enrollees faced massive out-of-pocket prescription drug costs once they reached a certain threshold known as the Medicare “donut hole”, and since the donut hole began closing in 2010, millions of Medicare beneficiaries have saved billions of dollars on prescription drugs;

Whereas, at a time when 3 in 10 adults report not taking prescribed medicines because of the cost, if the ruling of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas is upheld, seniors enrolled in Medicare would face billions of dollars in new prescription drug costs;

Whereas, as of March 2019, 37 States and the District of Columbia have expanded or voted to expand Medicaid to individuals with incomes below 138 percent of the Federal poverty level, providing health coverage to more than 12,000,000 newly eligible people;

Whereas, if the ruling of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas is upheld, the millions of individuals and families who receive coverage from Medicaid could lose eligibility and no longer have access to health care;

Whereas, as of March 2019, many people who buy individual health insurance are provided tax credits to reduce the cost of premiums and assistance to reduce out-of-pocket costs such as copays and deductibles, which has made individual health insurance coverage affordable for millions of people in the United States for the first time;

Whereas, if the ruling of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas is upheld, the health insurance individual exchanges would be eliminated and millions of people in the United States who buy health insurance on the individual marketplaces could lose coverage and would see premium expenses for individual health insurance increase exorbitantly; and

Whereas, if the ruling of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas is upheld, people in the United States would lose numerous consumer protections, including the requirements that—

(1) plans offer preventive care without cost-sharing;

(2) young adults can remain on their parents’ insurance plan until age 26; and

(3) many health insurance plans offer a comprehensive set of essential health benefits such as maternity care, addiction treatment, and prescription drug coverage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Department of Justice should—

(1) protect individuals with pre-existing conditions, seniors struggling with high prescription drug costs, and the millions of people in the United States who newly gained health insurance coverage since 2014; and

(2) reverse its position in *Texas v. United States*, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.).

SENATE RESOLUTION 135—EXPRESSING THE GRATITUDE AND APPRECIATION OF THE SENATE FOR THE ACTS OF HEROISM AND VALOR BY THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE JUNE 6, 1944, AMPHIBIOUS LANDING AT NORMANDY, FRANCE, AND COMMENDING THOSE INDIVIDUALS FOR LEADERSHIP AND BRAVERY IN AN OPERATION THAT HELPED BRING AN END TO WORLD WAR II

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 135

Whereas June 6, 2019, marks the 75th anniversary of the Allied assault at Normandy, France, by troops of the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Free France, known as “Operation Overlord”;

Whereas, before Operation Overlord, the German Army still occupied France and the Nazi government still had access to the raw materials and industrial capacity of Western Europe;

Whereas the naval phase of the Allied assault at Normandy was codenamed “Neptune”, and the date of June 6, 1944, is referred to as “D-Day” to denote the day on which the combat attack was initiated;

Whereas the D-Day landing was the largest single amphibious assault in history, consisting of—

(1) approximately 57,000 members of the United States Armed Forces;

(2) approximately 153,000 members of the Allied Expeditionary Force;

(3) approximately 5,000 naval vessels; and

(4) more than 11,000 sorties by Allied aircraft;

Whereas soldiers of 6 divisions (3 from the United States, 2 from the United Kingdom, which included troops of Free France, and 1 from Canada) stormed ashore in 5 main landing areas on beaches in Normandy, which were code-named “Utah”, “Omaha”, “Gold”, “Juno”, and “Sword”;

Whereas, of the approximately 10,000 Allied casualties incurred on the first day of the landing, more than 6,000 were members of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas the Allied assault and following operations were supported by ships, aircraft, and troops from Australia, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Free Norway, Greece, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the Polish Armed Forces in the West;

Whereas the advanced age of the last remaining veterans of, and the gradual disappearance of any living memory of, World War II and the Normandy landings make it necessary to increase activities intended to pass on the history of those events, particularly to younger generations;

Whereas the young people of Normandy and the United States have displayed unprecedented commitment to, and involvement in, celebrating—

(1) the veterans of the Normandy landings; and

(2) the freedom brought by those veterans in 1944;

Whereas the significant material remains of the Normandy landings found on the Normandy beaches and at the bottom of the sea in the territorial waters of France, such as shipwrecks and various items of military equipment, bear witness to the remarkable and unique nature of the material resources

used by the Allied forces to execute the Normandy landings;

Whereas 5 Normandy beaches and a number of sites on the Normandy coast, including Pointe du Hoc, were the scene of the D-Day landings and constitute, and will for all time constitute—

(1) a unique piece of world heritage; and

(2) a symbol of peace and freedom, the unspoiled nature, integrity, and authenticity of which must be protected at all costs; and

Whereas the world owes a debt of gratitude to the members of the “Greatest Generation” who assumed the task of freeing the world from Nazi and Fascist regimes and restoring liberty to Europe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 75th anniversary of the amphibious landing of the Allies on D-Day, June 6, 1944, at Normandy, France, during World War II;

(2) expresses gratitude and appreciation to the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the D-Day operations;

(3) thanks the young people of Normandy and the United States for their involvement in events celebrating the 75th anniversary of the Normandy landings with the aim of making future generations aware of the acts of heroism and sacrifice performed by the Allied forces;

(4) recognizes the efforts of France and the people of Normandy to preserve for future generations the unique world heritage represented by the Normandy beaches and the sunken material remains of the Normandy landings by inscribing those beaches and remains on the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (commonly referred to as “UNESCO”) World Heritage List; and

(5) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the 75th anniversary of the Normandy landings with appropriate ceremonies and programs to honor the sacrifices made by their fellow countrymen to liberate Europe.

SENATE RESOLUTION 136—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SAFE DIGGING MONTH

Mr. WICKER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. FISCHER, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 136

Whereas each year, the underground utility infrastructure of the United States, including pipelines, electric, gas, telecommunications, water, sewer, and cable television lines, is jeopardized by unintentional damage caused by those who fail to have underground lines located prior to digging;

Whereas some utility lines are buried only a few inches underground, making the lines easy to strike, even during shallow digging projects;

Whereas digging prior to locating underground utility lines often results in unintended consequences, such as service interruption, environmental damage, personal injury, and even death;

Whereas the month of April marks the beginning of the peak period during which excavation projects are carried out around the United States;

Whereas in 2002, Congress required the Department of Transportation and the Federal

Communications Commission to establish a 3-digit, nationwide, toll-free number to be used by State "One Call" systems to provide information on underground utility lines;

Whereas in 2005, the Federal Communications Commission designated "811" as the nationwide "One Call" number for homeowners and excavators to use to obtain information on underground utility lines before conducting excavation activities;

Whereas the 1,700 members of the Common Ground Alliance, who are dedicated to ensuring public safety, environmental protection, and the integrity of services, promote the national "Call Before You Dig" campaign to increase public awareness about the importance of homeowners and excavators calling 811 to find out the exact location of underground lines;

Whereas the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-90; 125 Stat. 1904) affirmed and expanded the "One Call" program by eliminating exemptions given to local and State government agencies and their contractors regarding notifying "One Call" centers before digging; and

Whereas the Common Ground Alliance has designated April as "National Safe Digging Month" to increase awareness of safe digging practices across the United States and to celebrate the anniversary of 811, the national "Call Before You Dig" number: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Safe Digging Month; and

(2) encourages all homeowners and excavators throughout the United States to call 811 before digging.

SENATE RESOLUTION 137—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD WORK WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM TO PREPARE FOR A FUTURE FREE TRADE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. LEE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 137

Whereas, on March 5, 1946, Sir Winston Churchill delivered the Iron Curtain speech in Fulton, Missouri, solidifying the "Special Relationship" between the United States and the United Kingdom;

Whereas, since the end of World War II, the United States and the United Kingdom have been beacons of freedom to the world, standing together in the fight against tyranny;

Whereas the Special Relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom has enabled economic prosperity and security cooperation for both countries for more than 70 years;

Whereas, on June 23, 2016, the people of the United Kingdom voted in support of a referendum to leave the European Union;

Whereas the United Kingdom is an important trading partner with the United States, with \$232,000,000,000 in goods traded between the two countries in 2017;

Whereas, on October 16, 2018, the United States Trade Representative expressed the intention of the President to negotiate a free trade agreement between the two countries after the United Kingdom leaves the European Union; and

Whereas the constitutional power of making treaties with foreign nations includes

both the legislative and executive branches: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States should have a close and mutually beneficial trading and economic partnership with the United Kingdom without interruption; and

(2) the President, with the support of Congress, should lay the groundwork for a future trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom.

SENATE RESOLUTION 138—RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DENTAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA AT AUGUSTA UNIVERSITY

Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. PERDUE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 138

Whereas The Dental College of Georgia (in this preamble referred to as the "DCG") welcomed its first class of students in 1969 as a result of the efforts of many individuals led by Dr. Judson C. Hickey, Dr. Louis Boucher, and Dr. Thomas Zwemer;

Whereas the goal of the DCG is to prepare students to provide innovative oral health care for the citizens of the State of Georgia and beyond by emphasizing education, patient care, research, and service;

Whereas, 50 years after the DCG welcomed its first class of students, the goal of the DCG remains the same;

Whereas the State of Georgia, including the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, and many benefactors provided funding for a new state-of-the-art facility for the DCG, which opened in 2011;

Whereas, as the sole dental college in the State of Georgia, nearly 400 students and 60 residents are enrolled annually in the DCG;

Whereas, as of February 2019, the DCG has 8 residency programs, including advanced education in general dentistry, endodontics, general practice, oral and maxillofacial surgery, orthodontics, pediatric dentistry, periodontics, and prosthodontics;

Whereas the DCG also has a fellowship program in esthetic and implant dentistry;

Whereas all of the programs of the DCG provide advanced education in specialized areas of dentistry; and

Whereas, since 2006, the DCG has been responsible for community outreach and has received funding from the Health Resources and Services Administration that has allowed senior dental students to provide oral health services at more than 25 different clinical sites in underserved areas of the State of Georgia, including clinics in Albany, the greater Atlanta area, Augusta, Columbus, Dalton, Gainesville, Greensboro, Jonesboro, Rochelle, Savannah, and Waynesboro: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes—

(1) the 50th anniversary of The Dental College of Georgia and its distinguished alumni; and

(2) the contributions of The Dental College of Georgia to educating the dentists of the State of Georgia.

SENATE RESOLUTION 139—TO AUTHORIZE THE PRODUCTION OF RECORDS BY THE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 139

Whereas, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs conducted an investigation into the Equifax data breach;

Whereas, the Subcommittee has received a request from the Federal Trade Commission for access to records of the Subcommittee's investigation;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by administrative or judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate is needed for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, acting jointly, are authorized to provide to the Federal Trade Commission and other law enforcement officials, regulatory agencies, and entities or individuals duly authorized by Federal or State governments, records of the Subcommittee's investigation into the Equifax data breach.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished Democratic leader, Mr. SCHUMER, I send to the desk a resolution on documentary production by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. President, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs recently conducted an investigation into the Equifax data breach. The Subcommittee has now received a request from the Federal Trade Commission seeking access to records that the Subcommittee obtained during the investigation.

In keeping with the Senate's practice under its rules, this resolution would authorize the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, acting jointly, to provide records, obtained by the Subcommittee in the course of its investigation, in response to this request and requests from other Federal or State government entities and officials with a legitimate need for the records.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND
PROPOSED

SA 246. Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 246. Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the following sums in this Act are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS
PROCESSING, RESEARCH AND MARKETING
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For an additional amount for the “Office of the Secretary”, \$3,005,442,000, which shall remain available until December 31, 2020, for necessary expenses related to losses of crops (including milk and harvested adulterated wine grapes), trees, bushes, and vines, as a consequence of Hurricanes Michael and Florence, other hurricanes, floods, tornadoes, typhoons, volcanic activity, snowstorms, and wildfires occurring in calendar years 2018 and 2019 under such terms and conditions as determined by the Secretary: *Provided*, That the Secretary may provide assistance for such losses in the form of block grants to eligible states and territories and such assistance may include compensation to producers, as determined by the Secretary, for forest restoration and poultry and livestock losses: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided under this heading, tree assistance payments may be made under section 1501(e) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (7 U.S.C. 9081(e)) to eligible orchardists or nursery tree growers (as defined in such section) of pecan trees with a tree mortality rate that exceeds 7.5 percent (adjusted for normal mortality) and is less than 15 percent (adjusted for normal mortality), to be available until expended, for losses incurred during the period beginning January 1, 2018, and ending December 31, 2018: *Provided further*, That in the case of producers impacted by volcanic activity that resulted in the loss of crop land, or access to crop land, the Secretary shall consider all measures available, as appropriate, to bring replacement land into production: *Provided further*, That the total amount of payments received under this heading and applicable policies of crop insurance under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) or the Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program (NAP) under section 196 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C.

7333) shall not exceed 90 percent of the loss as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the total amount of payments received under this heading for producers who did not obtain a policy or plan of insurance for an insurable commodity for the applicable crop year under the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.) for the crop incurring the losses or did not file the required paperwork and pay the service fee by the applicable State filing deadline for a noninsurable commodity for the applicable crop year under NAP for the crop incurring the losses shall not exceed 70 percent of the loss as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That producers receiving payments under this heading, as determined by the Secretary, shall be required to purchase crop insurance where crop insurance is available for the next two available crop years, excluding tree insurance policies, and producers receiving payments under this heading shall be required to purchase coverage under NAP where crop insurance is not available in the next two available crop years, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That, not later than 120 days after the end of fiscal year 2019, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress specifying the type, amount, and method of such assistance by state and territory: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

EMERGENCY FOREST RESTORATION PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the “Emergency Forest Restoration Program”, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence and wildfires occurring in calendar year 2018, and other natural disasters, \$480,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE
WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION
OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for “Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations”, for necessary expenses for the Emergency Watershed Protection Program related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence and wildfires occurring in calendar year 2018, and other natural disasters, \$125,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

RURAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM
ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for the cost of grants for rural community facilities programs as authorized by section 306 and described in section 381E(d)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence and wildfires occurring in calendar year 2018, and other natural disasters, \$150,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,

That sections 381E-H and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act are not applicable to the funds made available under this heading: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 101. In addition to amounts otherwise made available, out of the funds made available under section 18 of Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, \$25,200,000 shall be available for the Secretary to provide a grant to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands for disaster nutrition assistance in response to the Presidentially declared major disasters and emergencies: *Provided*, That funds made available to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands under this section shall remain available for obligation by the Commonwealth until September 30, 2020: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 102. For purposes of administering title I of subdivision 1 of division B of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123), losses to agricultural producers resulting from hurricanes shall also include losses incurred from Tropical Storm Cindy and losses of peach and blueberry crops in calendar year 2017 due to extreme cold: *Provided*, That the amounts provided by this section are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That amounts repurposed under this heading that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 103. (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a person or legal entity is not eligible to receive a payment under the Market Facilitation Program established pursuant to the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714 et seq.) if the average adjusted gross income of such person or legal entity is greater than \$900,000.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a person or legal entity if at least 75 percent of the adjusted gross income of such person or legal entity is derived from farming, ranching, or forestry related activities.

(b) A person or legal entity may not receive a payment under the Market Facilitation Program described in subsection (a)(1), directly or indirectly, of more than \$125,000.

(c) In this section, the term “average adjusted gross income” has the meaning given the term defined in section 760.1502 of title 7 Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect July 18, 2018).

(d) The amount provided by this section is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 104. In addition to other amounts made available by section 309 of division A of

the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (Public Law 115-72; 131 Stat. 1229), there is appropriated to the Secretary, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, \$600,000,000 to provide a grant to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for disaster nutrition assistance in response to a major disaster or emergency designated by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided*, That the funds made available to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under this section shall remain available for obligation by the Commonwealth until September 30, 2020, and shall be in addition to funds otherwise made available: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)(i)).

SEC. 105. There is hereby appropriated \$5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, for the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct an independent study, including a survey of participants, to compare the impact of the additional benefits provided by section 309 of Public Law 115-72 to the food insecurity, health status, and well-being of low-income residents in Puerto Rico without such additional benefits: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 106. In addition to amounts otherwise made available, out of the funds made available under section 18 of Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, \$5,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary to provide a grant to American Samoa for disaster nutrition assistance in response to the presidentially declared major disasters and emergencies: *Provided*, That funds made available to the territory under this section shall remain available for obligation by the territory until September 30, 2020: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Pursuant to section 703 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3233), for an additional amount for "Economic Development Assistance Programs" for necessary expenses related to flood mitigation, disaster relief, long-term recovery, and restoration of infrastructure in areas that received a major disaster designation as a result of Hurricanes Florence, Michael, and Lane, Typhoons Yutu and Mangkhut, and of wildfires, volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, and other natural disasters occurring in calendar year 2018, and tornadoes and floods occurring in calendar year 2019 under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$600,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That within the amount appropriated, up to 2 percent of funds may be transferred to the "Salaries

and Expenses" account for administration and oversight activities: *Provided further*, That within the amount appropriated, \$1,000,000 shall be transferred to the "Office of Inspector General" account for carrying out investigations and audits related to the funding provided under this heading.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Operations, Research, and Facilities" for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Yutu, and of wildfires, \$120,570,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020, as follows:

(1) \$3,000,000 for repair and replacement of observing assets, real property, and equipment;

(2) \$11,000,000 for marine debris assessment and removal;

(3) \$31,570,000 for mapping, charting, and geodesy services;

(4) \$25,000,000 to improve: (a) hurricane intensity forecasting, including through deployment of unmanned ocean observing platforms and enhanced data assimilation; (b) flood prediction, forecasting, and mitigation capabilities; and (c) wildfire prediction, detection, and forecasting; and

(5) \$50,000,000 for Title IX Fund grants as authorized under section 906(c) of division O of Public Law 114-113:

Provided, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit a spending plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate for funding provided under subsection (4) of this heading within 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

PROCUREMENT, ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Acquisition and Construction", \$25,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021, for improvements to operational and research weather supercomputing infrastructure and satellite ground services used for hurricane intensity and track prediction; flood prediction, forecasting, and mitigation; and wildfire prediction, detection, and forecasting: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall submit a spending plan to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate within 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

FISHERY DISASTER ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Fishery Disaster Assistance" for necessary expenses associated with the mitigation of fishery disasters, \$150,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds shall be used for mitigating the effects of commercial fishery failures and fishery resource disasters declared by the Secretary of Commerce, including those declared by the Secretary to be a direct result of Hurricanes Florence and Michael and Typhoons Yutu and Mangkhut: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses" for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael and Typhoon Yutu, \$1,336,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Buildings and Facilities" for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael and Typhoon Yutu, \$28,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RELATED AGENCIES

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

For an additional amount for "Payment to the Legal Services Corporation" to carry out the purposes of the Legal Services Corporation Act by providing for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence, Michael, and Lane, Typhoons Yutu and Mangkhut, calendar year 2018 wildfires, volcanic eruptions, and earthquakes, and calendar year 2019 tornadoes and floods, \$15,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be expended for any purpose prohibited or limited by, or contrary to any of the provisions of, sections 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, and 506 of Public Law 105-119, and all funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be subject to the same terms and conditions set forth in such sections, except that all references in sections 502 and 503 to 1997 and 1998 shall be deemed to refer instead to 2018 and 2019, respectively, and except that sections 501 and 503 of Public Law 104-134 (referenced by Public Law 105-119) shall not apply to the amount made available under this heading: *Provided further*, That, for the purposes of this Act, the Legal Services Corporation shall be considered an agency of the United States Government.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", \$200,000,000, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", \$400,000,000, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE IV
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
INVESTIGATIONS

For an additional amount for “Investigations” for necessary expenses related to the completion, or initiation and completion, of flood and storm damage reduction, including shore protection, studies which are currently authorized or which are authorized after the date of enactment of this Act, to reduce risk from future floods and hurricanes, at full Federal expense, \$35,000,000, to remain available until expended, for high priority studies of projects in States and insular areas that were impacted by Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Mangkhut, Super Typhoon Yutu, and Tropical Storm Gita: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report directly to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, including new studies selected to be initiated using funds provided under this heading, beginning not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for “Construction” for necessary expenses, \$740,000,000, to remain available until expended, to construct flood and storm damage reduction, including shore protection, projects which are currently authorized or which are authorized after the date of enactment of this Act, and flood and storm damage reduction, including shore protection, projects which have signed Chief’s Reports as of the date of enactment of this Act or which are studied using funds provided under the heading “Investigations” if the Secretary determines such projects to be technically feasible, economically justified, and environmentally acceptable, in States and insular areas that were impacted by Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Mangkhut, Super Typhoon Yutu, and Tropical Storm Gita: *Provided*, That projects receiving funds provided under the first proviso in “Title IV—Corps of Engineers—Civil—Department of the Army—Construction” in Public Law 115–123 shall not be eligible for funding provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That for projects receiving funds provided under this heading, the provisions of Section 902 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 shall not apply to these funds: *Provided further*, That the completion of ongoing construction projects receiving funds provided under this heading shall be at full Federal expense with respect to such funds: *Provided further*, That using funds provided under this heading, the non-Federal cash contribution for projects other than ongoing construction projects shall be financed in accordance with the provisions of section 103(k) of Public Law 99–662 over a period of 30 years from the date of completion of the project or separable element: *Provided further*, That up to \$25,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be used for continuing authorities projects to reduce the risk of flooding and storm damage: *Provided further*, That any projects using funds appropriated under this heading shall be initiated only after non-Federal interests have entered into binding agreements with the Secretary requiring, where applicable, the non-Federal interests to pay 100 percent of the operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation costs of the project and to hold and save the United

States free from damages due to the construction or operation and maintenance of the project, except for damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or its contractors: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report directly to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For an additional amount for “Mississippi River and Tributaries” for necessary expenses to address emergency situations at Corps of Engineers projects and rehabilitate and repair damages to Corps of Engineers projects, caused by natural disasters, including disasters in 2019, \$575,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report directly to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For an additional amount for “Operation and Maintenance” for necessary expenses to dredge Federal navigation projects in response to, and repair damages to Corps of Engineers Federal projects caused by, natural disasters, including disasters in 2019, \$908,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which such sums as are necessary to cover the Federal share of eligible operation and maintenance costs for coastal harbors and channels, and for inland harbors shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report directly to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for “Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies”, as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (33 U.S.C. 701n), for necessary expenses to prepare for flood, hurricane and other natural disasters and support emergency operations, repairs, and other activities in response to such disasters, including disasters in 2019, as authorized by law, \$510,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works shall provide a monthly report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate detailing the allocation and obligation of these funds, beginning not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACCOUNT

For an additional amount for “Central Utah Project Completion Account”, \$350,000, to be deposited into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account for use by the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission, to remain available until expended, for expenses necessary in carrying out fire remediation activities related to wildfires in 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

WATER AND RELATED RESOURCES

For an additional amount for “Water and Related Resources”, \$15,500,000, to remain available until expended, for fire remediation and suppression emergency assistance related to wildfires in 2017 and 2018: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE V

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND
INVESTIGATIONS

COAST GUARD

OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT

For an additional amount for “Operations and Support” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael, Florence, and Lane, Tropical Storm Gordon, and Typhoon Mangkhut, \$46,977,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

PROCUREMENT, CONSTRUCTION, AND
IMPROVEMENTS

For an additional amount for “Procurement, Construction, and Improvements” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael, Florence, and Lane, Tropical Storm Gordon, and Typhoon Mangkhut, \$476,755,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND
RESTORATION

For an additional amount for “Environmental Compliance and Restoration” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Michael and Florence, \$2,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for “Construction” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence, Lane, and Michael, and flooding associated with major declared disaster DR-4365, and calendar year 2018 earthquakes, \$82,400,000, to

remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of this amount \$50,000,000 shall be used to restore and rebuild national wildlife refuges and increase the resiliency and capacity of coastal habitat and infrastructure to withstand storms and reduce the amount of damage caused by such storms: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For an additional amount for the "Historic Preservation Fund" for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, and Typhoon Yutu, \$50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2022, including costs to States and territories necessary to complete compliance activities required by section 306108 of title 54, United States Code (formerly section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act) and costs needed to administer the program: *Provided*, That grants shall only be available for areas that have received a major disaster declaration pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided further*, That individual grants shall not be subject to a non-Federal matching requirement: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction" for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoons Yutu and Mangkhut, and calendar year 2018 wildfires, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions, \$78,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for "Surveys, Investigations, and Research" for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, and calendar year 2018 wildfires, earthquake damage associated with emergency declaration EM-3410, and in those areas impacted by a major disaster declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) with respect to calendar year 2018 wildfires or volcanic eruptions, \$98,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of this amount, \$72,310,000 is for costs related to the repair and replacement of equipment and facilities damaged by disasters in 2018: *Provided further*, That, not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, the Survey shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations that describes the potential options to replace the facility damaged by the 2018 volcano disaster along with cost estimates and a description of how the Survey will provide direct access for monitoring volcanic activity and the potential threat to at-risk communities: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

INSULAR AFFAIRS

ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES

For an additional amount for "Technical Assistance" for financial management expenses related to the consequences of Typhoon Yutu, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses" for necessary expenses related to the consequences of major disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) in 2018, \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For an additional amount for "Science and Technology" for necessary expenses related to improving preparedness of the water sector, \$600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Leaking Underground Storage Tank Fund" for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, calendar year 2018 earthquakes, and Typhoon Yutu, \$1,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For additional amounts for "State and Tribal Assistance Grants" for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael and calendar year 2018 earthquakes for the hazardous waste financial assistance grants program, \$1,500,000, to remain available until expended; for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Typhoon Yutu for the hazardous waste financial assistance grants program and for other solid waste management activities, \$56,000,000, to remain available until expended, provided that none of these funds shall be subject to section 3011(b) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act; and for grants under section 106 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, to address impacts of Hurricane Florence, Hurricane Michael, Typhoon Yutu, and calendar year 2018 wildfires, notwithstanding subsections (b), (e), and (f), of such section: *Provided*, That such amounts are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

For an additional amount for "State and Tribal Assistance Grants", \$349,400,000 to remain available until expended, of which \$53,300,000 shall be for capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and of which \$296,100,000 shall be

for capitalization grants under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 604(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(a)(1)(D) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, funds appropriated herein shall be provided to States or Territories in EPA Regions 4, 9, and 10 in amounts determined by the Administrator for wastewater treatment works and drinking water facilities impacted by Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Yutu, and calendar year 2018 wildfires and earthquakes: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the requirements of section 603(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(d) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, for the funds appropriated herein, each State shall use not less than 20 percent but not more than 30 percent of the amount of its capitalization grants to provide additional subsidization to eligible recipients in the form of forgiveness of principal, negative interest loans or grants or any combination of these: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall retain \$10,400,000 of the funds appropriated herein for grants for drinking water facilities and waste water treatment plants impacted by Typhoon Yutu: *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated herein shall be used for eligible projects whose purpose is to reduce flood or fire damage risk and vulnerability or to enhance resiliency to rapid hydrologic change or natural disaster at treatment works as defined by section 212 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or any eligible facilities under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, and for other eligible tasks at such treatment works or facilities necessary to further such purposes: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may retain up to \$1,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein for management and oversight: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

In addition, for an additional amount for "State and Tribal Assistance Grants", \$250,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$130,500,000 shall be for capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and of which \$119,500,000 shall be for capitalization grants under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 604(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(a)(1)(D) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, funds appropriated herein shall be provided to States or Territories in EPA Regions 2, 4 and 6 in amounts determined by the Administrator for wastewater and drinking water treatment works and facilities impacted by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria: *Provided further*, That, for Region 2, such funds allocated from funds appropriated herein shall not be subject to the matching or cost share requirements of sections 602(b)(2), 602(b)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act nor the matching requirements of section 1452(e) of the Safe Drinking Water Act: *Provided further*, That, for Region 2, notwithstanding the requirements of section 603(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(d) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, each State and Territory shall use the full amount of its capitalization grants allocated from funds appropriated herein to provide additional subsidization to eligible recipients in the form of forgiveness of principal, negative interest loans or grants or any combination of these: *Provided further*, That, for Regions 4 and 6, notwithstanding the requirements of section 603(i) of

the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(d) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, for the funds allocated, each State shall use not less than 20 percent but not more than 30 percent amount of its capitalization grants allocated from funds appropriated herein to provide additional subsidization to eligible recipients in the form of forgiveness of principal, negative interest loans or grants or any combination of these: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall retain \$37,300,000 of the funds appropriated herein for grants to any state or territory that has not established a water pollution control revolving fund pursuant to title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act for drinking water facilities and waste water treatment plants impacted by Hurricanes Irma and Maria: *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated herein shall only be used for eligible projects whose purpose is to reduce flood damage risk and vulnerability or to enhance resiliency to rapid hydrologic change or a natural disaster at treatment works as defined by section 212 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or any eligible facilities under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, and for other eligible tasks at such treatment works or facilities necessary to further such purposes: *Provided further*, That, for Region 2, notwithstanding section 603(d)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and section 1452(f)(2) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, funds allocated from funds appropriated herein may be used to make loans or to buy, refinance or restructure the debt obligations of eligible recipients only where such debt was incurred on or after September 20, 2017: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may retain up to \$1,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein for management and oversight: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for “Forest and Rangeland Research” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, and the calendar year 2018 wildfires, \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For an additional amount for “State and Private Forestry” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, and the calendar year 2018 wildfires, \$12,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For an additional amount for “National Forest System” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, and the calendar year 2018 wildfires, \$84,960,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of this amount \$21,000,000 shall be used for hazardous fuels management activities: *Provided*

further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

For an additional amount for “Capital Improvement and Maintenance” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, and the calendar year 2018 wildfires, \$36,040,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Wildland Fire Management”, \$720,271,000, to remain available through September 30, 2022, for urgent wildland fire suppression operations: *Provided*, That such funds shall be solely available to be transferred to and merged with other appropriations accounts from which funds were previously transferred for wildland fire suppression in fiscal year 2018 to fully repay those amounts: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For an additional amount for “National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences” for necessary expenses in carrying out activities set forth in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9660(a)) and section 126(g) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 related to the consequences of major disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) in 2018, \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS TITLE

SEC. 601. Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the agencies receiving funds appropriated by this title shall provide a detailed operating plan of anticipated uses of funds made available in this title by State and Territory, and by program, project, and activity, to the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That no such funds shall be obligated before the operating plans are provided to the Committees: *Provided further*, That such plans shall be updated, including obligations to date, and submitted to the Committees on Appropriations every 60 days until all such funds are expended.

TITLE VII

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Training and Employment Services”, \$50,000,000, for the dislocated workers assistance national reserve for necessary expenses directly related to the consequences of Hurricanes

Florence and Michael, Typhoon Mangkhut, Super Typhoon Yutu, wildfires and earthquakes occurring in calendar year 2018, and tornadoes and floods occurring in calendar year 2019 (referred to under this heading as “covered disaster or emergency”), to remain available through September 30, 2020: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor may transfer up to \$1,000,000 of such funds to any other Department of Labor account for reconstruction and recovery needs, including worker protection activities: *Provided further*, That these sums may be used to replace grant funds previously obligated to the impacted areas: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided, up to \$500,000, to remain available until expended, shall be transferred to “Office of Inspector General” for oversight of activities responding to such covered disaster or emergency: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

For an additional amount for “Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant”, \$30,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2021, for necessary expenses directly related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Mangkhut, Super Typhoon Yutu, wildfires and earthquakes occurring in calendar year 2018, and tornadoes and floods occurring in calendar year 2019 in those areas for which a major disaster or emergency has been declared under section 401 or 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191): *Provided*, That the Secretary shall allocate such funds based on assessed need notwithstanding sections 658J and 658O of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990: *Provided further*, That such funds may be used for costs of renovating, repairing, or rebuilding child care facilities without regard to section 658F(b) or 658G of such Act and with amounts allocated for such purposes excluded from the calculation of percentages under subsection 658E(c)(3) of such Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 658J(c) of such Act, funds allotted to a State and used for renovating, repairing, or rebuilding child care facilities may be obligated by the State in that fiscal year or the succeeding three fiscal years: *Provided further*, That Federal interest provisions will not apply to the renovation or rebuilding of privately-owned family child care homes, and the Secretary shall develop parameters on the use of funds for family child care homes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall not retain Federal interest after a period of 10 years in any facility renovated, repaired, or rebuilt with funds appropriated under this paragraph: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph shall not be available for costs that are reimbursed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, under a contract for insurance, or by self-insurance: *Provided further*, That obligations incurred for the purposes provided herein prior to the date of enactment of this Act may be charged to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for “Children and Families Services Programs”, \$90,000,000,

to remain available through September 30, 2021, for necessary expenses directly related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Mangkhut, Super Typhoon Yutu, wildfires and earthquakes occurring in calendar year 2018, and tornadoes and floods occurring in calendar year 2019 in those areas for which a major disaster or emergency has been declared under section 401 or 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191): *Provided*, That \$55,000,000 shall be for Head Start programs, including making payments under the Head Start Act: *Provided further*, That none of funds provided in the previous proviso shall be included in the calculation of the “base grant” in subsequent fiscal years, as such term is defined in sections 640(a)(7)(A), 641A(h)(1)(B), or 645(d)(3) of the Head Start Act: *Provided further*, That funds provided in the second previous proviso are not subject to the allocation requirements of section 640(a) of the Head Start Act: *Provided further*, That \$5,000,000 shall be for payments to States, territories, and tribes for activities authorized under subpart 1 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act, with such funds allocated based on assessed need notwithstanding section 423 of such Act and paid without regard to percentage limitations in subsections (a) or (e) in section 424 of such Act: *Provided further*, That \$25,000,000 shall be for payments to States, territories, and tribes authorized under the Community Services Block Grant Act, with such funds allocated based on assessed need notwithstanding sections 674(b), 675A, and 675B of such Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 676(b)(8) of the Community Services Block Grant Act, each State, territory, or tribe may allocate funds to eligible entities based on assessed need: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this paragraph shall not be available for costs that are reimbursed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, under a contract for insurance, or by self-insurance: *Provided further*, That up to \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be available for Federal administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That obligations incurred for the purposes provided herein prior to the date of enactment of this Act may be charged to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES
EMERGENCY FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the “Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund”, \$201,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2020, for necessary expenses directly related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Mangkhut, Super Typhoon Yutu, wildfires and earthquakes occurring in calendar year 2018, and tornadoes and floods occurring in calendar year 2019 in those areas for which a major disaster or emergency has been declared under section 401 or 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191) (referred to under this heading as “covered disaster or emergency”), including activities authorized under section 319(a) of the Public Health Service Act (referred to in this Act as the “PHS Act”): *Provided*, That of the amount provided, \$80,000,000 shall be transferred to “Health Resources and Services Administration—Primary Health Care” for expenses directly related to a covered disaster

or emergency for disaster response and recovery, for the Health Centers Program under section 330 of the PHS Act, including alteration, renovation, construction, equipment, and other capital improvement costs as necessary to meet the needs of areas affected by a covered disaster or emergency: *Provided further*, That the time limitation in section 330(e)(3) of the PHS Act shall not apply to funds made available under the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided, not less than \$20,000,000 shall be transferred to “Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—CDC-Wide Activities and Program Support” for response, recovery, mitigation, and other expenses directly related to a covered disaster or emergency: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided, not less than \$100,000,000 shall be transferred to “Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration—Health Surveillance and Program Support” for grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements for behavioral health treatment, treatment of substance use disorders, crisis counseling, and other related helplines, and for other similar programs to provide support to individuals impacted by a covered disaster or emergency: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided, up to \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be transferred to “Office of the Secretary—Office of Inspector General” for oversight of activities responding to such covered disasters or emergencies: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

HURRICANE EDUCATION RECOVERY
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Hurricane Education Recovery” for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael, Typhoon Mangkhut, Super Typhoon Yutu, wildfires, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions occurring in calendar year 2018, and tornadoes and floods occurring in calendar year 2019 in those areas for which a major disaster or emergency has been declared under section 401 or 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191) (referred to under this heading as “covered disaster or emergency”), \$165,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2020, for assisting in meeting the educational needs of individuals affected by a covered disaster or emergency: *Provided*, That such assistance may be provided through any of the programs authorized under this heading in title VIII of subdivision 1 of division B of Public Law 115–123 (as amended by Public Law 115–141), as determined by the Secretary of Education, and subject to the terms and conditions that applied to those programs, except that references to dates and school years in Public Law 115–123 shall be deemed to be the corresponding dates and school years for the covered disaster or emergency: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Education may determine the amounts to be used for each such program and shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate of these amounts not later than 7 days prior to obligation: *Provided further*, That \$2,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading, to remain available until expended, shall be transferred to the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Education for oversight of activities supported with funds appropriated under this heading, and up to \$1,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be for program adminis-

tration: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 701. Not later than 30 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretaries of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education shall provide a detailed spend plan of anticipated uses of funds made available in this title, including estimated personnel and administrative costs, to the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That such plans shall be updated and submitted to the Committees on Appropriations every 60 days until all funds are expended or expire.

SEC. 702. (a) Section 1108(g)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1308(g)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and (E)” and inserting “(E), and (F)”;

(2) in subparagraph (C), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “and (E)” and inserting “and (F)”;

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (F);

(4) by inserting after subparagraph (D), the following:

“(E) Subject to subparagraph (F), for the period beginning January 1, 2019, and ending September 30, 2019, the amount of the increase otherwise provided under subparagraph (A) for the Northern Mariana Islands shall be further increased by \$36,000,000.”; and

(5) in subparagraph (F) (as redesignated by paragraph (3) of this section)—

(A) by striking “title XIX, during” and inserting “title XIX—

“(i) during”;

(B) by striking “and (D)” and inserting “(D), and (E)”;

(C) by striking “and the Virgin Islands” each place it appears and inserting “, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands”;

(D) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) for the period beginning January 1, 2019, and ending September 30, 2019, with respect to payments to Guam and American Samoa from the additional funds provided under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall increase the Federal medical assistance percentage or other rate that would otherwise apply to such payments to 100 percent.”.

(b) The amounts provided by the amendments made by subsection (a) are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE VIII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended, for audits and investigations related to Hurricanes Florence, Lane, and Michael, Typhoons Yutu and Mangkhut, the calendar year 2018 wildfires, earthquakes, and volcano eruptions, and other disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided*, That, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Government Accountability Office shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a spend plan specifying funding estimates for audits and investigations of any such declared disasters occurring in 2018 and identifying funding estimates or carryover balances, if any, that

may be available for audits and investigations of any other such declared disasters: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE IX

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps”, \$115,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, for planning and design related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael on Navy and Marine Corps installations: *Provided*, That none of the funds shall be available for obligation until the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate receive a master plan for the installations: *Provided further*, That, not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed expenditure plan for funds provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Military Construction, Air Force”, \$700,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, for planning and design, and construction expenses related to the consequences of Hurricane Michael: *Provided*, That none of the funds shall be available for obligation until the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate receive a basing plan and future mission requirements for installations significantly damaged by Hurricane Michael: *Provided further*, That, not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed expenditure plan for funds provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for “Military Construction, Army National Guard”, \$42,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael: *Provided*, That none of the funds shall be available for obligation until the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate receive form 1391 for each specific request: *Provided further*, That, not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, the Director of the Army National Guard, or his designee, shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed expenditure plan for funds provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That such funds may be obligated or expended for planning and design and military construction projects not otherwise authorized by law: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
MEDICAL FACILITIES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Medical Facilities”, \$3,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, for necessary expenses related to the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael and Typhoons Mangkhut and Yutu: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, upon determination that such action is necessary to address needs as a result of the consequences of Hurricanes Florence and Michael and Typhoons Mangkhut and Yutu, may transfer such funds to any discretionary account of the Department of Veterans Affairs: *Provided further*, That before a transfer may take place, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit notice thereof to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be available for obligation until the Secretary of Veterans Affairs submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed expenditure plan for funds provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TITLE X

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the “Public Transportation Emergency Relief Program” as authorized under section 5324 of title 49, United States Code, \$10,542,000 to remain available until expended, for transit systems affected by major declared disasters occurring in calendar year 2018: *Provided*, That not more than three-quarters of 1 percent of the funds for public transportation emergency relief shall be available for administrative expenses and ongoing program management oversight as authorized under sections 5334 and 5338(f)(2) of such title and shall be in addition to any other appropriations for such purpose: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION
OPERATIONS
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

Of the amounts made available for “Federal Aviation Administration—Operations” in division B of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123), up to \$18,000,000 shall also be available for necessary expenses related to the consequences of major declared disasters occurring in calendar year 2018: *Provided*, That amounts repurposed under this heading that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
EMERGENCY RELIEF PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the Emergency Relief Program as authorized under section 125 of title 23, United States Code, \$1,650,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an

emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for “Community Development Fund”, \$2,491,000,000 to remain available until expended, for necessary expenses for activities authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, restoration of infrastructure and housing, economic revitalization, and mitigation in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster that occurred in 2018 or 2019 (except as otherwise provided under this heading) pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided*, That funds shall be awarded directly to the State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974) at the discretion of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading the Secretary shall allocate an amount necessary to address unmet needs for restoration of infrastructure for grantees that received allocations for disasters that occurred in 2017 under this heading of division B of Public Law 115-56 and title XI of subdivision 1 of division B of Public Law 115-123: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided in the previous proviso, the Secretary’s determination of unmet needs for restoration of infrastructure shall not take into account mitigation-specific allocations: *Provided further*, That any funds made available under this heading and under the same heading in Public Law 115-254 that remain available, after the funds under such headings have been allocated for necessary expenses for activities authorized under such headings, shall be allocated to grantees receiving awards for disasters that occurred in 2018 or 2019, for mitigation activities in the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster that occurred in 2018 or 2019: *Provided further*, That allocations under the previous proviso shall be made in the same proportion that the amount of funds each grantee received or will receive under this heading for unmet needs related to disasters that occurred in 2018 or 2019 and the same heading in division I of Public Law 115-254 bears to the amount of all funds provided to all grantees that received allocations for disasters that occurred in 2018 or 2019: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under the text preceding the first proviso under this heading and under the same heading in Public Law 115-254, the Secretary shall allocate to all such grantees an aggregate amount not less than 33 percent of the sum of such amounts of funds within 120 days after the enactment of this Act based on the best available data, and shall allocate no less than 100 percent of such funds by no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall not prohibit the use of funds made available under this heading and the same heading in Public Law 115-254 for non-Federal share as authorized by section 105(a)(9) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5305(a)(9)): *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, grantees may establish grant programs to assist small businesses for working capital purposes to aid in recovery: *Provided further*, That as a condition of making any grant, the Secretary shall certify in

advance that such grantee has in place proficient financial controls and procurement processes and has established adequate procedures to prevent any duplication of benefits as defined by section 312 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5155), to ensure timely expenditure of funds, to maintain comprehensive websites regarding all disaster recovery activities assisted with these funds, and to detect and prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds: *Provided further*, That with respect to any such duplication of benefits, the Secretary shall act in accordance with section 1210 of Public Law 115-254 (132 Stat. 3442) and section 312 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5155): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall require grantees to maintain on a public website information containing common reporting criteria established by the Department that permits individuals and entities awaiting assistance and the general public to see how all grant funds are used, including copies of all relevant procurement documents, grantee administrative contracts and details of ongoing procurement processes, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That prior to the obligation of funds a grantee shall submit a plan to the Secretary for approval detailing the proposed use of all funds, including criteria for eligibility and how the use of these funds will address long-term recovery and restoration of infrastructure and housing, economic revitalization, and mitigation in the most impacted and distressed areas: *Provided further*, That such funds may not be used for activities reimbursed by, or for which funds have been made available by, the Federal Emergency Management Agency or the Army Corps of Engineers, in excess of the authorized amount of the project or its components: *Provided further*, That funds allocated under this heading shall not be considered relevant to the non-disaster formula allocations made pursuant to section 106 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5306): *Provided further*, That a State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe may use up to 5 percent of its allocation for administrative costs: *Provided further*, That the first proviso under this heading in the Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2018 (division I of Public Law 115-254) is amended by striking “State or unit of general local government” and inserting “State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5302))”: *Provided further*, That the sixth proviso under this heading in the Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2018 (division I of Public Law 115-254) is amended by striking “State or subdivision thereof” and inserting “State, unit of general local government, or Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5302))”: *Provided further*, That in administering the funds under this heading, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive, or specify alternative requirements for, any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the obligation by the Secretary or the use by the recipient of these funds (except for requirements related to fair housing, nondiscrimination, labor standards, and the environment), if the Secretary finds that good cause exists for the waiver or alternative requirement and such waiver or alternative requirement would not be inconsistent with the overall purpose of title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That,

notwithstanding the preceding proviso, recipients of funds provided under this heading that use such funds to supplement Federal assistance provided under section 402, 403, 404, 406, 407, 408 (c)(4), or 502 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) may adopt, without review or public comment, any environmental review, approval, or permit performed by a Federal agency, and such adoption shall satisfy the responsibilities of the recipient with respect to such environmental review, approval or permit: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 104(g)(2) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5304(g)(2)), the Secretary may, upon receipt of a request for release of funds and certification, immediately approve the release of funds for an activity or project assisted under this heading if the recipient has adopted an environmental review, approval or permit under the preceding proviso or the activity or project is categorically excluded from review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall publish via notice in the Federal Register any waiver, or alternative requirement, to any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers pursuant to title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 no later than 5 days before the effective date of such waiver or alternative requirement: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, up to \$5,000,000 shall be made available for capacity building and technical assistance, including assistance on contracting and procurement processes, to support States, units of general local government, or Indian tribes (and their subrecipients) that receive allocations pursuant to this heading, received disaster recovery allocations under the same heading in Public Law 115-254, or may receive similar allocations for disaster recovery in future appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading and under the same heading in Public Law 115-254, up to \$2,500,000 shall be transferred, in aggregate, to “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Program Office Salaries and Expenses—Community Planning and Development” for necessary costs, including information technology costs, of administering and overseeing the obligation and expenditure of amounts under this heading: *Provided further*, That the amount specified in the preceding proviso shall be combined with funds appropriated under the same heading and for the same purpose in Public Law 115-254 and the aggregate of such amounts shall be available for any of the same such purposes specified under this heading or the same heading in Public Law 115-254 without limitation: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That amounts repurposed under this heading that were previously designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act are designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 1001. (a) Amounts previously made available for activities authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, restoration of infrastructure and housing, economic revitalization, and mitigation in

the most impacted and distressed areas resulting from a major disaster, including funds provided under section 145 of division C of Public Law 114-223, section 192 of division C of Public Law 114-223 (as added by section 101(3) of division A of Public Law 114-254), section 421 of division K of Public Law 115-31, and any mitigation funding provided under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” of Public Law 115-123, that were allocated in response to Hurricane Matthew, may be used interchangeably and without limitation for the same activities in the most impacted and distressed areas related to Hurricane Florence. In addition, any funds provided under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” in this Act or in division I of Public Law 115-254 that are allocated in response to Hurricane Florence may be used interchangeably and without limitation for the same activities in the most impacted and distressed areas related to Hurricane Matthew. Until HUD publishes the Federal Register Notice implementing this provision, grantees may submit for HUD approval revised plans for the use of funds related to Hurricane Matthew that expand the eligible beneficiaries of existing programs contained in such previously approved plans to include those impacted by Hurricane Florence. Approval of any such revised plans shall include the execution of revised grant terms and conditions as necessary. Once the implementing Notice is published, any additional action plan revisions shall follow the requirements contained therein.

(b) Amounts made available for administrative costs for activities authorized under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) related to disaster relief, long-term recovery, restoration of infrastructure and housing, economic revitalization, and mitigation in the most impacted and distressed areas under this Act or any future Act, and amounts previously provided under section 420 of division L of Public Law 114-113, section 145 of division C of Public Law 114-223, section 192 of division C of Public Law 114-223 (as added by section 101(3) of division A of Public Law 114-254), section 421 of division K of Public Law 115-31, and under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Planning and Development—Community Development Fund” of division B of Public Law 115-56, Public Law 115-123, and Public Law 115-254, shall be available for eligible administrative costs of the grantee related to any disaster relief funding identified in this subsection without regard to the particular disaster appropriation from which such funds originated.

(c) The additional uses pursuant to this section for amounts that were previously designated by the Congress, respectively, as an emergency requirement or as being for disaster relief pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act are designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 1002. Of all amounts made available for mitigation activities under the heading “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Community Development Fund” in Public Law 115-123, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the allocations to all eligible grantees, and the necessary administrative requirements applicable to such allocations within 90 days after enactment of this Act;

(1) For any plans or amendments addressing the use of any funds provided under Public Law 115–123 and received by the Secretary prior to December 22, 2018, the Secretary shall review pending amendments within 15 days of enactment of this Act and pending plans within 30 days of enactment of this Act;

(2) After the date of this Act, the Secretary may not apply the statutory waiver or alternative requirement authority provided by Public Law 115–123 to extend or otherwise alter existing statutory and regulatory provisions governing the timeline for review of required grantee plans.

TITLE XI

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS ACT

SEC. 1101. Each amount designated in this Act by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available (or rescinded or transferred, if applicable) only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

This Act may be cited as the “Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2019”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I have 11 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 2, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: General Tod D. Wolters, USAF, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Commander, United States European Command and Supreme Allied Commander Europe, and General Stephen J. Townsend, USA, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Commander, United States Africa Command.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 2, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 2, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “The President’s Fiscal year 2020 budget for Department Energy.”

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 2, 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 Tuesday, April 2, 2019, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing on NATO.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 2, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 2, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Ron A. Bloom, of New York, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, and James A. Crowell IV, and Jason Park, both of the District of Columbia, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 2, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 2, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 2, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

The Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 2, 2019, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following fellows on the HELP Committee be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 116th Congress: Meghan Mott, Garrett Devenney, Brian Keplun, Lindsey Tepe, Erika Nuernberg, and Yesenia Ayala.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mary Polanco, a fellow from the Air Force assigned to my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this year.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 7

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 7) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

MEDICAID SERVICES INVESTMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2019

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1839.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1839) to amend title XIX to extend protection for Medicaid recipients of home and community-based services against spousal impoverishment, establish a State Medicaid option to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through health homes, prevent the misclassification of drugs for purposes of the Medicaid drug rebate program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. McCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 1839) was passed.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF TED LINDSAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 132 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 132) honoring the life of Ted Lindsay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further 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. 132) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 28, 2019, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DENTAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA AT AUGUSTA UNIVERSITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 138, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 138) recognizing the 50th anniversary of The Dental College of Georgia at Augusta University.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 138) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

AUTHORIZING THE PRODUCTION OF RECORDS BY THE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 139, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 139) to authorize the production of records by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and 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. 139) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12:30 p.m., Wednesday, April 3; 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 and resume consideration of the Kessler nomination, with the time until 2 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during Monday's session of the Senate ripen at 2 p.m. tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, last week the dedicated journalists at the Cincinnati Enquirer published the first in a series of reports on the Ohioans left behind by the economic recovery. This is a big project that seven reporters, three editors, photographers, and videographers are all working on. They are doing what reporters do best—going behind the headlines about stock market performance and actually talking to people from all walks of life in southwest Ohio, in their circulation area.

When you look beyond the numbers, you see a pretty different story from what this President and his Wall Street

Cabinet like to brag about. These reporters traveled the 80-mile road that stretches from Middletown to Cincinnati and beyond. They talked to teachers and factory workers. They talked to pastors and truckdrivers, people of all ages, and people of all races. Over and over they found the same things. These Ohioans have simply not recovered from the Wall Street recession of a decade ago. They haven't recovered from decades of trade and tax policies that funneled wealth to the richest CEOs and the biggest multinational corporations.

These reporters wrote:

[These workers] may find jobs, but they don't earn the salaries and benefits they once did. They may pay their bills on time, but they're one illness or broken-down car from financial crisis.

Their savings accounts are stretched. Their health and retirement benefits inadequate. They need more than they have.

In other words, their hard work isn't paying off. Listen to some of the stories these reporters tell. They talked to a subcontractor for AK Steel. His employer is renegotiating its contract with the factory.

The authors wrote:

If the contract vanishes, someone will still do the work he does, but that's about the only thing he knows for sure. A new company might fire everyone and hire new drivers or decide to cut his pay.

More and more companies use subcontractors and independent contractors as a way to—as they always put it—"cut labor costs." What they really mean is to pay people less.

Listen to the story of a Mexican immigrant in West Chester Township in Butler County. He is here legally. He has a work permit. He works 60 hours a week to support his family. Do you know what he told reporters?

It's real tight with four kids. . . . I'm not here to take anybody else's jobs or money or benefits. . . . I'm here to work.

Another woman, a cancer survivor, talked to reporters about her crippling medical debt. She had to leave her job because of her condition, and she owes thousands of dollars because of her cancer treatment.

They wrote that "the debt took her car first, then her home of 12 years."

Think about that. The debt took her car first because she got sick and because we don't protect people with pre-existing conditions because of the President's comments and antics and all. They took her car first, and then they took her home of 12 years.

Listen to a story of a man in Middletown. He is trying to get a job, but he can't yet afford a computer or a car. He is applying for a job in an auto parts plant. He has to fill out forms online, and he has to have a drug test. That means trying to figure out how to get to a job counseling center to use a computer. It means trying to get a friend to drive him another 7 miles to the drug testing center.

The competition for a decent-paying job like that is so stiff that he is afraid

if he doesn't get the application in very soon, the job will be gone.

Think about the many layers of these stories. The reporting makes clear, as they say, that these are not outliers. These are not unusual cases. "Household income is lower today than before the recession in almost half the counties in Greater Cincinnati."

Greater Cincinnati is partly in Kentucky, represented by Senator McCONNELL and Senator PAUL, partly in Indiana, represented by Senator YOUNG and our new colleague from Indiana, and much in Ohio, represented by Senator PORTMAN and me.

Poverty is worse in one-third of those counties.

Wages for the poorest workers have barely budged since the recovery began.

And we know it isn't just southwest Ohio. It is the whole State. It is the whole country. It is the same story we see repeated over and over and over in this country. Wall Street recovers, corporations recover, and the wealthiest CEOs recover and then some. They all do better than ever.

Corporations spent more than \$800 billion with a "b"—800,000 million—in stock buybacks last year.

Remember the President's tax bill? I heard him say in his Cabinet Room, every American would get at least a \$4,000 raise. Some Americans would get a \$9,000 raise. He told a group of Senators face-to-face. There would be many more good-paying jobs created. He went to Youngstown, OH, only 1 year ago and said: Don't sell your homes. Stay here. The jobs are going to come back. We are going to build new factories. We are going to repopulate these factories.

Well, on his watch, three shifts of 1,500 people each at Lordstown—a GM plant—and Youngstown have been laid off, it appears, permanently.

The President's tax bill? That money didn't end up in the pockets of the company's workers. Stock buybacks go straight to the pockets of CEOs and other corporate managers who make the decisions about what to do with corporate stock buybacks.

So do you remember I said \$800 billion in stock buybacks last year? For the first time in a decade, corporations spent more on buying back their own stock, meaning taking the money and putting it in their pockets. They spent more money buying back their own stock than they did in long-term capital expenditures and investing in their workers' pay. They took more money for themselves—as if the President didn't know that of his tax cut, between 70 percent and 80 percent went to the richest 1-percent of the people in the country over time. He knew that. I think he knew that.

He also knew that in this tax bill there was a 50-percent-off coupon. If you produce in the United States, you pay a 21-percent corporate tax rate. If you move to Mexico you pay a 10.5-percent corporate tax rate. So what the President did and what the Senate did

is to give a 50-percent-off coupon as a reward for shutting down your production in Lordstown, OH, and moving to Mexico.

Corporations spent more on their stock than investing in long-term capital expenditures and workers, but ordinary Americans—what happened to the people in this story?

As for this story that the Cincinnati Enquirer wrote about and all of the people they interviewed—White, Black, Latino, Asian American, young and old, middle class and people falling out of the middle class, and low-income people who work hard and aspire to the middle class—what happened to them? They got left behind.

We need to change how we think about our economy. It is time for people in this Congress and in the White House to stop measuring the economy in quarterly earnings reports and stock prices.

Who thinks that way? People don't structure their lives thinking about quarterly financial reports. They don't structure their lives thinking of stock prices. People don't think in terms of 3-month earnings quarters. They think in terms of school years. They think in terms of 30-year mortgages. They think in terms of "the number of years left that I have to work before my retirement, and am I going to have enough?" That is the way that people think, but that is who we are here to serve, in South Dakota, Ohio, or anywhere else. We are here to serve workers and here to serve families. We are not here on the Senate Banking Committee to serve Wall Street. We are not here on the Senate Finance Committee or on the floor of the Senate to serve the biggest companies in the country that typically reward us by moving jobs overseas.

We need policies that restructure our economy to recognize that all work has dignity. When work has dignity, everyone can afford healthcare and everyone can afford housing. They have power over their schedules. They have the economic security to start a family, to pay for daycare or college or both, to take time off to care for themselves or their families when they are sick, and they save for their retirement.

The dignity of work fundamentally is about wages. It is about benefits. It is about having power over your own schedule. It is about daycare. It is about saving for retirement. It is about being able to take off to care for a loved one, whether you are raising children or taking care of an aging parent.

When work has dignity, our country has a strong middle class and a prosperous future.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, last month, the courts once again stepped in and allowed politicians to meddle in women's healthcare. Last month the courts once again stepped in. Unelected judges—unelected, conservative, most-

ly male judges—stepped in and allowed politicians to meddle in women's healthcare. These unelected judges ruled that Ohio can defund Planned Parenthood, limiting healthcare options for tens of thousands of Ohioans.

Planned Parenthood centers just in my State alone provide 70,000 free STD and HIV tests, cancer screenings, domestic violence education, and prenatal care. These clinics—and I have been to a number of them—are often the only places that many women and some men have to turn. Think again about the services they provide. They provide STD and HIV tests. They provide cancer screenings. They provide prenatal care. They provide domestic violence education.

What happens if they can't go to Planned Parenthood because of a political movement? Because of the politicizing of women's health, we see elected officials in Ohio taking away that care. They can't afford care somewhere else or they live too far away from other healthcare providers to have any real options. They turned to Planned Parenthood.

This decision by these judges is devastating for Ohioans. I get letters all the time from Ohioans who rely on Planned Parenthood.

One woman in Cincinnati wrote:

[Planned Parenthood] performed several of my yearly screenings, one of which detected an abnormality that was taken care of early and didn't develop into a major problem. Also, I was able to buy highly effective birth control at a reasonable price and avoid harder choices down the road.

Why would a legislature and a judge want to take that away?

A woman from West Liberty, a conservative community in our State, wrote:

If Planned Parenthood was not available to me as a young woman, I would've had nowhere to turn.

I was comfortable with seeking the help of the kind women and staff at Planned Parenthood. I was young and naive, but at least I knew there was somewhere safe to turn to.

A Columbus woman who wrote from the State's largest city:

At the age of 18, I became a young new mother. Throughout my years as a new mom, struggling to manage financial responsibilities on top of everything else, I used Planned Parenthood for most of my OB needs.

Planned Parenthood not only provided a well-rounded education in which I had received none previously—

That happens so often—

but they also provided services that I would not have had access to otherwise.

Another woman from Cincinnati wrote:

I am 42 years old, but when I was a young woman in college I went to a Planned Parenthood clinic to receive my yearly check-ups. It was cheap, near my college, and easy to access.

During one of my appointments they shared with me that they had found an irregular pap-smear and that I needed immediate medical attention.

[The doctor] suggested a surgery for an issue she found that may later cause issues

with having children. The doctor was amazing, supportive, and provided me the guidance as a young woman of what to do to ensure I was safe and getting the proper next steps.

Planned Parenthood saved my life.

The animosity coming out of the majority leader's office, the animosity toward Planned Parenthood coming from so many of my colleagues, and so much of the animosity coming out of the White House toward Planned Parenthood just amazes me because this woman said: "Planned Parenthood saved my life."

Think about that.

It is time for old White men in Washington and in courtrooms—and that is usually who they are. They are very affluent, they are generally older men judges, they are generally White, and they are making decisions in courtrooms and dictating decisions that should be made between a woman and her doctor.

That is what this is. This, along with heartbeat bills and all the other bills making their way through the State legislature in my State of Ohio and around the country—they spread lies. They spread disinformation. They are all about the same thing—intimidating women, intimidating doctors, and making it harder for women to get comprehensive healthcare. It is immoral, and it is despicable. I join so many of my colleagues in pledging never to stop fighting to protect women's freedom to make their own healthcare decisions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here for my usual climate speech. The Presiding Officer has seen this increasingly battered poster many times before.

We have had an interesting period in the Senate recently with respect to climate change, and I would like to take a moment to comment on it. Before I do that, I think it is important to kind of frame the backdrop of what is going on and why this matters.

This is the measurement of carbon dioxide levels on Earth. This goes back 400,000 years—no agriculture, no wheel, a long, long time ago. We see, over time, this recurring pattern in which CO₂ levels stay between 180 and 300 ppm. You can go back and people can see that these are—there are temperature shifts that correlate with these CO₂ levels.

We know this—I saw Senator BROWN from Ohio here. We know this because people have gone out—including two scientists from Ohio State. They have gone out to glaciers in the farthest and highest reaches of the planet, and they have drilled out cores of ice that go back tens of hundreds of thousands of years, and they are able to figure out, from the characteristics of the ice of that period, what the CO₂ concentra-

tions were—that and a lot of other data as well. This is very well scientifically established.

It is a little bit hard to see because it gets lost in the 0 year line, but this is what has happened. This is the highest level ever right there—highest historic CO₂ level. We shot up to here. We are actually over 400 ppm, and the range was 180 to 300. Do the math. Between 300 and 180, that is 120 ppm range, and now we are almost, by that full range, out of that range. That is an extraordinary anomaly in the entire history of the species—in fact, before our species.

So the idea that this has all happened before, that the climate is always changing, that is factual and scientific nonsense. Anybody who says that is either uninformed or should be ashamed of themselves because it is not always changing up to 400-plus ppm. It just isn't. We have no experience of that ever.

We do know that as these CO₂ levels go up, the planet warms. We have known that since Abraham Lincoln was President. When Abraham Lincoln was riding around here in his top hat, scientists had begun to understand about greenhouse gases and what that did. So there is nothing new in this. The science is totally established, and this is unprecedented in human history and before.

Here is where it comes home to roost for me. This is a map of the northern part of my State. This is the lower tip of our capital city, Providence. Over here is Bristol and Warren. Here is Warwick. This is Narragansett Bay. This is the top of Prudence Island. Here is the Mount Hope Bay. If you can see, all the parts that you see here as blue, all of that is now land. All of that is now land.

It has people's homes on it. It has people's businesses on it. It has some of our public recreation facilities on it. It is all predicted to disappear by the end of this century if we don't get our hands around this climate change problem. We don't have until the end of the century to stop it because like a giant oil tanker, you can put all engines in reverse, you can shut off engines, it is still going to have a lot of carry because of the momentum that has built up. This, where we are right now, is going to create effects for a long time. We have way less until the end of the century to act. The newest studies say we have about 12 years, if we really want to get ahead of this.

There has been some interesting stuff said on the Senate floor recently. Tell it to the people whose homes are going to be gone. This isn't just a political debate. There are lives, there are people's homes, and there are people's businesses that are at stake.

We had a big appearance by 13 Republican Senators led by the majority leader, and they all came to the Senate floor to make fun of the Green New Deal or at least the Koch brothers' phony cartoon version of the Green New Deal. Out of the 13, 12 mentioned

a fanciful \$93 trillion cost that the Koch brothers have come up with. So basically the purpose was to come to the floor, make fun of the Green New Deal, and pretend it is going to cost \$93 trillion.

Very few could even use the word "climate change." Imagine that. There were 13 Republican Senators coming to the floor to talk about climate change, and all they want to do is make fun of the Green New Deal, mock it, pretend it is going to cost \$93 trillion, and then go away as if these people's homes didn't matter and as if this weren't serious to people who are looking at this.

The news report that I have just seen on the \$93 trillion says this:

When it comes to the \$93 trillion estimate for the Green New Deal, created by its critics, the answer is found in a network of interlinked groups: a think tank, its political arm and a super political action committee. Add a web of secret donors, and eager lawmakers—

The 13 of them—

and you have the blurry outlines of an echo chamber that propels an unverified claim into the orbit of Washington politics.

I am sure that is all good fun, but this is pretty serious, from my point of view. It actually got worse after that. A Senator from Utah came to the floor with a lot of jokes about rocket launchers, velociraptors, tauntauns, and 20-foot seahorses carrying Aquaman around.

By the way, if you are looking at having your constituents' homes disappear underwater, jokes about Aquaman are not funny, not funny at all. Train seahorses—give me a break—jokes about cows.

"Critics," he said, "will chastise me for not taking climate change seriously." Well, yes, I am here to do exactly that because it is darn serious to most everybody and particularly to my home State. So jokes about Sharknados just—I would say this: You might disagree with me about climate change, and you might not want to do anything about climate change, but, by God, I think if there is one thing we owe each other in this body, it is sincerity, and to come to the floor with an insincere bill that is designed to fail is demeaning to the whole body. To come to the floor and make jokes, when our own national scientific agencies are warning of these harms about all of this, it is just fundamentally wrong.

Let me talk about the Senator's home State a little bit because one of the things I have done is paid my colleagues the sincere compliment of going to many of their States to look into what is going on with climate change. Let me review what I have said about Utah because I went there.

What I have learned—I gave a speech before I went in based on research that I did. I gave another speech when I came out based on what I heard in Utah. Going in, I knew the average temperature had already increased 2 full degrees Fahrenheit in parts of Utah. The 2 degrees centigrade we are

worried about for the globe, it is already there in Utah. There are actually spots in Utah where the temperature has risen as much as 4.5 degrees Fahrenheit.

There are significant trends in river and stream flooding and also the highest drying trend in rivers and streams in Southern Utah as the system comes unhinged. Lake Powell in Utah, when I was ready to leave, was about half full, which is kind of a big deal because Salt Lake City gets 80 percent of its water supply from snowpack in the Uinta and Wasatch Mountains.

Local predictions were that water managers in Utah would no longer be able to depend on the historic data about snow melt and river flow because the change is so complete that the old data isn't germane any longer. There have been wildfire studies led by Dr. Philip Dennison of the University of Utah connecting climate change to the wildfires that take place out there. In fact, Utah State has entire courses of study teaching students about climate change—how to predict it and how to fight back. Utah State has its own climate action plan. It has an active climate center. The University of Utah has an active sustainability center. Students and researchers work there to address climate change. Each year, the University of Utah publishes an annual report on climate change. I am sure that is all just so amusing to my colleague from Utah.

Mayors are engaged in Utah, including the mayor then of Salt Lake City. Mayor Ralph Becker took first place in the Mayors Climate Protection Center rankings. I can only imagine how amusing that was for the senior Senator from Utah to yuck it up about that.

His ski areas—Alta, Canyons, Deer Crest, Deer Valley, and Park City—all signed the BICEP coalition's Climate Declaration in support of taking national action on climate change. I bet that really cracked him up.

The Park City Foundation in Utah was predicting a local temperature increase of 6.8 degrees Fahrenheit by 2075, which they said would cause a total loss of snowpack in the lower Park City resort area. It kind of takes the fun out of skiing when there is no snow in Park City.

A retired pediatrician named David Folland, who is the coleader of Salt Lake Citizens Climate Lobby, wrote there is an actual solution: "Placing a fee on carbon sources and returning the proceeds to households would create jobs, build the economy, improve public health, and help stabilize the climate." I hope my colleague from Utah has a chance to go talk to this retired pediatrician and hear from him just how amusing all of this climate change stuff is.

Republican Presidential candidate John Huntsman, who has served Utah as Governor, wrote a New York Times op-ed piece back then titled "The G.O.P. Can't Ignore Climate Change."

Well, it is getting to the point where we are pushing them enough. They can't ignore it so much. Their fallback, I guess, is to make fun of it. That is really, really helpful.

Here is what he wrote:

The fact is that the planet is warming, and failing to deal with this reality will leave us vulnerable and possibly worse. Hedging against risk—

He said— is an enduring theme of conservative thought.

An enduring theme of conservative thought, up until it bumps up against the enduring theme of Republican fundraising from the fossil fuel industry.

So then I went out there and had a chance to meet with the folks from the Utah ski industry. During the last season, they told me they had nearly 4½ million skiers and snowboarders and that almost 1 in 10 jobs in Utah is in tourism. They market themselves as having what they call the Greatest Snow on Earth, and they pointed out that according to the EPA, average temperatures had already risen 2 full degrees Fahrenheit there over the past 100 years.

I visited with Ski Utah and with a group of professional skiers from the group, Protect Our Winters, who want to see the mountaintops and the ski slopes that give them their recreation and give them their living, in many cases, protected and saved. The scientists at the University of Utah, including meteorologists Leigh Sturges and John Horel, were predicting that there would be more rain and less snow at major Utah ski resorts under different climate change scenarios. Rain at a ski resort is not a good thing, and with this many jobs in Utah, you would think somebody from the Utah Senate delegation might be willing to take this seriously and work in good faith toward a solution.

Ski Utah's 14 resorts would certainly like that. They got together and sent a letter last year to the Governor of Utah asking the State to take action on climate change. Salt Lake City's letter went out too. Salt Lake City's drinking water, 70 percent comes from snowpack melt. When the snowpack goes away, so does that captured supply of water serving the city.

The State, when I was there, was experiencing abnormally dry conditions. I went out to the Great Salt Lake Shorelands Preserve that was run by The Nature Conservancy. You go out there, and you walk on boards over the marsh because, you know, it is marsh. It is wet. It is spongy. It is hard to walk through. Not then. It was dry as a bone. We were walking over it, but there was absolutely dry soil underneath.

The Salt Lake itself has shrunk. The lake's volume has fallen by nearly half since Utah's early pioneers reached its shores in 1847. The lake's surface is down 11 feet. That has left roughly half of the former lake bed dry and exposed.

The Salt Lake, for which Salt Lake City is named, is drying up. I guess that is another reason for a lot of yucks here on the Senate floor from the senior Senator from Utah.

There is a bird—I know here in Mammoth Hall, where we care mostly about big interests and big money, it may seem ridiculous to talk about a bird. There is a bird called Wilson's phalarope. It flies a 3,000-mile migration from the Patagonian lowlands up to the Great Salt Lake. As the Great Salt Lake shrinks, it is going to find that it doesn't have a destination. It is going to be a little like the red knot flying from Brazil straight through to Delaware. Imagine how long taking an airplane flight from Brazil to Delaware would be. Now imagine you are a bird that is about this high, and you have to fly all that way yourself in a straight shot. They do that. Here is this wonderful Wilson's phalarope, and its lake is drying up.

All that dust from the dried-up lake bed is now a contaminant, compromising air quality in Salt Lake City, which now gets an "F" from the American Lung Association for both ozone and particulates. The Salt Lake City mayor then was Jackie Biskupski. She had pledged to transition the city to 100 percent renewable energy sources by 2032.

I will tell you, I met with scientists from Brigham Young, Utah State, and the University of Utah, and there was no doubt about climate change. There was nobody yucking it up about climate change. There were no jokes about tauntauns and Aquaman. This is something they take very seriously. It is entitled to be taken very seriously.

I will close by referring to some of the comments I found over the weekend from members and in some cases leaders of the Mormon Church, the Church of Latter-day Saints. Here is the official statement by Mormon Women for Ethical Government on Environmental Stewardship and Climate Change:

The consequences of maintaining the status quo of carbon emissions and the resulting rate of global temperature change are dire and include major shifts in patterns of weather, fire, and hydrology; large-scale impacts on biodiversity; and disruption to human systems, including agriculture and food supplies, migration, national security, and economies. . . . We urge governments, institutions, and businesses to boldly mobilize in pursuit of creative and radical strategies that will effectively curb climate change and dramatically reduce carbon emissions.

I urge the Senator from Utah to read that and to listen to those constituents.

G. Michael Alder wrote—I guess in the Ensign on an LDS Church website—"about the environmental damage caused by such man-made problems as acid rain, excessive carbon dioxide and other chemicals in the atmosphere, deforestation, and the pollution of our oceans, lakes, and streams," saying that "as a result, serious, mostly unintended changes are taking place in the

air, water, and land around us. . . . The evidence is mounting that we are doing ourselves and our mortal home serious damage. . . . A continued increase in carbon dioxide and other gases in the atmosphere, produced by our vast consumption of oil, coal, and other fossil fuels, appears to be responsible for a general increase in temperature worldwide. . . . That increase threatens possible major changes in climate around the world, potentially causing drought in some areas and greater rainfall in others. . . . The studies showed that the greatest global temperature increase has taken place in the last decade. Carbon dioxide and trace gases produced by our industrial societies were considered to be the cause.”

Well, they are. In fact, they are unanimously considered to be the cause by the responsible science community.

The last thing I will read is an address given by Elder Steven E. Snow of the Seventy of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints during a

panel discussion that occurred Wednesday October 10, 2018, at Utah State University.

He begins by agreeing with his mountain fellow Utahans about Utah’s fresh powder snow, calling it, again, the “greatest snow on earth,” at least according to Utah’s license plates.

He goes on to say:

It causes me much grief when I look outside my window and see a hazy inversion or when I hear consistent reports of Utah’s poor air quality. I am concerned for the families affected by wildfires and for the school-children forced to stay indoors because of smoky skies.

No jokes. He is concerned.

He goes on:

Algal blooms are breaking out in Utah’s lakes. We are experiencing unusually dry seasons and record-breaking warm winters.

He cites another church leader, President Dallin Oaks, and quotes him:

These are challenging times, filled with big worries: wars and rumors of wars, possible epidemics of infectious diseases, droughts, floods, and global warming.

He goes on to say, quoting a commentary on MormonNewsroom.org, that “the creation groans under the weight of recklessness and indulgence.”

Here is the sentence that stuck with me: “Climate change is real, and it’s our responsibility as stewards to do what we can to limit the damage done to God’s creation.”

Making jokes about that will not limit the damage we are now doing to God’s creation.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 12:30 P.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:51 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, April 3, 2019, at 12:30 p.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
KIMBERLY HAMM

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, together, Leader MCCARTHY and I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Kimberly Hamm, who is departing the House to become a Senior Policy Advisor to the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Ms. Hamm has served with great integrity and effectiveness in the House's Office of General Counsel for more than four years, as an Assistant and an Associate General Counsel. During her tenure, Ms. Hamm played a critical role in safeguarding the legal interests of the House of Representatives, its Members, Officers and employees, particularly in connection with federal court litigation involving issues of the highest institutional importance.

Specifically, Ms. Hamm provided invaluable legal counsel and representation to many of the Committees of the House, greatly assisting them in fulfilling their constitutionally-authorized oversight roles, protecting confidential committee communications with the Executive Branch from disclosure, and defending the House's oversight and investigative prerogatives when challenged in litigation.

In addition, Ms. Hamm provided frequent and vital legal advice to the institutional offices of the House, assisting with the development and implementation of numerous internal procedures, improving mechanisms for executing legal requirements and defending long-standing institutional norms, including the right of the House to open each legislative day with a prayer.

Ms. Hamm's work on behalf of the House has been of the highest caliber and I am confident that the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission will benefit from her exceptional policy knowledge and legal counsel. On behalf of the entire House community, Leader MCCARTHY and I thank Ms. Hamm for her dedicated service, and wish for her the very best in all her future endeavors.

ASHLEY CORIA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ashley Coria for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Ashley Coria is a student at Jefferson Jr/Sr. and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ashley Coria is exemplary of the type of achievement

that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ashley Coria for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. A. DONALD McEACHIN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. MCEACHIN. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on April 1 during roll call no. 137, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 1593. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea." I was also unavoidably detained during roll call no. 138, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass, as amended, H.R. 1590. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea." I was also unavoidably detained during roll call no. 139, on approving the Journal. Had I been present, I would have voted, "aye."

The descriptions would be, respectively:

137—"On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 1593, the Coordinating and Leveraging Activities for School Security Act";

138—"On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 1590, the Terrorist and Foreign Fighter Travel Exercise Act"; and

139—"on approving the Journal".

OATH CEREMONY ON APRIL 5, 2019

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure and sincerity that I take this time to congratulate thirty individuals who will take their oaths of citizenship on April 5, 2019. This memorable occasion will be held at the United States Courthouse and Federal Building in Hammond, Indiana.

America is a country founded by immigrants. From its beginning, settlers have come from countries around the world to the United States in search of better lives for their families. Oath ceremonies are a shining example of what is so great about the United States of America—that people from all over the world can come together and unite as members of a free, democratic nation. These individuals realize that nowhere else in the world offers a better opportunity for success than here in America.

On April 5, 2019, the following people, representing many nations throughout the world,

will take their oaths of citizenship in Hammond, Indiana: Yankho E. Pfledderer, Anas Bassam Kalam, Dalbag Singh Bajwa, Adriana Rivera, Josh Jesus Ortega, Luz C. Marquez, Zora Ristevska, Janette Magallanes, Maritza Zapata, Gonzalo Diaz, Julia A. Martinez, Araceli G. Campos, Bert Veenendaal, Yadviga Tischenko, Zoran Avramoski, Neha J. Patel, Irma Yolanda Duarte, Juan Carlos Amaya, Audrey Corinne Kaucoud Behinan, Miguel A. Rivera, Nathalia Conte Silvestre Casiano, Bojana Pavic, Victor Alvarez, Angelica Maria Avila, Enrique Vargas, Sonal B. Patel, Luis Enrique Hernandez, Sofia Sanchez, Alicia Prado, and Lourdes Maria Fry.

Although each individual has sought to become a citizen of the United States for his or her own reasons, be it for education, occupation, or to offer their loved ones better lives, each is inspired by the fact that the United States of America is, as Abraham Lincoln described it, a country "... of the people, by the people, and for the people." They realize that the United States is truly a free nation. By seeking American citizenship, they have made the decision that they want to live in a place where, as guaranteed by the First Amendment of the Constitution, they can practice religion as they choose, speak their minds without fear of punishment, and assemble in peaceful protest should they choose to do so.

Madam Speaker, I respectfully ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating these individuals who will become citizens of the United States of America on April 5, 2019. They, too, are American citizens, guaranteed the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We, as a free and democratic nation, congratulate them and welcome them.

MICHAEL A. CRUZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Michael A. Cruz for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Michael A. Cruz is a student at Arvada West High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Michael A. Cruz is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Michael A. Cruz for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

• 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.

ADDRESSING THE SITUATION IN
KAZAKHSTAN CONCERNING
BERGEI RYSKALIYEV

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my concern with what appears to be a politically motivated prosecution of the former governor of Kazakhstan's western Atyrau region, Bergei Ryskaliyev, as well as 22 other people, including Ryskaliyev's family members and colleagues from the western oil-producing region of the country. This sham trial appears to be the next step in the Kazakh regime's efforts to silence legitimate calls of local citizens demanding oil revenue transparency, safe working conditions, and fair pay. Just not long ago, in the country's western oil-producing city of Zhanaozen, a peaceful demonstration was crushed by Kazakh police, who opened fire on the protestors, resulting in at least 16 people killed.

The fact that Kazakhstan has a long history of discrediting and even criminally prosecuting members of the ruling elite when they are perceived to be gaining too much power and prominence, which was the case with Mr. Ryskaliyev during his time in office, points to the possibility of political motivation behind the prosecution. Additionally, independent NGOs and western legal experts who observed the trial point out that there has not been sufficient evidence to justify the prejudicial findings regarding Mr. Ryskaliyev, essentially denying him a fundamental human right to a fair trial. The U.S. State Department Human Rights Reports for 2018 corroborates that there is no such thing as judicial independence in Kazakhstan and corruption is evident at every stage of the judicial process.

As Kazakhstan is aspiring to be a strategic partner of the United States, I call on my colleagues to join me in urging the State Department to review the case of Mr. Ryskaliyev and assure that it will be included in our Government's discussions on promoting democracy in this important part of the world.

In light of the resignation of President Nursultan Nazarbayev, the issue of peaceful transition of power with participation of opposition politicians and people previously convicted on politically motivated charges is extremely important.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FAIR PAY
ACT OF 2019

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today is Equal Pay Day, which marks the number of additional days a woman must work to earn what a man earned the prior year. The 1963 Equal Pay Act (EPA), the first of the great civil rights statutes of the 1960s, has grown creaky with age and needs updating to reflect the new workforce, in which women work almost as much as men.

The best case for a stronger and updated EPA occurred here in the Congress in 2003,

when female custodians in the House and Senate won an EPA case after showing that female workers were paid a dollar less per hour for doing the same or similar work as males. Had these women not been represented by their union, they would have had an almost impossible task in using the rules for bringing and sustaining an EPA class action lawsuit.

Based on my own experience as the first woman to chair the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, I again introduce the Fair Pay Act (FPA) on behalf of the average female worker, who is often first steered to, and then locked into, jobs with wages that are deeply influenced by the gender of individuals who have traditionally held such jobs. Much of the wage inequality women experience today is because of employer-steering and deeply rooted wage stereotypes, which result in wages paid according to gender and not according to the skill necessary to do the job. I introduce the FPA because the pay disparity most women face today stems mainly from the segregation of women and men in different jobs and paying women in female-dominated jobs systematically less. Two-thirds of white women and three quarters of African-American women work in just three areas: sales/clerical, service and factories. We need more aggressive strategies to break through the societal barriers present throughout history the world over, as well as employer-steering based on gender, which is as old as paid employment itself.

The FPA requires that if men and women are doing comparable work, they are to be paid comparable wages. If a woman, for example, is an emergency services operator, a female-dominated profession, she should not be paid less than a fire dispatcher, a male-dominated profession, simply because each of these jobs has been dominated by one sex. If a woman is a social worker, a traditionally female occupation, she should not earn less than a probation officer, a traditionally male job, simply because of the gender associated with each of these jobs.

The FPA, like the EPA, will not tamper with the legal burden. Under the FPA, as under the EPA, the burden will be on the plaintiff to prove discrimination. The plaintiff must show that the reason for the disparate treatment is gender discrimination, not legitimate market factors.

Remedies to achieve comparable pay for men and women are not radical or unprecedented. State governments, in red and blue states alike, have shown that it is possible to eliminate the part of the pay gap that is due to discrimination. Twenty state governments have adjusted wages for female-dominated professions, raising pay for teachers, nurses, clerical workers, librarians, and other female-dominated jobs that paid less than comparable male-dominated jobs. Minnesota, for example, implemented a pay equity plan when it found that traditionally female jobs paid 20 percent less than comparable traditionally male jobs. There may well be some portion of a gender wage gap that is traceable to market factors, but 20 states have shown that you can tackle the gender discrimination-based wage gap without interfering in the market system. States generally have closed the wage gap over a period of four to five years at a one-time cost of no more than three to four percent of payroll.

In addition, many female workers routinely achieve pay equity through collective bargaining, and countless employers provide it on their own as they see women shifting out of vital female-dominated occupations as a result of the shortage of skilled workers, as well as because of the unfairness to women. Unequal pay has been built into the way women have been treated since Adam and Eve. To dislodge such deep-seated and pervasive treatment, we must go to the source, the traditionally female occupations, where pay is linked with gender and always has been.

CELEBRATING KATHLEEN M.
WILSON'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. AYANNA PRESSLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Kathleen M. Wilson and wish her a happy 100th birthday. Mrs. Wilson, a longtime resident of Boston and Massachusetts's 7th District, is known for her youthful spirit, her volunteerism, her sense of humor, uncontrollable laugh and her love of dance.

Mrs. Wilson has spent over four decades as a public servant and a strong member of our community. She stood as the pinnacle of equality, working tirelessly with several women from Roxbury to fight segregation in the Boston Public Schools and demand a quality education for children in Boston's black community. Kay, the nickname given to her by her late husband and love of her life, regularly boarded helicopters and small service planes to deliver pay and supplies to workers in devastated areas after joining the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in her retirement.

Mrs. Wilson is a mother of two, grandmother of three, great-grandmother of three, and beloved by all of them. She remains active with the Goldenaires, The Urban League Guild, AARP of Boston, Seniors on the Move and The Swingers at 12th Baptist Church. No matter who Mrs. Wilson meets, they do not believe that she is 100 years young.

LILA DANIELS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Lila Daniels for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Lila Daniels is a student at Three Creeks K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Lila Daniels is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Lila Daniels for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge

Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DONATE FOR DISASTER RELIEF ACT OF 2019

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Donate for Disaster Relief Act.

Last year, there were 53 major disasters declared. The year before that, we had 61 declared major disasters. As we continue to feel the effects of climate change, there are going to be more major disasters and we as a nation are going to have to pay for the response and repair after these events. Now is the time to start thinking about what we can do to be better prepared for when these disasters strike.

That is why I am introducing the Donate for Disaster Relief Act, which creates a completely voluntary check-off on income tax returns that lets taxpayers elect to donate to a disaster relief trust. This bill is an opportunity for us to share our selflessness and generosity and be better prepared to adequately fund our response to an emergency situation.

The harsh reality of disasters is that while we may not be able to predict when or where they will always occur, we certainly can be prepared. The altruism of the American people is on display in their willingness to pitch in and help those in their greatest time of need. This bill creates an easy way for concerned Americans to anticipate the need for disaster relief, wherever and whenever it may be necessary.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this critically important legislation.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHAIRMAN ALLEN E. LAWSON OF THE SAN PASQUAL BAND OF MISSION INDIANS

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition and honor of Chairman Allen E. Lawson of the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians. Chairman Lawson has served for 22 years in a leadership position for the Tribe, headquartered in the Valley Center area of California's 50th Congressional District, and retired from his chairmanship on January 13, 2019. During his tenure, Chairman Lawson was firmly focused on Tribal welfare and increased prosperity for all members of the Tribe.

Under his leadership, San Pasqual's Tribal government grew from three employees to over 100 employees, resulting in significant increases in services to over 400 Tribal families living on the reservation. Chairman Lawson's leadership was instrumental with the establishment of Valley View Casino, a business that continues to thrive, generating revenue for the

entire Tribe and benefitted the reservation by creating new Tribal Fire and Police Departments that were dedicated to ensuring the safety of all Tribal residents. Chairman Lawson also established one of the few fully accredited Native American Fire Academies and, over the last 10 years, the academy has proudly trained over 1,000 first responders that help protect both the reservation and the surrounding community. Chairman Lawson successfully expanded the Tribal Education Center, resulting in increased high school graduation rates, more graduates headed to colleges, and the preservation of the Tribe's history, traditions and culture.

During his tenure, the Tribal Public Works, Water, and Environmental Departments were also established, and, after decades of negotiations with four other Native American tribes, Chairman Lawson was an integral part of the negotiation that finally settled and secured the entitled rights to the San Luis Rey watershed. Chairman Lawson was also instrumental in launching an Inter-Tribal Alliance in which Tribes and Federal agencies would partner collaboratively on construction projects thereby reducing costs, maximizing resources and providing jobs to Native Americans.

It is for these accomplishments and many more that Chairman Lawson should be recognized. The legacy of any leader is the impact and significant contributions they have made to greatly influence the lives of those around them. Chairman Lawson's guiding principle and singular focus has been the past, current, and future generations of the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians and I am confident that his legacy will never be forgotten and always appreciated.

COMMENDING DON GRIMSLEY FOR HIS IMPACT ON HALL COUNTY'S YOUTH COMMUNITY

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Don Grimsley for the incredible impact he has made in Hall County. Over the last decade, Mr. Grimsley has given countless hours to many youth organizations, and last month, he was recognized for his service as the Gainesville Kiwanis Club honored him with the 2019 John W. Jacobs Jr. Youth Service Award.

Mr. Grimsley first experienced his call to service when his son was born with spina bifida. With inspiration from his daughter, they launched Rolling Hearts, a charity for individuals with spina bifida that raises money for the neuroscience department at Children's Healthcare of Atlanta, among other things. Mr. Grimsley and his wife also sat on the board of the Spina Bifida Association of Georgia, helping educate the community and working to give children with spina bifida a great and normal life. In addition to helping children with spina bifida, Mr. Grimsley also serves as Eagle Scoutmaster, statistician for North Hall Middle School's basketball team, and the Watch D.O.G.S. program, which increases the presence of male role models in schools.

Mr. Grimsley's service to this community is especially near and dear to my heart as my

daughter, Jordan, was born with spina bifida. I understand firsthand the importance of providing our children with a normal life, and I am incredibly grateful for his service to such a meaningful cause. I also know his passion for mentoring youth and stepping in as a 'surrogate dad' has made an immeasurable impact on the lives of many young men in Georgia.

I want to congratulate Don Grimsley on receiving the John W. Jacobs Jr. Youth Service Award, and I want to thank him for his tremendous service to our community. Hall County is a better place because of Don Grimsley.

SARAH DAVIDSON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sarah Davidson for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Sarah Davidson is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sarah Davidson is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sarah Davidson for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL POSEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, my return flight to Washington, D.C. was delayed due to technical difficulties, and I was unable to attend the legislative session on April 1, 2019. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 137; yea on Roll Call No. 138; and nay on Roll Call No. 139.

HONORING LINDSAY RIGHTER

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Lindsay Righter. Lindsay has been with my team since I first took office, and left earlier this year after six years of service as an exemplary field representative for my constituents in Humboldt County, Trinity County, and Del Norte County. As a valued member of my staff, Lindsay has been essential to my work in the northern part of my congressional district, and of special note, has

helped thousands of our country's veterans and other constituents with complicated issues.

Lindsay grew up in Springfield, Illinois, and attended Southern Illinois University, where she earned a bachelor's degree in forestry. She moved to Humboldt County in June 2002 and worked with AmeriCorps Watershed Stewards from 2006 to 2008. In this role, she supervised staff and AmeriCorps members, and did demanding field work, including wading in some of the North Coast's most beautiful rivers counting salmon carcasses to better understand the condition of our vital fish populations.

In March of 2009, Lindsay was hired as a field representative for the former 1st congressional district of California under Congressman MIKE THOMPSON. She became a skilled case-worker with an affinity for helping veterans. After redistricting in 2012, I hired Lindsay in the same role and quickly recognized her as an asset to my team. Lindsay's eye for detail, her work ethic, and her dedication to helping the people of the new 2nd congressional district made her one of my most valuable employees. Her understanding of the issues in the district and her connections to the community—including sitting on boards for the Open Door Community Health Center and Redwood Parks Conservancy—helped me better understand issues in Humboldt, Del Norte, and Trinity counties. Lindsay increasingly focused on veterans' issues and health care, led event planning efforts, ran my Congressional Art Competition, and brought her extraordinary problem-solving skills to bear on an array of issues.

Madam Speaker, as Lindsay moves on to Humboldt State University's College of Professional Studies in Arcata, I hope you will join me and my staff in wishing her the best in all her future endeavors. We will miss her joyful nature, her sense of duty and her deep competence, and I am grateful for her work on my constituents' behalf.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Madam Speaker, I was unable to cast my vote on April 1, 2019 for Roll Call Vote 137, Roll Call 138, and Roll Call Vote 139. Had I been present, my vote would have been the following: Yea on Roll Call Vote 137, Yea on Roll Call 138, and Yea on Roll Call 139.

CONGRATULATIONS TO JOSHUA AND CHELSEA

HON. TROY BALDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a matter that is very near and dear to my heart—the marriage of my son, William Joshua Balderson to Chelsea Alise Gallagher this coming Saturday, April 6, 2019.

As a parent, I know that one of life's greatest joys is witnessing the marriage of one of your children, and the blending of two families into one. As parents, we can only try to raise our children with honor, teach them well, and send them out into the world as respectable adults who are prepared to face life's challenges. Everything else—successful careers, love, marriage, and building families of their own—those are bonuses.

What a blessing it is for Joshua and Chelsea to have found each other, and to share such love for one another. I know I don't speak for only myself when I say how excited and honored we are to welcome Chelsea into the Balderson family this weekend. I thank Chelsea's parents, Bill and Karen Gallagher, for sharing their beautiful daughter with our family. I feel blessed to have Chelsea as my soon-to-be daughter-in-law. I wish my wonderful son, Joshua, and his bride a lifetime of health and happiness with one another. May this be the first of many blessings to come.

MADISYN DEIDEL

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Madisyn Deidel for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Madisyn Deidel is a student at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Madisyn Deidel is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Madisyn Deidel for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF REBECCA TEBBS NUNN

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Rebecca Tebbs Nunn, who was crowned Ms. Super Senior Virginia. This pageant recognizes the value and importance of senior women, exemplifying their wisdom, experience, and generosity.

Rebecca is not only a native from Lancaster County, but is also the Vice Mayor of Kilmarnock, an author of four published novels, and was a professional actress for over 20 years. Most notably, Rebecca had the privilege of performing with the Helen Hayes Repertory Theatre on Broadway. She has even taught drama at both the high school and college levels.

After Rebecca was crowned Ms. Senior Virginia in 2016, she has continued to give back to her community by performing at nursing homes and other assisted living centers. She has also conducted acting workshops for children from all over the country and abroad. I am extremely proud to say that Rebecca is the first Virginian to receive the Ms. Super Senior award.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognition of Rebecca Tebbs Nunn. The Commonwealth is fortunate to have someone with such determination and tenacity. May God bless Rebecca Tebbs Nunn and I look forward to seeing her continued success for many years to come.

REMEMBERING ARLENE HOWARD

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life of a great American and true New Yorker, Arlene Howard, who passed away over the weekend at the age of 95. Mrs. Howard was World War II Navy Veteran who raised a family committed to serving the United States of America.

While I had met Mrs. Howard several times prior, my relationship with her started after the national tragedy of 9/11. Her son George, an off-duty officer with the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey Police Department, raced from his Hicksville home to the World Trade Center and met death. In the days that followed, the story of George's bravery captured the nation's attention and Mrs. Howard gave her son's shield to President George W. Bush the day he visited Ground Zero.

When President Bush addressed a Joint Session of Congress in the weeks following the attacks, he did so with George's shield in hand. The shield remained with the President throughout his presidency.

In the years following, Mrs. Howard grew close with my entire family, especially with my mother. From my first meeting with her, I knew she was stronger, tougher, and more caring than anyone I had ever met. She was dedicated to preserving the memory of her son and never wavered in her support for America's military and the Men and Women in Blue. Her dedication to her country and family live on with her children and grandchildren.

R.I.P. Arlene Howard.

JULIE DELUNA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Julie DeLuna for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Julie DeLuna is a student at Jefferson Jr/Sr. and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Julie DeLuna is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and

perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Julie DeLuna for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING THE AMERICAN RED CROSS NORTHWEST CHAPTER

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today along with my colleague, Representative MIKE THOMPSON, to recognize the important role of the American Red Cross Northwest Chapter which contributed to the 2019 presidential declaration of March as Red Cross Month.

Since its founding in 1881, the American Red Cross has become one of the nation's largest humanitarian organizations, providing disaster relief, emergency volunteer training, and support to military families across the country. Each year the Red Cross responds to an average of 62,000 disasters across the country, operating emergency shelters, serving meals and distributing relief materials to millions of disaster victims. These efforts are largely completed by a resilient network of volunteers that the organization has trained throughout the country, who are estimated to respond to an emergency once every eight minutes. This scale of service and rate of response is truly unmatched by other humanitarian efforts nationwide.

In the last few years, my colleague and I have both witnessed the importance of the American Red Cross Northwest Chapter in a time of crisis. During the 2017 and 2018 wildfires, the Northwest Chapter operated shelters, collected and distributed relief materials, and provided emotional and mental health support of fire victims throughout Northern California. In fact, the Northwest Chapter of the American Red Cross assisted 330 families with 123 local disasters and assisted 98 military families with emergency assistance this past year alone. And as recently as last month, the Red Cross was engaged in flood relief efforts in parts of my district that were severely impacted by rain and flooding caused by atmospheric rivers.

Since President Franklin D. Roosevelt first declared March as Red Cross Month in 1943, we have come together at this time, each year, to celebrate the accomplishments of the organization and raise awareness of its value to the American people. And as natural disasters continue to rise with each coming year, the humanitarian efforts of the American Red Cross and its many volunteers become that much more important.

Madam Speaker, the American Red Cross performs a critical humanitarian role throughout our country. The success of their efforts is largely connected to the organization's ability to recruit and train volunteers who can be called to action in their local communities. The American Red Cross Northwest Chapter has

provided invaluable assistance to our congressional districts in time of highest need. Therefore, please join my colleague and I in thanking them and in helping to raise awareness for the American Red Cross by supporting the annual declaration.

TRIBUTE TO U.S. ARMY
SPECIALIST JOSEPH P. COLLETTE

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. STIVERS. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of Ohio's 15th Congressional District to honor and commemorate a husband, a father, a brother, a son, and a hero. United States Army Specialist Joseph P. Collette, of Lancaster, gave his life in the service of our nation on March 22, 2019.

At age 29, Specialist Collette was fulfilling a goal he had held for over a decade: to deploy with the United States Army. As his soulmate and wife, Caela, tells it, following the tragedy of September 11, her husband felt the call to serve. As his time with the 242nd Ordnance Battalion, 71st Explosive Ordnance Disposal Group was coming to an end, he desperately wanted to go on deployment.

It is that level of bravery, selflessness, and commitment for which Specialist Collette will be remembered by both his loved ones and community. He was a genuine, laid back, funny young man who was beloved by many.

A man of many special talents, he loved sharing his passion for cooking for others and challenging his friends in paintball matches and Pokémon battles. He loved spending time outdoors including running, snowboarding, and four-wheeling. But his priority in life was spending time with his friends and family.

Like a pebble dropped in a pond, the ripples created by Specialist Collette's life and work are far-reaching. His legacy will live on in the memories of those who knew him and loved him: his wife, Caela; his children; Blair and Cody Collette; step-children Lena and Aria Scott; his parents, Joey Collette, and Theresa Mecionis and step-father, Jim Wickline; his siblings; Anthony, Camille, and Nicholas; and the rest of his extended family and loved ones.

As a Brigadier General in the Ohio Army National Guard, I have had the distinct privilege to serve alongside outstanding men and women like Specialist Collette. I can say with absolute certainty that Lancaster, Ohio is undeniably a better place because of Specialist Collette, and our nation is a safer place because of his service. I am honored to celebrate his legacy, and I encourage my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in extending deepest condolences to his family, and in honoring his supreme sacrifice.

CAILIN DEVINE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Cailin Devine

for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Cailin Devine is a student at Three Creeks K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Cailin Devine is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Cailin Devine for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

GORDON LOGAN, THE HILLVETS' FOUNDATION PHILANTHROPIST OF THE YEAR

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I applaud the generosity of Gordon Logan, an exceptional Texan who has been selected to receive the HillVets' Foundation "Philanthropist of the Year Award." His commitment to veterans is second to none and he is a deserving recipient of this prestigious honor.

Gordon has made support for veterans central to his personal, professional and philanthropic life for the past 25 years. Following his service in the U.S. Air Force, Gordon founded Sport Clips Haircuts and has committed his growing company to putting veterans first. Sport Clips currently has 45 veteran franchise owners and offers a 20% discount to veterans looking to join the brand. The company sponsors the Ageless Aviation Dreams Foundation, which provides dream flights in Boeing Stearman biplanes for seniors and veterans living in long-term care facilities and has given more than 3,500 dream flights. Gordon's Sport Clips also sponsors veteran-centered organizations such as the Aleethia Foundation, Gratitude Initiative, Honor Flight Austin, R.O.C.K veteran program and Rosie's List in San Diego.

In addition to being a past president and current member of the VetFran Committee, Gordon also serves on the VFW Foundation Board, which directs the funds donated to the VFW for active duty servicemembers and veterans, and on the advisory board for USO Fort Hood. The VFW's Sport Clips Help A Hero Scholarship program has provided some 1,300 scholarships totaling \$5.5 million to service men and women and veterans pursuing their education and training goals. Gordon's commitment to investing his abilities to support our veterans is a deeply held creed that speaks to the generous activism of true and devoted public servant.

Gordon Logan is one of our nation's stalwart champion for veterans. I am honored to represent him in Congress, as his efforts represents Texas values at their very best. I proudly stand alongside those who salute his work on behalf of our nation's heroes.

HONORING JOSEPH ORENDAIN

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Madam Speaker, I stand today to honor the career of Joseph Orendain. Mr. Orendain recently retired from the Hidalgo County District Attorney's Office, serving with honor and prestige throughout his tenure as an Assistant District Attorney.

Twenty-nine years ago, Mr. Orendain began his legal career in the District Attorney's office. Though he easily could have left for a more lucrative job, he continued his service to the community for nearly three decades. He has worked on countless noteworthy cases and earned recognition from his peers as well as the Association of Government Attorneys in Capital Litigation Awards, receiving an award for Outstanding Advocacy in Capital and Complex Homicide Cases. Mr. Orendain made history when he became the first prosecutor to successfully try a human trafficking case in the United States using a state penal code.

Mr. Orendain's involvement and commitment to justice was ingrained in him at an early age. The child of the man who founded the Texas Farm Workers Union, he followed his father to strikes and marches to fight for workers' rights. When he was only 14-years-old he marched in the Texas Farm Workers March for Human Rights from the Rio Grande Valley in Texas to Washington, D.C.

In 2017, Mr. Orendain and his trial partner, Cregg Thompson, tried and successfully secured a guilty conviction in another landmark case. Ultimately, it took them six weeks of rigorous work to succeed. I am confident that Mr. Orendain will continue to improve the lives of many in his community and make us proud. I wish him the best as he enjoys his well-earned retirement with family, friends and loved ones.

Madam Speaker, Joseph Orendain is a pillar of our community, and it is truly a privilege to represent committed, selfless individuals like him.

LAVELL DICKERSON

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud LaVell Dickerson for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

LaVell Dickerson is a student at Arvada High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by LaVell Dickerson is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to LaVell Dickerson for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the

same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

HONORING ALICE PAUL TAPPER

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Alice Paul Tapper, a District of Columbia native, for her activism creating a nationwide Raise Your Hand movement as a Girl Scout Cadette in Girl Scouts Nation's Capital.

Alice Paul Tapper was born in Washington, D.C. to humanitarian Jennifer Tapper and journalist Jake Tapper. She is a sixth grade student at Maret School. Raise Your Hand is the brainchild of Alice, who witnessed firsthand that girls were shying away from raising their hand in class or volunteering at school activities. She brought the issue to the attention of her Girl Scout troop, and they agreed that Girl Scouts should have a patch for that. Alice realized this type of empowerment could only take place in a girl-led organization.

Alice's observations are also grounded in research. Girls' self-confidence drops 3.4 times below boy's, especially between the ages of eight and 12. Working with Girl Scouts Nation's Capital, the Raise Your Hand patch, was launched. Girls earn the patch after pledging to raise their hands more in class and recruiting other girls to do the same. The patch was put into circulation nationwide in October 2017.

Today, over 12,000 girls and women from around the globe have taken the pledge and earned the patch. Alice has received national attention for the Raise Your Hand movement, including appearing on local news and being one of the youngest persons to get an op-ed published in the New York Times.

Alice will bring her message to young readers in a children's book, Raise Your Hand, published by Penguin Young. The book chronicles Alice's advocacy initiative for girls and will be released March 26, 2019, after she appears on the Ellen Show on March 22nd. Alice has donated her advance of \$25,000, as well as a matching donation from Oprah Winfrey, to Girl Scouts Nation's Capital, so that more girls can grow in confidence.

Madam Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Alice Paul Tapper for her initiative to elevate girls' self-esteem and to encourage them to raise their hands in the District of Columbia and around the world.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I regretfully missed votes on Monday, April 1, 2019. I had intended to vote "yes" on Roll Call vote 137, "yes" on vote 138 and "yes" on vote 139.

VALERIA ECHAUARRIA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Valeria Echauarría for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Valeria Echauarría is a student at Jefferson Jr/Sr. and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Valeria Echauarría is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Valeria Echauarría for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING JOHN DELL'OSSO

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of John Dell'Oso, a National Park Service ranger who is retiring after more than 35 years of dedicated federal service.

Born in San Francisco, John's family moved to Petaluma where he would attend school. After getting his AA degree from the Santa Rosa Junior College in 1981, John received a Bachelor of Science in Environmental Planning and Management from the University of California Davis two years later.

John began his career with the National Park Service in May of 1983 at the Point Reyes National Seashore. Starting as a Seasonal Interpretive Ranger that summer, John worked as an Administrative Clerk and a park ranger, eventually becoming a Supervisory Park Ranger. In 1994, John was promoted to Chief of Interpretation and Resource Education for the Point Reyes National Seashore, and later became the park Public Information Officer, roles that he held for 25 years.

John's leadership brought great acclaim to the park and the National Park Service over the years, especially in the area of universal accessibility. Through design work on exhibit panels, accessibility guides, audio descriptions, and braille publications, John expanded the way in which the park shares information to the public. The park interpretation and resource education division has received 14 national media awards under his leadership, which is more than any other national park unit. During his tenure, John also worked to expand accessibility in parks across the country, and the National Park Service recognized him for his work on sea level rise exhibits and messaging in 2017.

John's dedication to public service extended beyond his work for the National Park Service.

He was elected to the Cotati City Council in 1994, served three four-year terms on the council, and chaired the Sonoma County Mayors and Councilmembers Association. John has also served as a member of numerous local boards and commissions, including the Cotati Library Foundation, Rancho Cotati Little League, Sonoma County Library Commission, and the Santa Rosa Junior College Agriculture and Natural Resources Advisory Committee, among others

Madam Speaker, John Dell'Osso has spent his career making our parks more educational and accessible to the public. His commitment to public service through the National Park Service, and as a local elected official, has had a significant and positive impact on the region and the country. Therefore, please Join me in congratulating John Dell'Osso on the occasion of his retirement, and wishing him well on his next endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF RAMONA THOMAS

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of Ramona Thomas and celebrate her upcoming retire-

ment on June 3, 2019. Ramona has dedicated 29 years to serving the Permian Basin.

Ramona began her tenure with Permian Basin Community Centers, now known as PermiaCare, as a Staff Accountant in 1990, and almost twenty-nine years later, she will be retiring as the Chief Executive Officer, a position she's held since November of 2014. PermiaCare provides integral mental health, intellectual and developmental disability, and substance-abuse disorder services, and Ramona's leadership in the organization has attributed to their ability to expand into the leading expert in behavioral health and development disability services in the Permian Basin.

In addition to being an integral leader in PermiaCare, she has also served through various capacities in numerous professional organizations. Ramona has also gone above and beyond as an active leader in the community. She regularly volunteers with the Rotary Club, Leadership Midland, the Midland Behavioral Health Leadership Team, and the United Way of Midland.

I worked directly with Ms. Thomas during my time on the Board of Directors for Permian Basin Community Centers, during which time she was the Chief Financial Officer. I found her to execute her work precisely, and she led her agency to be ranked consistently as one of the best in Texas. I'll always remember Ms. Thomas' personable demeanor, unquestionable talent, and as a joy to work with. On behalf of the 11th District of Texas, congratula-

tions to Ramona Thomas on her retirement. I look forward to seeing what she will accomplish in this next chapter.

JEWEL FAHRIG

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 2019

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jewel Fahrig for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award.

Jewel Fahrig is a student at Wayne Carl Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Jewel Fahrig is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jewel Fahrig for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2163–S2208

Measures Introduced: Nineteen bills and seven resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 978–996, S.J. Res. 17, and S. Res. 134–139. **Pages S2188–89**

Measures Passed:

Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act: Senate passed H.R. 1839, to amend title XIX to extend protection for Medicaid recipients of home and community-based services against spousal impoverishment, establish a State Medicaid option to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through health homes, prevent the misclassification of drugs for purposes of the Medicaid drug rebate program. **Page S2203**

Honoring the life of Ted Lindsay: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 132, honoring the life of Ted Lindsay, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S2203–04**

The Dental College of Georgia at Augusta University 50th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 138, recognizing the 50th anniversary of The Dental College of Georgia at Augusta University. **Page S2204**

Authorizing Production of Records: Senate agreed to S. Res. 139, to authorize the production of records by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. **Page S2204**

Measures Considered:

Nominations in the Senate: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration S. Res. 50, improving procedures for the consideration of nominations in the Senate. **Pages S2163–76, S2177–80**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 57), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion

to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the resolution. **Page S2177**

Senator McConnell entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of the resolution. **Page S2177**

Calabria Nomination—Cloture: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Mark Anthony Calabria, of Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency. **Page S2183**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur upon disposition of the nomination of Roy Kalman Altman, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida. **Page S2183**

Prior to the consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S2183**

Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 12:30 p.m., on Wednesday, April 3, 2019, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of Jeffrey Kessler, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, with the time until 2 p.m., equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees; and that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the motions to invoke cloture filed on Monday, April 1, 2019, ripen at 2 p.m., on Wednesday, April 3, 2019. **Page S2204**

Messages from the House: **Page S2186**

Measures Referred: **Page S2186**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S2186–87, S2203**

Executive Communications: **Page S2187**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S2187–88**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2189–90**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S2190–95

Additional Statements:

Pages S2184–86

Amendments Submitted:

Pages S2195–S2203

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Page S2203

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S2203

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—57)

Page S2177

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:51 p.m., until 12:30 p.m. on Wednesday, April 3, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2204.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Commerce, after receiving testimony from Michael Platt, Assistant Secretary for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, Steven Dillingham, Director, Census Bureau, David J. Redl, Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, and Administrator, National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Neil Jacobs, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Observation and Prediction, performing the duties of Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere, John Fleming, Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, Henry Childs, National Director, Minority Business Development Administration, Gil Kaplan, Under Secretary for International Trade, Matthew Borman, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Andrei Iancu, Under Secretary for Intellectual Property, and Director, Patent and Trademark Office, and Walter Copan, Under Secretary for Standards and Technology, and Director, National Institute of Standards and Technology, all of the Department of Commerce.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of General Tod D. Wolters, USAF, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Commander, United States European Command and Supreme Allied Commander Europe, and General Stephen J. Townsend, USA, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be

Commander, United States Africa Command, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Airland concluded a hearing to examine Army modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant General James F. Pasquarrette, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff, G–8, Lieutenant General James M. Richardson, USA, Deputy Commander, Army Futures Command, and Lieutenant General Paul A. Ostrowski, USA, Principal Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army, (Acquisition, Logistics and Technology) and Director of the Army Acquisition Corps, all of the Department of Defense.

INVESTING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the application of environmental, social, and governance principles in investing and the role of asset managers, proxy advisors, and other intermediaries, after receiving testimony from former Senator Phil Gramm; James R. Copland, Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, New Bern, North Carolina; and John Streur, Calvert Research and Management, Washington, D.C.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Energy, after receiving testimony from Rick Perry, Secretary of Energy.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION OVERSIGHT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, after receiving testimony from Kristine L. Svinicki, Chairman, and Jeff Baran, Stephen Burns, Annie Caputo, and David Wright, each a Commissioner, all of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

NATO AT 70

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine NATO at 70, focusing on a strategic partnership for the 21st century, after receiving testimony from Ian J. Brzezinski, Atlantic Council Brent Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security, and Karen Donfried, German Marshall Fund of the United States, both of Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Ron A. Bloom, of New York, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, and James A. Crowell IV, and Jason Park, both of the District of Columbia, both to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

REAUTHORIZING HEA

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorizing HEA, focusing on addressing campus sexual assault and ensuring student safety and rights, after receiving testimony from Patricia M. Hamill, Conrad O'Brien P.C., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Fatima Goss Graves, National Women's Law Center, and Anne H. Meehan, American Council on Education, both of Washington, D.C.; Jeannie Suk Gersen, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Massachusetts; and Jeff S. Howard, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City.

ARBITRATION IN AMERICA

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine arbitration in America, after re-

ceiving testimony from Myriam Gilles, Yeshiva University Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, New York, New York; Alan S. Kaplinsky, Ballard Spahr LLP, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; F. Paul Bland, Jr., Public Justice, and Victor E. Schwartz, Shook Hardy and Bacon, LLP, both of Washington, D.C.; Alan S. Carlson, Italian Colors Restaurant, Oakland, California; and Kevin Ziober, Newport Beach, California.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

ALZHEIMER'S

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Alzheimer's, focusing on new directions in biomedical research and caregiving, after receiving testimony from Richard Hodes, Director, National Institute on Aging, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services; Clay Jacobs, Alzheimer's Association Greater Pennsylvania Chapter, Wilkes-Barre; Sharon Fekrat, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, North Carolina; and Mary Dysart Hartt and Mike Hartt, both of Hampden, Maine.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 24 public bills, H.R. 2019–2042; and 6 resolutions, H.J. Res. 29–30; and H. Res. 280, 282–284 were introduced. **Pages H2985–86**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H2987**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 639, to amend section 327 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that National Urban Search and Rescue Response System task forces may include Federal employees (H. Rept. 116–29);

H. Con. Res. 16, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition (H. Rept. 116–30);

H. Con. Res. 19, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby (H. Rept. 116–31); and

H. Res. 281, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–32). **Page H2985**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Butterfield to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2941**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:39 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H2945**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Dr. Lora Hargrove, Mount Calvary Baptist Church, Rockville, Maryland. **Page H2945**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 222 yeas to 189 nays with one answering "present", Roll No. 143. **Pages H2945, H2972–73**

Condemning the Trump Administration's Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans' Health

Care: The House considered H. Res. 271, condemning the Trump Administration's Legal Campaign to Take Away Americans' Health Care. Further proceedings were postponed. **Pages H2956–69**

H. Res. 274, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) and the resolution (H. Res. 271) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 230 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 141, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 140.

Pages H2948–56

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office": H.R. 540, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 770 Ayrault Road in Fairport, New York, as the "Louise and Bob Slaughter Post Office", by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yea-and-nay vote of 414 yeas to 7 nays, Roll No. 142; and

Pages H2969–70, H2972

Changing the address of the postal facility designated in honor of Captain Humayun Khan: S. 725, to change the address of the postal facility designated in honor of Captain Humayun Khan.

Pages H2971–72

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, April 3rd. **Page H2973**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, as the "Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building": H.R. 829, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1450 Montauk Highway in Mastic, New York, as the "Army Specialist Thomas J. Wilwerth Post Office Building". **Pages H2970–71**

Discharge Petition: Representative Scalise presented to the clerk a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of H. Res. 102, providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 962) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion (Discharge Petition No. 1).

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear

on pages H2955, H2956, H2972, and H2972–73. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:11 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration. Testimony was heard from the following National Nuclear Security Administration officials: Admiral James F. Caldwell, Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors; Lisa E. Gordon-Hagerty, Under Secretary for Nuclear Security and Administrator; Brent Park, Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation; and Charles Verdon, Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs.

APPROPRIATIONS—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Environmental Protection Agency. Testimony was heard from Holly Greaves, Chief Financial Officer, Environmental Protection Agency; and Andrew Wheeler, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

MEMBERS DAY AND PUBLIC WITNESS DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled "Members Day and Public Witness Day". Testimony was heard from Representatives Dunn, Thompson of Pennsylvania, Carbajal, Brindisi, Cisneros, Kildee, and Sablan; and public witnesses.

THE RURAL ECONOMY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled "The Rural Economy". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the National Institutes of Health. Testimony was heard from the following National Institutes of Health officials: Diana W. Bianchi, Director, Eunice

Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; Francis S. Collins, Director; Anthony S. Fauci, Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases; Gary Gibbons, Director, National Heart Lung and Blood Institute; Doug Lowy, Deputy Director, National Cancer Institute; and Nora Volkow, Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY AND NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL AGENCY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a budget hearing on the Defense Intelligence Agency and National Geospatial Agency. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Robert P. Ashley, Director, Defense Intelligence Agency; and Vice Admiral Robert D. Sharp, Director, National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency. This hearing was closed.

MEMBERS DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a hearing entitled “Members Day”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Takano, and Representatives Casten of Illinois and Eshoo.

PUBLIC WITNESS DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a hearing entitled “Public Witness Day”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Department of Homeland Security held a budget hearing on the Transportation Security Administration. Testimony was heard from David Pekoske, Administrator, Transportation Security Administration.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. AIR FORCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a budget hearing on the U.S. Air Force. Testimony was heard from General David L. Goldfein, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force; and Heather Wilson, Secretary, U.S. Air Force.

FISCAL YEAR 2020 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ARMY AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2020 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the Department of Army and the Department of the Air Force”. Testimony was heard from Mark T. Esper, Secretary of the Army, U.S. Army; General Mark A. Milley,

Chief of Staff, U.S. Army; Heather Wilson, Secretary of the Air Force, U.S. Air Force; and General David L. Goldfein, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

EXAMINING THE ROLE OF THE COMMANDER IN SEXUAL ASSAULT PROSECUTIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled “Examining the Role of the Commander in Sexual Assault Prosecutions”. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant Commander Erin Elliot, U.S. Navy; Lieutenant General Charles N. Pede, The Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army; Vice Admiral John G. Hannink, The Judge Advocate General, U.S. Navy; Lieutenant General Jeffrey A. Rockwell, The Judge Advocate General, U.S. Air Force; and Major General Daniel J. Lecce, Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, U.S. Marine Corps.

EXAMINING SURPRISE BILLING: PROTECTING PATIENTS FROM FINANCIAL PAIN

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions held a hearing entitled “Examining Surprise Billing: Protecting Patients from Financial Pain”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LESSONS FROM ACROSS THE NATION: STATE AND LOCAL ACTION TO COMBAT CLIMATE CHANGE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change held a hearing entitled “Lessons from Across the Nation: State and Local Action to Combat Climate Change”. Testimony was heard from Jay Inslee, Governor, Washington; Steve Benjamin, Mayor, Columbia, South Carolina; Jackie Biskupski, Mayor, Salt Lake City, Utah; James Brainard, Mayor, Carmel, Indiana; Daniel C. Camp III, Chairman, Board of Commissioners, Beaver County, Pennsylvania; and Jerry F. Morales, Mayor, Midland, Texas.

PRICED OUT OF A LIFESAVING DRUG: THE HUMAN IMPACT OF RISING INSULIN COSTS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Priced Out of a Lifesaving Drug: The Human Impact of Rising Insulin Costs”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE FAIR HOUSING ACT: REVIEWING EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATION AND PROMOTE OPPORTUNITY IN HOUSING

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Fair Housing Act: Reviewing Efforts to Eliminate Discrimination and Promote Opportunity in Housing”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING CRISIS IN RURAL AMERICA: ASSESSING THE FEDERAL RESPONSE

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing, Community Development, and Insurance held a hearing entitled “The Affordable Housing Crisis in Rural America: Assessing the Federal Response”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HOW CLIMATE CHANGE THREATENS U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “How Climate Change Threatens U.S. National Security”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE FUTURE OF NATO: NEW CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, Energy, and the Environment held a hearing entitled “The Future of NATO: New Challenges and Opportunities”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SUPPORTING A FACT-BASED APPROACH TO PREVENTING TERRORIST TRAVEL TO THE UNITED STATES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Intelligence and Counterterrorism; and Subcommittee on Border Security, Facilitation, and Operations held a joint hearing entitled “Supporting a Fact-Based Approach to Preventing Terrorist Travel to the United States”. Testimony was heard from Rebecca Gambler, Director, Homeland Security and Justice Team, Government Accountability Office; Donald Conroy, Director, National Targeting Center—Passenger Operations, Office of Field Operations, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; and Monte Hawkins, Director, National Vetting Center, Department of Homeland Security.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 5, the “Equality Act”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PROTECTING COASTAL COMMUNITIES FROM OFFSHORE DRILLING

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing entitled “Protecting Coastal Communities from Offshore Drilling”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Cunningham and Rooney of Florida; Jimmy Carroll, Mayor, Isle of Palms, South Carolina; Sharon Hewitt, Senator, Louisiana State Senate; and public witnesses.

WOW 101: THE STATE OF WESTERN WATER INFRASTRUCTURE AND INNOVATION

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife held a hearing entitled “WOW 101: The State of Western Water Infrastructure and Innovation”. Testimony was heard from Vicente Sarmiento, President, Board of Directors, Orange County Water District and Council Member, City of Santa Ana, Fountain Valley, California; and public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands hearing on H.R. 823, the “Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act”; H.R. 1708, the “Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act”; H.R. 434, the “Emancipation National Historic Trail Act”; and H.R. 306, the “Kettle Creek Battlefield Park Study Act”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Jackson Lee and Schiff; Chris French, Acting Deputy Chief, National Forest System, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Dan Smith, Deputy Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Dan Gibbs, Executive Director, Department of Natural Resources, Colorado; Laurene Weste, Councilmember, Santa Clarita, California; and public witnesses.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a business meeting on A Resolution Offered by Chairman Elijah E. Cummings Authorizing Issuance of Subpoena Related to Security Clearances; and A Resolution Offered by Chairman Elijah E. Cummings Authorizing Issuance of Subpoenas Related to the 2020 Census. A Resolution Offered by Chairman Elijah E. Cummings Authorizing Issuance of Subpoena Related to Security Clearances, and A Resolution Offered by Chairman Elijah E. Cummings Authorizing Issuance of Subpoenas Related to the 2020 Census passed, as amended.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Committee on Rules: Full Committee concluded a hearing on H.R. 1585, the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019”. The Committee granted, by record vote of 9–3, a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for the purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–9, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the Rules Committee report, and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part B of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Jackson Lee, Cline, Scanlon, and Lesko.

A REVIEW OF THE NASA FY2020 BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “A Review of the NASA FY2020 Budget Request”. Testimony was heard from James F. Bridenstine, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

THE SMALL BUSINESS TRADE SNAPSHOT: AGRICULTURE AND WORKERS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Rural Development, Agriculture, Trade, and Entrepreneurship held a hearing entitled “The Small Business Trade Snapshot: Agriculture and Workers”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PIPELINE SAFETY: REVIEWING THE STATUS OF MANDATES AND EXAMINING ADDITIONAL SAFETY NEEDS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous

Materials held a hearing entitled “Pipeline Safety: Reviewing the Status of Mandates and Examining Additional Safety Needs”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Moulton and Trahan; Howard R. Elliott, Administrator, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation; Jennifer L. Homendy, Board Member, National Transportation Safety Board; and public witnesses.

MAPPING THE CHALLENGES AND PROGRESS OF THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Technology and Modernization held a hearing entitled “Mapping the Challenges and Progress of the Office of Information and Technology”. Testimony was heard from Carol Harris, Director for Information Technology Acquisition Management, Government Accountability Office; and Brent Arronte, Deputy Assistant Inspector General, Office of Audits and Evaluations, Office of Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs.

MISSION CRITICAL: ASSESSING THE TECHNOLOGY TO SUPPORT COMMUNITY CARE

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “MISSION Critical: Assessing the Technology to Support Community Care”. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Veterans Affairs officials: Richard Stone, Executive in Charge, Veterans Health Administration; James Gfrerer, Assistant Secretary for Office of Information and Technology, and Chief Information Officer; and Melissa Glynn, Assistant Secretary for Enterprise Integration.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1759, the “BRIDGE for Workers Act”; H.R. 1994, the “Setting Every Community Up for Retirement Enhancement Act of 2019”; and H.R. 1957, the “Taxpayer First Act of 2019”. H.R. 1759, H.R. 1994, and H.R. 1957 were ordered reported, without amendment.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY,

APRIL 3, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Environmental Protection Agency, 8:45 a.m., SD-124.

Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Defense Health Program, 9:30 a.m., SD-192.

Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security, to hold hearings to examine the proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, 9:30 a.m., SD-138.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the National Nuclear Security Administration, 2:30 p.m., SD-138.

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2:30 p.m., SD-192.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Senate Sergeant at Arms and the United States Capitol Police, 3 p.m., SD-124.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to hold hearings to examine missile defense policies and programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SR-222.

Subcommittee on SeaPower, to hold hearings to examine Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, 3 p.m., SR-232A.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., SD-G50.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 2:15 p.m., S-116, Capitol.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold hearings to examine enhancing tribal self-governance and safety of Indian roads, 2:30 p.m., SD-628.

Committee on Judiciary: Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, to hold hearings to examine women inventors and the future of American innovation, 2:15 p.m., SD-226.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: to hold hearings to examine reauthorization of the Small Business Administration's Access to Capital programs, 2:45 p.m., SR-428A.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Nutrition, Oversight, and Department Operations, hearing entitled "Examining the Proposed ABAWD Rule and its Impact on Hunger and Hardship", 9 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Food and Drug Administration, 9 a.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 9 a.m., 2358-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the National Parks Service, Fish and Wildlife Services, and U.S. Geological Survey, 1 p.m., 2008 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, budget hearing on the Federal Communications Commission, 1:30 p.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on Science, Energy, and Environmental Management Programs, 1:45 p.m., 2362-B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Labor, 2 p.m., 2358-C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Commerce, 2:15 p.m., H-309 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Defense, budget hearing on Defense Health Programs, 3 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Member Day", 9 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, hearing entitled "Fiscal Year 2020 Priorities for National Security Space Programs", 1:45 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Intelligence and Emerging Threats and Capabilities, hearing entitled "Reviewing Department of Defense Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction for Fiscal Year 2020", 2:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2021, the "Investing for the People Act of 2019", 2 p.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Investment, hearing entitled "Strengthening Accountability in Higher Education to Better Serve Students and Taxpayers", 9 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1644, the "Save the Internet Act of 2019"; H.R. 1781, the "Payment Commission Data Act of 2019"; H.R. 938, the "BLOCKING Act of 2019"; H.R. 1520, the "Purple Book Continuity Act of 2019"; H.R.1503, the "Orange Book Transparency Act of 2019"; H.R. 1499, the "Protecting Consumer Access to Generic Drugs Act of 2019"; H.R. 965, the "CREATES Act of 2019"; H.R. 1385, the "SAVE Act"; H.R. 1386, the "ENROLL Act of 2019"; H.R. 987, the "MORE Health

Education Act”; H.R. 1010, a bill to provide that the rule entitled “Short-Term, Limited Duration Insurance” shall have no force or effect; H.R. 986, the “Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act of 2019”; H.R. 1425, the “State Health Care Premium Reduction Act”; and H.R. 9, the “Climate Action Now Act”, 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Member Day”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets, hearing entitled “Putting Investors First: Reviewing Proposals to Hold Executives Accountable”, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and International Terrorism, hearing entitled “Assessing U.S. Policy Priorities in the Middle East”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Oversight, Management, and Accountability, hearing entitled “Ensuring Effective and Efficient Operations: A Review of the Fiscal Year 2020 DHS Management Directorate Budget Request”, 2 p.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on a Resolution Authorizing Issuance of Subpoenas, 9 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Immigration and Citizenship, hearing entitled “Securing the Future of American Agriculture”, 12 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, hearing entitled “Examining the Spending Priorities and Mission of the National Park Service”, 9 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States, hearing on 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. 312, the “Mashpee Wampanoag 5 Tribe Reservation Reaffirmation Act”; and legislation on the RESPECT Act, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Subcommittee on National Security, hearing entitled “The Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction’s 2019 High-Risk List”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2020”, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2020 Intelligence Community Budget Request Overview”, HVC-304. This hearing will be closed.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine Slovakia’s chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, focusing on priorities and challenges, 3:30 p.m., SVC-201-00.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12:30 p.m., Wednesday, April 3

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Wednesday, April 3

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Jeffrey Kessler, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination at 2 p.m.

Senators will meet in the Senate Chamber to depart as a body at 10:40 a.m., to the Hall of the House for the 11 a.m. Joint Meeting with the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg.

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Joint Meeting with the Senate to Receive His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Consideration of 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.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Balderson, Troy, Ohio, E388
Carter, John R., Tex., E389
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E390
Collins, Doug, Ga., E387
Conaway, K. Michael, Tex., E391
Gonzalez, Vicente, Tex., E388, E390

Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E387
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E387, E389, E390
Hunter, Duncan, Calif., E386, E387
King, Peter T., N.Y., E388
McEachin, A. Donald, Va., E385
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E386, E390
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E385

Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E385, E385, E386, E387, E388, E388, E389, E390, E390, E391
Posey, Bill, Fla., E387
Pressley, Ayanna, Mass., E386
Stivers, Steve, Ohio, E389
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E385
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E388



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.