



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 2019

No. 45

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 13, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DARREN SOTO 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.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF H. LEON COMER, SR.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the life of H. Leon Comer, Sr., who passed away at the age of 91 on Tuesday, March 5, 2019. He was a man born of humble means who never lost sight of where he came from.

He was the son of the late John Stoll Comer, Sr., and Annie Lee Roach

Comer, where he was one of seven siblings. He was born in Rock Hill, South Carolina, where he attended Oak Ridge Elementary School and later served in the United States Merchant Marines.

He was married to Francis Watkins Comer for 64 years and had two children, Brenda Comer Sutton and Leon "Chip" Comer, Jr.

Leon Comer believed in the value of hard work and, after working as a manager of a beer distributor in the greater Rock Hill market for 12 years, he founded Comer Distributing in 1971, with only five employees, distributing 250,000 cases of beer, with only three routes.

The original building, consisting of only 5,000 square feet, was located on Pendleton Street, and later expanded to 17,000 square feet to a much larger site on Carmel Road.

Comer Distributing expanded into the greater Columbia market in 2012 and, 1 year later, added another 11,200 square feet of space. The company opened in a two-story office building in 2018, along with an expanded warehouse. The company has grown to 70 employees, providing 1.5 million cases of a variety of brand-name beverages each year.

Leon retired in 1990; however, over the course of his lifetime, he served on many boards, clubs, and commissions, including the Rock Hill Economic Development Board; York County Natural Gas Authority; York Masonic Lodge #385; Hejaz Shriners; Winthrop Eagle Club, where he was a founding member; Ducks Unlimited; the South Carolina Beer Wholesalers Association, serving twice as chairman of the board; the Waterfowl Association; the American Legion; Frank Roach Post #34; the USC Gamecock Club; and many more organizations and local groups.

Leon and his wife, Frances, were longtime members of St. John's United Methodist Church, where he was very active for many years. The lives that

have been positively affected by the giving and donations to Christian causes, such as the men's shelters and the Boys and Girls Clubs, will be remembered for years to come.

The company is now being run by his son, Chip Comer, and the legacy of his father can be summed up by the words of Chip when he said the following: "My father is the epitome of what I would always want to be, as he taught me so many life lessons growing up."

Leon Comer left an indelible imprint on the many lives that he touched, and he will be remembered as a man who epitomized the meaning of "true service above self" and was a man who dedicated his life to serving his faith, his family, and his country.

May God bless Leon Comer and his family.

FIX THEM BEFORE WE FLY THEM

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; and I rise today because I love my country and because I love the people, and I love their lives and I care about them. And because I love them and I care about them, I call upon the President of the United States of America to ground the 737 MAX 8.

This plane is unfit to fly. We have had two go down in the last 6 months. Two down within 6 months is two too many.

We cannot put profits above people, Mr. President. This is an opportunity for you to exert your executive power in a positive way on behalf of people who fly these planes.

It is not about the pilots; it is about the planes. These planes are unfit to fly, and we cannot put profits above people, and they are to be grounded until they are fit.

□ 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.

H2683

Ground them until they are fixed. They are unfit to fly. Fix them before we fly them.

SCOUTING ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDE VALUABLE EXPERIENCES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Scouting organizations are pivotal in the lives of so many American youth, and this week there has been much to celebrate. Yesterday, the Girl Scouts of the USA marked its 107th birthday, and tonight the Boy Scouts of America will conclude its annual report to the Nation.

Girl Scouts help girls develop into the future leaders of our economy, our communities, our country, and the world by encouraging them to dream big and work hard to achieve their goals. In fact, many Congresswomen have been Girl Scouts, and we saw some Congresswomen deliver speeches on this floor yesterday in honor of the Girl Scouts building girls of courage, confidence, and character for 107 years.

Mr. Speaker, I know firsthand the positive impact that Scouting can have on the life of a young person. I have been actively involved with the Boy Scouts of America since I was 11 years old.

On May 17, 1977, I became an Eagle Scout myself, as a member of Boy Scout Troop 52 in Walker Township, Pennsylvania. Over the years, I have proudly held various leadership roles with Boy Scout troops in Pennsylvania, including two separate stints as Scoutmaster for Troop 353 and president of the Juniata Valley Boy Scout Council. One of my greatest honors was to witness 29 young men achieve the rank of Eagle Scout during my tenure as Scoutmaster.

Many Eagle Scouts will gather tonight in the Capitol to conclude the annual Report to the Nation delegation trip. I am proud to be a part of the Eagles on the Hill reception, and I look forward to hearing from the Scouts.

Members of Congress and I will speak about how Scouting positively impacted our lives. And after the speeches, the Scouts will have a chance to discuss their experience in Scouting as a whole, as well as their time in the Report to the Nation delegation.

Report to the Nation is an annual event meant to connect some of Scouting's best and brightest with government officials and elected representatives. Each year, 6 to 10 representatives of the Boy Scouts meet with senior government officials, including the President and key congressional leaders, with the goal of providing an update of what Scouts have achieved over the past year. This also allows members of the Federal Government an opportunity to meet some of the Nation's brightest young Scouts. The delegation spends between a week

and 10 days in Washington, D.C., conducting meetings and touring the city.

The Report to the Nation delegation stems from the congressional charter of the Boy Scouts of America, dating back to June 15, 1916, and represents millions of Boy Scouts.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of the USA both contribute to the spirit of this Nation and play an essential role in educating our youth. These organizations build character; they help young people become actively engaged in their communities; and they promote serving others in ways big and small. And that is something we can all respect and admire.

A COMMUNITY IN PERIL

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

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with great urgency to sound an alarm because we have a community in peril.

The Liberian community in Minnesota and around the Nation is dealing with a crisis of our very own making. When the DED, Deferred Enforced Departure, program expires on March 31, thousands of our Liberian friends and neighbors will be at risk of losing their jobs and their homes and being deported back to a nation that they no longer know.

Thousands of Liberians settled in the United States in the 1990s and early 2000s when their country was devastated by civil wars. My friend Louise Stevens was one of them. She was a woman with a dream of a good life who worked hard to get an education and worked hard to get a good job; and because of a civil war she had nothing to do with, she had the courage and bravery to flee her home and start over in America.

She slept on a mattress in a friend's living room for over a year. She and her kids shared two rooms for another year. And when President Clinton introduced the DED program in 1999, she was finally able to work without fear of being deported.

She went to Boston Scientific and, with her education and work ethic, was able to get a good job and start a career that spanned 18 years. Now, she is over 60 years old, and she could lose everything once again.

"The world took everything from me," she told us. "Now I have a home; I have a job; I have a hospital to go to; I have friends; and Minnesota is my home. America is my home. I can't wrap my head around a piece of paper telling me we don't care; you can't live here anymore."

Another of my Liberian constituents, Michael, told us that "I am almost 50. My friends in Liberia are either dead or living outside of the country. If I am sent back, I will have accomplished nothing. My whole life is here, and this is my home."

Another, Abdi Mohamed, who is afraid of losing his brother: "I cannot begin to imagine the nightmare this will create in my community," he said. "I am not ready to let my bond with my brother go. We love to go shopping at the Mall of America. Dave and Busters is so much fun together. I am not ready for this."

Mr. Speaker, we can do something about this. We can stop the nightmare from becoming a reality. We can legislate a fix.

It is time to act. This is what we are here to do: to put people before politics and make a real difference in our communities.

Our Liberian neighbors are friends; they are workers; and they are taxpayers. They have played by the rules; they have worked exceptionally hard; and they have thrived in good jobs. If we lose them, we will be losing our workforce; we will be losing our community; and we will be losing our family.

We have 18 days to act, 18 days to do something to make sure that our Liberian community will never have to spend another sleepless night wondering if the world will take everything away from them once again.

THANKING OUR FARMER COOPERATIVES

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, in many parts of my district and all across Kansas, farmer cooperatives are the foundation of a modernized and productive agriculture industry. For decades, co-ops have been farmers' primary business partner, supplier, and grain buyer. Memberships have been passed down from one generation to another, and relationships have been lifelong.

Today, our farmer co-ops are as strong and as important as ever. In the far reaches of my district, the co-ops provide feed, fertilizer, and fuel to farmers.

As times and needs have changed, so too have our co-ops. From online platforms for account statements and purchasing to precision technology that reduces fertilizer inputs and improves soil productivity, innovation has been necessary and vital to the co-ops' success.

Kansas farmer co-ops are responsible for more than 4,600 jobs and \$1.1 billion in total economic impact, statewide. These member-owned organizations have been and will continue to be vital to the continued growth and success of the agriculture industry.

Farmers are facing steep headwinds, and organizations like the co-ops are important in helping producers navigate through uncertainty in the industry.

We often take the time to thank our farmers, but it is also important we thank the hardworking men and

women of our farmer co-ops for the valuable time and expertise they put into supporting our farmers and our agriculture industry.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL AG DAY

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of National Ag Day, a celebration of our Nation's oldest and most important industry and the hardworking men and women who put food on our table, clothes on our back, and fuel in our cars.

The number of people in agriculture today is but a fraction of what it was 100 years ago, but the impact of today's agriculture industry is unprecedented. Today's farmer feeds about 165 people, and agriculture remains this country's number one export.

In Kansas, agriculture accounts for nearly half the State's economy, and, in my district, that number is more than 60 percent. For many rural communities, farming and ranching is the sole economic driver.

Kansas is the national leader in agriculture, ranking first in the production of grain sorghum, second in the production of wheat, third for cattle, and fourth in the production of sunflowers. In fact, Kansas is second in the Nation for the total number of acres farmed.

□ 1015

Winters like the one we are currently experiencing at home have highlighted the time and dedication farmers and ranchers have to their land and animals. In Kansas, farmers with livestock are working around the clock to ensure the animals are healthy, warm, and well fed. That means enduring sub-zero windchills, blizzard-like conditions, and middle-of-the-night checks.

While agriculture has become a target of environmentalists who want to discontinue life as we know it in Kansas, I am here today to testify to the great work farmers and ranchers have done to protect and improve our air, land, and water. Farmers are the original conservationists, and continue to find ways to do more with less, while protecting our most valuable natural resources.

National Ag Day is our opportunity to celebrate farmers and ranchers, highlight the impact they have on our communities and country, and remember the thousands of products made possible by their hard work.

Back home, it is a day to introduce thousands of grade school kids to the agriculture industry with fun things like how to milk a cow, gathering eggs, and even flying drones.

I encourage Members to join me today in celebration of National Agriculture Day and take time to thank a farmer.

HONORING JOHN KILZER

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today I learned that John Kilzer, a friend, an

important figure in Memphis and in the music community, passed away.

John Kilzer was 62 years old. He was born in Jackson, Tennessee, up the road from Memphis, but he lived most of his life in Memphis.

He was the epitome of what Memphis is about. A lot of times people in Memphis call us grit and grinders, and the city is the city of grit and grind. It comes from the basketball team, the Grizzlies.

John's life was Memphis and John's life was grit and grind. He was a high school All-American basketball player who went to the University of Memphis, then Memphis State, and played basketball. Didn't play it that well, but he played it. He was on the team; a good outside shooter and a scrapper.

He got interested in other things and he had some demons with him too. Those demons came along maybe from his father, who was an alcoholic, and it caused John to have problems with abuse of drugs and alcohol as well. It interfered with his basketball career, interfered with his music life, but he never let it keep him down. He came back. He came back every chance he could.

He came back as a musician who was signed by David Geffen, had two albums by Geffen, one song that made the top ten, and songs recorded by Maria Muldaur, Rosanne Cash, and others.

He became a minister and he had a series of ministries in St. John's United Methodist Church in Memphis. It was called Recovery Ministry, where he had other musicians come and join him, and they performed for folks who were having trouble with addiction, gave them a concert every Friday and helped them on the road to recovery.

He never forgot people, especially little people. He made a big difference.

For a man from Jackson, Tennessee, who was a tall guy who played basketball, to become a musician and become a minister and a writer: quite a life.

He was influenced by Reverend James Lawson, a hero of the civil rights movement, whose simple presence at a Calvary Church Lenten service influenced John to get back into ministry.

He had a ministry degree and a Ph.D. in ministry as well that he got in London, England.

He was influenced in music—which he dabbled with but wasn't very good—by Teenie Hodges, a guitarist for Al Green. He came over to see the basketball team and saw a guitar in John's room. He took up with John and taught him the finer points of music, songwriting, and guitar playing, and John did good at that, but what John did best was helping his fellow human being.

He never gave up. He always saw hope and opportunity. And he thought in universal terms.

So when I read about my friend, John, dying, the first thing I did was go around to try to find his CD in my

condo. Most of my CDs are in Memphis, about 1,000 to 1, but I looked around and couldn't find John's CD. It must be in Memphis.

So I thought, maybe I can talk to my friend Alexa, see if Alexa can help me. I said, "Alexa, play me some John Kilzer." And Amazon Music had John Kilzer, about eight or nine songs in there, including a song he wrote with Kirk Whalum, a great saxophonist and a legend in Memphis and in the music scene, called "Until We're All Free". We are not all free until we are all free. It is a great song.

So if you have a chance, if you have got Alexa as a friend, ask her to play you some John Kilzer. It is good music.

CONGRESS MUST MEET ITS CONSTITUTIONAL OBLIGATION

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart as another individual has lost her life on U.S. Highway 12 in my home State of Minnesota, in fact, right in my neighborhood.

U.S. Highway 12 is the road we drive to get to and from our hometown of Delano, Minnesota. This is one of the most dangerous stretches of road in our State. The highway has actually been called the "Corridor of Death."

On March 2, 2019, Marleena Anna Dieterich, an 18-year-old from Delano, Minnesota, lost her life in another crash on this highway.

Marleena was a student at Delano High School, a member of our hometown, and a young life with so much promise. We lost her far too soon.

Today I rise to remember the life of Marleena, to remember that she was an honor student, a black belt in Taekwondo, and was planning to major in biomedical sciences and minor in premed. Her life held endless promise.

This accident, like so many on U.S. Highway 12, was tragic and senseless.

Over the years, some improvements have been made to portions of U.S. Highway 12, but until massive improvements are made to the most dangerous stretch of this highway, tragic accidents will continue to occur.

Since the beginning of 2019, just 2 months, 14 crashes have already occurred on that stretch of the highway leading into Delano in Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District. More must be done, and quickly.

While we are committed to working with the Minnesota Department of Transportation and the Highway 12 Safety Coalition to ensure that Minnesotans can travel safely and securely on this road, I am inviting our Transportation Secretary Chao to visit us and see firsthand some of our most desperate transportation needs in Minnesota.

At the Federal level, Congress must start to exercise its obligation under Article I of the Constitution to dedicate and direct Federal funds to build,

maintain, and improve our Federal highways, especially lifesaving safety improvements.

Together, we can find a solution to the safety hazard that U.S. Highway 12 poses, and together, we will.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE MINNESOTA
WHITECAPS

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, this March, during the National Hockey League's Gender Equality Month, I want to congratulate the Minnesota Whitecaps for making it to the National Women's Hockey League playoffs.

Not everyone can play professional sports, but everyone can participate at some level. Sports are a great training ground for life. Lessons in sportsmanship, teamwork, how to handle adversity are all important to the development of productive, contributing citizens in a civil society.

Professional women athletes play a large role in the development of girls hockey in communities across the country, but especially the Minnesota hockey community.

We are lucky to have inspiring players turn coaches that mentor the next generation of female hockey players and great Americans.

I know the entire Minnesota hockey world is proud of the Whitecaps.

Congratulations on your success, and good luck in the playoffs.

HEALTHPARTNERS RECOGNIZED FOR SERVING
THE UNDERSERVED

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize HealthPartners for receiving the 2019 CMS Health Equity Award from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

This award recognizes organizations that demonstrate an exceptional commitment to serving the most underserved individuals among us.

HealthPartners has locations throughout Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District, which I am honored to represent in this Congress.

HealthPartners is committed to eliminating healthcare disparities for those with language, cultural, and other barriers.

I am pleased to congratulate this outstanding company for receiving this well-deserved award.

I hope other healthcare providers will take note of the small changes that can make a big difference in eliminating bias in the distribution of healthcare services.

SUPPORTING STATE AND LOCAL
TAX DEDUCTION

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, tax day is approaching on April 15, and I again rise to state my support for the State and local tax deduction.

There were many positive aspects to the tax bill that I voted against.

I support reducing the corporate tax rate, but it should not have been done

by increasing personal taxes on any hardworking middle-income Long Islander in my district.

The \$10,000 cap that was made to the SALT deduction was a punch in the gut to middle-class taxpayers in my district.

There were positive aspects, as I said, of the tax bill: expanding the medical expense deduction, preserving education and student deductions, doubling the child tax credit, the AMT changes.

And as I stated, changing the corporate tax rate helps make the United States more competitive globally, to improve our business climate, to help create more jobs, but it should not be done by raising taxes on the personal income side.

I have been working closely with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to address this issue. I have been working with Democratic Representative JOSH GOTTHEIMER of New Jersey. I cosponsor legislation between PETER KING, a Republican, and TOM SUOZZI, a Democrat, H.R. 257. NITA LOWEY introduced a bill that I cosponsor, H.R. 188.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues in this Chamber to work together to address this important issue, because it is important to deliver tax relief to all Americans.

Now, I do have an important message, though, to the Governor of New York, the mayor of New York City, those who are running State and local governments in States like mine. The reason why our State and local tax deduction was as high as it was is because our State and local taxes are as high as they are.

So everybody needs to look in the mirror and figure out what we can do to do our part, because all levels of government need to deliver tax relief.

My home State of New York has some of the highest taxes in the entire country. It is ranked as the second worst State in the entire Nation to do business. You couple that with the loss of the SALT deduction, and it has only sped up the amount of businesses and individuals who are choosing to leave our State.

It was very upsetting to see an effort by elected officials, some here in Congress, others in the State legislature to push away 25,000 good-paying Amazon jobs that would have been coming to Long Island City.

Now, we all must do our part. The State and local tax deduction has been around in some way since, you could say, Abraham Lincoln's administration. He used the State and local tax deduction to help keep this union together and fight the Civil War.

It was a tough debate a little over a year ago now when the tax law was passed through both Chambers and signed by the President, but next month, as April 15 approaches and people have to pay their taxes, they are going to be seeing less in their return where I am from. Some will be getting more, and that is great.

I didn't oppose this bill because all of my constituents were going to see a tax increase. It was that too many were going to see a tax increase.

Now, all, when they are getting their tax return need to understand that throughout the year, money was added to their paycheck because of a change in the way that taxes were calculated with withholdings through the year. So that is something else to factor in when trying to figure out the impact of the tax bill. Again, some people will be seeing less than they owe, others will be seeing more.

In this Chamber, in the halls of the New York State capitol, in the halls of State capitols everywhere, in city halls, in county and town governments all throughout America, we all need to do our part to deliver tax relief.

□ 1030

Because at all levels of government, really, it is not a revenue issue that has been leading to the situation that we face as a country and in our local governments. It has been an expenditure issue.

Whether you could save a dollar, a million dollars, a billion dollars, wherever you can find money to save, we need to get better at how we tax and spend the people's money. We need to spend it as if it is our own.

Mr. Speaker, there is a message here to my colleagues in this Chamber. I ask for their support of this legislation, multiple bills that have been introduced. I make that plea to the Senate, to the administration, and also to all those representatives of State and local governments responsible for the fact that the reason our deduction was as high as it was, was because our State and local taxes were as high as they were. But we need to do our part here in this Chamber.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FORMER
CONGRESSMAN RALPH HALL

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 of this year, 6 days ago, we lost our colleague Ralph Hall.

Ralph's journey among us here in Congress and our world started on May 3, 1923, in a town called Fate, Texas. Never in American history has a town of birth been more appropriate for a man than Fate, Texas. Ralph's life was all about fate, great faith, and God.

As fate would have it, Ralph left Fate and moved to Rockwall when he was 3 years old. He started working there at a local convenience store.

As fate would have it, guess who showed up? Bonnie and Clyde, the notorious killers on a rampage throughout Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, that part of our country. They gave Ralph a 25-cent tip—a quarter—big money in those days. He was so excited, he showed his boss the quarter and noticed a newspaper lying there on the

floor. Whose picture was on the front of that paper? Bonnie and Clyde.

He told his boss, "They just came here. They are in Rockwall. That is their car." His boss called the local sheriff. Ralph couldn't hear the conversation, but the sheriff said something to the effect of, "Thanks for calling about Bonnie and Clyde. I've got two stray dogs I've got to catch. Once I get those dogs, I'm going after Bonnie and Clyde."

After the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, Ralph joined our Navy to fly naval aircraft. He went to Pensacola, Florida, for his first training.

As fate would have it, he met a Hall of Fame baseball player, Ted Williams of the Boston Red Sox, the last man to hit over .400 in a season. Knowing he had Ted on his baseball team, Ralph found a young Army sergeant and said: "Hey, son, I want to bet you my whole paycheck on a baseball game, Navy versus Army."

The day of the game, Ralph knocked on Ted's door. Ted answered with a fishing pole and some gear to go fishing. Ralph said, "You have to play baseball and beat Army." Ted said, "I came here to learn to fly, defend America, and then fish." Ralph held the game up so Ted could go AWOL, absent without leave, and go fishing.

Of course, that night, Ralph had to go home to his queen, his beloved Mary Ellen, and tell her, "Honey, I have just lost my entire paycheck betting on a baseball game with the Army."

Ralph got out of flight school and went to war. He flew the F6F Hellcat on aircraft carriers. Now, I was a naval aviator, and I have to tell you, those guys were crazy, crazy, crazy courageous. Right now, if you land on an aircraft carrier, you have what is called the meatball. This ball gives you course and glide slope. In those days, they had guys with paddles.

Ralph said his proudest achievement in naval aviation during the war was to make sure on his record book that his takeoffs were the same number as his landings.

As fate would have it, once again, Ralph came home to Rockwall, Texas, to become a lawyer. The local county judge retired, so there was a vacancy. People said, "Ralph, you should run our county. File for election." Ralph didn't want to play politics. That wasn't his business. But driving home, he said, "You know what? I will just apply, maybe be there for just a couple months and go back home to my lawyer job." He filed 1 minute before the deadline that year, 1 minute.

He was driving home. The local radio was booming: "Ralph Hall, running for county judge." Guess who was outside his home, waiting with an angered look on her face? His queen, Mary Ellen.

That fate got Ralph going into public service and got Ralph here on Capitol Hill.

As fate would have it, when America goes back to the Moon sometime in the next couple years, they are going to do that because of Ralph Hall.

God bless Ralph Hall. As our dear friend Gene Cernan said: May you always have fair winds and following seas. You shot for your Moon. You are still among the stars.

God bless Ralph Hall.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, as a third-generation farmer from California's San Joaquin Valley, I wish everyone a happy National Agriculture Day, something that we do throughout our country.

I am proud, obviously, to represent the heart of California's San Joaquin Valley. But our agricultural productivity throughout the country, beginning with the very origins of the history of the United States, has truly been one of the tremendous assets that we have had.

We are home to the most productive agricultural land in the world, not only throughout the country, but in California. Our farmers, our dairymen and -women, our ranchers, and our livestock folks feed the country. I have often said that our food security, that dinner that we have on our dinner table every night, is a part of America's national food security.

As a senior member of the House Agriculture Committee, I am proud that we delivered a comprehensive farm bill last year. Now it is part of our job to ensure that we implement that farm bill as a safety net for agriculture throughout the country. But it is also a safety net for those who are working poor, those who are, unfortunately, recipients of food assistance programs and the school lunch and the school breakfast programs. So the farm bill does a great deal to help all Americans.

This year, the Agriculture Committee will work to ensure that those promises we made in the farm bill will be implemented in the way we intended. The subcommittee that I chair, the Subcommittee on Livestock and Foreign Agriculture, will be at the vanguard of that effort.

Today, on National Agriculture Day, let us thank those who grow America's food and fiber and put it on America's dinner table every night. I am talking about the farmers, the dairymen and -women, and the farmworkers, who, through their hard work and the fruits of their labor, make this all come together.

VISAS FOR CITIZENS OF PORTUGAL

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, soon, the Portuguese Caucus will be reintroducing legislation that is important for not only the United States, but for our ally Portugal. We will be introducing bipartisan legislation that will allow citizens of Portugal to be eligible for what is called the E-1 treaty trader visa and the E-2 treaty investors visa.

Portugal is one of the United States' oldest allies and a close economic part-

ner. The United States became Portugal's largest trading partner outside the European Union in 2015. Bilateral trade reached \$4.2 billion in 2015, a 30 percent increase from 5 years ago.

However, because Portugal did not have a bilateral investor treaty with the United States before joining the European Union, they are one of only five European Union countries whose citizens are not eligible for the E-1 and E-2 visas.

This is long overdue. It is good for the United States; it is good for Portugal; and it is good for increased economic activity between both countries. It is bipartisan. Hopefully, this year, we will be successful in implementing these E-1 and E-2 treaty investor visas.

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 70th anniversary of the founding of NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

We helped create NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, not only to protect our European allies, but to protect our interests. For 70 years, it has done just that, a remarkable success.

Next month, in April, we have invited the Secretary General of NATO to come address a bipartisan joint session of Congress to take assessment of and to commend our NATO partners, along with the United States, for a job well done.

How do you say a job well done? Well, after World War II, over the last 70 years, this is the longest peacetime period in Europe in 1,000 years. Think about that. The last 70 years has been the longest peacetime period in Europe in more than 1,000 years.

NATO has been one of the cornerstones that has created that peace dividend, being an absolute and critical barrier against the aggression of the Soviet Union and other totalitarian states, being there for the fall of the Iron Curtain. NATO's relevance today is just as important as it was then.

RECOGNIZING MCCAFFREY'S FOOD MARKETS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, our local businesses in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, help make our community vibrant and prosperous. Today, I am proud to recognize one such business, McCaffrey's Food Markets, which was recently named Business of the Year by the Newtown Business Association. Each year, the Newtown Business Association recognizes a business that contributes to our regional economy and contributes substantially to the community at large.

The McCaffreys opened their first supermarket in 1986 in Lower Makefield and over the past three decades has expanded throughout Pennsylvania and

New Jersey while maintaining its headquarters in Middletown Township.

McCaffrey's Food Markets and the McCaffrey family are both noted for their generosity to our community and are noted supporters of the American Red Cross, St. Mary's Medical Center, the American Cancer Society, and the 9/11 Garden of Reflection, among many other organizations and memorials.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud McCaffrey's Food Markets, the McCaffrey family, and all their amazing employees for their investment in our community and their entrepreneurship.

I also thank Bill Sheffer and Beverly Dimler of the Newtown Business Association for all their leadership in our community.

RECOGNIZING BUCKS COUNTY ASSOCIATION FOR
THE BLIND AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a nonprofit organization in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that is seeking to assist college students as they enter the workforce. The Bucks County Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired, based in Newtown, recently teamed up with Bucks County Community College to collect attire for college students.

Mr. Speaker, a critical component to ensuring the success of recent college graduates, and those who will be graduating in the future, is making sure that they are equipped with the resources they need to succeed. I applaud the work of the Bucks County Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired, especially the organization's executive director, Anne Marie Hyer, for her service.

I also thank Bucks County Community College for its collaboration with this dynamic organization and so many others in our community.

HONORING JOHN POPRIK

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life and memory of a very, very special member of the Bucks County community, John Poprik, whom we recently lost.

Born in Philadelphia, John attended Father Judge High School and Drexel University, where he graduated in 1970 with a degree in accounting. He was a respected business executive, having served as the CFO of Better Material Corp. before becoming the CFO of Sommer Maid Creamery.

John was truly dedicated to making our community a better place through public service. He served on the Northampton Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority, the Bucks County Drug and Alcohol Commission, and Pennsylvania's Office of Unemployment Compensation Board of Review.

More than anything, John was a dedicated family man. He spent some of his most treasured moments with his five grandchildren, his wife, Pat, and his children.

I extend my deepest condolences to his beloved wife of 50 years, my dear friend Pat Poprik, and their sons, Brad and Matt. May John, a good and decent

and honorable man, enjoy his eternal reward for a life well-lived.

□ 1045

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. WALTZ. Mr. Speaker, each year in the month of March, our Nation takes time to celebrate Women's History Month and to recognize the important role women have played in our personal, local, national, and world history.

We have made progress elevating women throughout our society, but it is not enough. There is still more work to be done here at home and around the world.

Women play a critical role in the history of every American.

As the son of a single mother who worked multiple jobs while putting herself through night school, I owe everything I am to this strong, independent, American woman. She and millions of other women like her blazed the trail for me, for today's young women, and, particularly, for my 15-year-old daughter, Anderson.

I am proud to be raising a young woman at a time where we have seen tremendous gains for women in our Nation.

I am proud to serve alongside a historic 102 women here in this Congress, the 116th Congress, including trailblazers like MARTHA MCSALLY, the first female fighter pilot in Congress, and numerous other Republican colleagues in the House who were the first women to represent their districts: Representatives like LIZ CHENEY and ELISE STEFANIK, who are working diligently to ensure more female candidates have the resources they need to compete in our election system, and countless others who inspire me.

As these national role models continue to be important, it is also critical to recognize the important role local heroes and local women have in our communities and our Nation, including many from my own district in Florida. That is why each week this month I will be honoring local women who have had or are having an important impact in our community, women like:

Alice Scott Abbott, a Flagler County resident of the early 1900s who worked with the national women's suffrage movement and, following the ratification of the 19th Amendment, fervently employed her fellow Flagler County women to register and participate in the 1920 November election;

Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, who founded the Volusia County School that would later become Bethune-Cookman University. She was a national leader on issues related to civil rights, to education, to women and young people until her death in 1955.

Mr. Speaker, as these local heroes exemplify, women and their contribu-

tions are critical to our success as a nation, but I also believe their strength is an essential part of our national security.

As a Green Beret who operated all over the world, I know firsthand where women thrive in business, where they thrive in civil society, in politics, and in government, extremism does not. Where women thrive, extremism fails.

As an Afghan elder once told me during one of my combat tours, he shared with me his secret weapon in defeating the Taliban. It wasn't a weapon or a missile or some type of other secret device. It was his teenage daughters, whom he had sent to India to be educated. He looked at me and said: This is our secret weapon to defeat extremism.

And I will quote for you, Mr. Speaker, the Nobel Peace Prize-winning young girl who was shot in the face for attending school, Malala Yousafzai. She said: "Extremists have shown what frightens them most: a girl with a book."

So this Women's History Month must serve as a reminder that as a nation we have a responsibility to empower women who participate in every aspect of our society—not only for the betterment of America, but also as an example for the world.

So thank you to the women of my district, our Nation, and the world who worked to make their communities a better place for us all.

DAYTONA BIKE WEEK

Mr. WALTZ. Mr. Speaker, This week is Daytona Bike Week, where my district welcomes nearly 300,000 avid motorcyclists for our community's 78th annual celebration of liberty, freedom, and two-wheeled, motorized muscle. No other event comes close to matching our combination of bikes, Florida beaches, sun, and fun.

It all started in January 1937, on a 3.2-mile race course running along the world's most famous beach—Daytona Beach. Riders first headed south on the paved roadway of Route A1A, turned left onto the beach, then raced north on the sand until turning back onto the pavement at a spot now marked by a favorite local restaurant named Racing's North Turn. Then, the riders did it again and again and again for 200 miles.

This was the birth of the famed Daytona 200 motorcycle race and the Bike Week that now surrounds it. Since then, only World War II has interrupted these annual festivities. Today, the Daytona 200 headlines Bike Week as a spectacular finale in the famed Daytona International Speedway.

Don't miss the week's other high-adrenaline racing, too. The American Flat Track series opens its season this week, and the Daytona Supercross is back again, bigger and better than ever.

If you are unsure of where to start, try the brand-new official Bike Week Welcome Center, located in One Daytona.

So to everyone visiting Daytona this week, thank you for supporting our local businesses. Have fun and ride safe.

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

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all who call upon Your name. Send Your spirit to fill their hearts with those divine gifts You have prepared for them.

May Your grace find expression in their compassion for the weak and the poor among us, and may Your mercy encourage good will in all they do and accomplish this day.

As the Members of the people's House face the demands of our time, grant them and us all Your peace.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. DUNN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

REJECT THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, President Trump's budget landed with a thud on the backs of working Americans this week.

Its message is quite simple: this administration will reward wealth with one hand and target working families with another.

To this President, avoiding the estate tax for wealthy heirs is an entitlement, but the healthcare of everyday Americans is expendable.

To this President, carried interest on passive income is a worthy tax benefit for executives, while a livable minimum wage for a working parent is a burden we cannot afford.

To this President, a lengthy record of felony convictions won't deny your tax credit for a private jet, but a conviction for misdemeanor drug possession could cost you the roof over your head.

A budget that puts Americans first doesn't deem millions of Americans unworthy.

A budget that puts Americans first doesn't starve them of housing, of healthcare, and of food because their President counts stock market gains as more important than our common humanity.

But putting Americans first has never been the fundamental policy of this administration. It has always been to draw a bright line between the wealthy and the striving.

I stand to reject this budget.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MAYOR BETTY WALKER

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mayor Betty Walker of Chiefland, Florida, who passed away on Monday, February 25.

Mayor Walker served the citizens of Chiefland as an elected city commissioner for over 15 years and as mayor and vice mayor for 11 of those years.

Betty Walker was the first African American female elected official for the city of Chiefland. She was a great leader. She loved her community immensely. She advocated for the police and fire departments and the maintenance departments as well.

Mayor Walker had recently retired after spending almost 40 years helping adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

She truly loved the people of Chiefland. She was passionate about parks and recreation and always had a vision for her city.

Mayor Walker leaves behind a rich legacy that not many can match.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring a life well lived and a community leader who will be missed by many, Mayor Betty Walker of Chiefland.

YEMEN

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, today in Yemen, there are millions of Yemeni people who are on the brink of death from famine and disease, lack of access to food and water, basic medicine and healthcare.

Thousands of Yemeni civilians have died in this genocidal war being waged by Saudi Arabia with support from the United States. They have been living under the looming threat of death at a moment's notice.

This must end. Not another day can go by with U.S. support for this genocidal war.

Saudi Arabia is not our ally. They spend billions of dollars spreading the Wahhabi-Salafist ideology that fuels terrorist organizations like ISIS and al-Qaida. They take the weapons that they get from the United States and provide them to al-Qaida.

Enough is enough.

Mr. Speaker, today, the Senate is taking an important vote, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to hear the pleas of the Yemeni people who are begging for their lives. Vote today to end the unconstitutional U.S. support for Saudi Arabia's genocidal war in Yemen.

HONORING FRED HILSENDRATH

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of the life and legacy of a friend and Holocaust survivor, Fred Hilsenrath, who recently passed away at the age of 90.

Fred was only 4 years old when Adolph Hitler took over as chancellor of Germany.

After spending years in concentration camps throughout Romania, facing death, witnessing some of the most heinous and grotesque atrocities the world has seen, Fred and his family were finally rescued by a Jewish Russian soldier.

With his new-found freedom, Fred moved to the United States to finish his education in electrical engineering.

After meeting his wife, Eleanor, Fred moved first to San Francisco and, finally, to retire in Fairfield Bay, Arkansas. Here, he wanted that slower pace of life.

In his later years, Fred advocated to young people, "Find your passion early and pursue it, even if adversity comes your way."

He was a role model and friend to many across the State of Arkansas, and I extend my condolences, respect, and affection to his friends, family, and loved ones.

TRUMP'S BUDGET

(Mrs. KIRKPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am here to represent the residents of Arizona's Second Congressional District. I work for them.

Our constituents sent us here to practice good government and to fight for their values and interests, so I am upset with the President's recent budget request.

A budget is an expression of our values, and this budget further proves how out of touch Donald Trump is with real American families.

This budget ransacks Medicaid, Medicare, and affordable healthcare. It makes it harder for Americans to have access to quality healthcare.

This budget abandons hungry families who are struggling to make ends meet. It fails farmers and rural communities. It pushes affordable college further out of reach, making it harder for students to attend college. And this budget demands billions for a wasteful, ineffective wall.

We need to have a budget that prioritizes working families and not large corporations.

We need to invest more in our education system and invest more in our young people, not less.

What the President has laid out does not accomplish the goals or values of American families, and I reject this budget.

RURAL COMMUNITIES ARE FORGOTTEN AND LEFT BEHIND

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

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Equality Act.

Too often in our policy debates, it is our rural communities that are forgotten and left behind. And for LGBTQ people living in rural America, this is no different.

If you want to live and work and raise your family in rural America, you should be able to have that choice, but it is unfortunately the case today that rural LGBTQ families are denied opportunities in housing, employment, and healthcare access.

While in California we have comprehensive laws to protect LGBTQ people and protect them against discrimination, this is not the case everywhere.

That is why we need bills like the Equality Act.

This bill would take important steps to protect every LGBTQ family from discrimination in housing, employment, and financing.

It will help ensure that every family that chooses to live in rural America can fully participate in our society free from fear of discrimination simply because of who they are or who they love.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 24, EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE REPORT OF SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC AND TO CONGRESS, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 15, 2019, THROUGH MARCH 22, 2019

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 208 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 208

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24) expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The amendments to the concurrent resolution and the preamble printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble, as amended, 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 the Judiciary.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from March 15, 2019, through March 22, 2019—

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

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

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule 1.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), 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. DESAULNIER. Mr. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 208, providing for the consideration of H.

Con. Res. 24, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress.

The rule provides for consideration of the legislation under a closed rule.

The rule self-executes two amendments to simply clarify that the resolution is calling for the release of the special counsel's findings in addition to any report.

□ 1215

It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

Finally, the rule provides standard recess procedures for the period of March 15 through March 22.

Mr. Speaker, when the Justice Department named the special counsel for the Russia investigation, acting Attorney General Rod Rosenstein said: "A special counsel is necessary in order for the American people to have full confidence in the outcome. Our Nation is grounded on the rule of law, and the public must be assured that government officials administer the law fairly."

This investigation has been about following the facts wherever they may lead, getting to the truth of Russia's involvement in the 2016 election, and ensuring government is transparent and accountable to the American public.

This does not predetermine the outcome of that investigation. It simply expresses that the report of the special counsel should be made available to Congress and to the American people.

The public, including my constituents in California—our constituents in California, Mr. Speaker—want to know what happened. Nearly 9 in 10 Americans in both parties say the investigation should produce a full public report on their findings. Not only do the American people want to know, but they deserve to know. Congress needs to preserve their ability to know.

Our election system is an integral part of what makes us the beacon of Western democracy. Any and all attempts to undermine this system is an attack on our country's values and cannot be taken lightly.

This is a serious investigation with consequences for our elections, democracy, government, and the future of this country and democracy itself. There is no one with more intimate knowledge of Russia's involvement in our election than the special counsel.

To date, this investigation has resulted in 34 people and three companies being criminally charged; nearly 200 charges filed; seven guilty pleas; one conviction following a jury trial; and the investigation, while costing \$25 million, has recovered approximately \$48 million in assets from tax evasion.

Mr. Speaker, eight Federal and congressional intelligence and national security groups believe Russia interfered

in our election, with the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the FBI, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence concluding that Vladimir Putin personally “ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. Presidential election” to “undermine public faith in the democratic process.”

The last time our country had a special counsel operating under the same rules as this probe was in 1993 to investigate the Waco siege and allegations of government wrongdoing. Prosecutors posted their final report directly on the internet with hundreds of pages of exhibits and timelines. The American people must receive the same transparency when this report is released.

I encourage my friends across the aisle to support the release of this report. We have commitments to support it from three House Republican leaders, including the minority leader, the minority whip, and the Republican Conference chair. I hope all my colleagues across the aisle will join us in this vote to ensure that we are on the record that we will share one of the most important investigations of our time within these halls and with all of America.

This is happening on our watch, and it is our job to be faithful to our oath to defend and uphold democracy. As Justice Brandeis famously said, “Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants.”

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my friend from California for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when I see someone of your stature come to the chair, I think: We must be down here to debate some serious American public policy. We must be down here to change the law in ways that can only happen once in a generation when people come together to make things happen.

I don't know what they told you when you came to the chair this morning, but let me be the first to tell you that is not at all why we are here today. What we are here to say today is important, that the American people have a vested interest in confidence in our democracy. That is a value shared from the furthest side of the left to the furthest side of the right. But the resolution we have here before us today is just a restatement of current law.

Sometimes I think, Mr. Speaker, that we undermine faith in the democracy when we try to pretend that division exists where division does not, where we try to pretend that we are doing great things when, in fact, we are not.

This is an opportunity today to speak with a voice in Congress that says the special counsel should release the report. But let me be clear, because we sometimes do more harm than good,

that is going to be the headline: “House Votes for Special Counsel to Release Report.” That is not actually what the resolution says, and I want to guide you.

If you have a copy, Mr. Speaker, you can go back through it. It is not going to be on page 1. It is not going to be on pages 2, 3, 4, or 5. The real substance of the resolution is back on the bottom of page 5, early on page 6. It says, “to the extent permitted by law.”

As you know from your legal background, Mr. Speaker, the law does not allow the special counsel to release so many things. Grand jury testimony, for example, nowhere in the country is grand jury testimony disclosed. Those facts are gathered, but that is never disclosed. Intelligence sources and methods, that is never disclosed, nor would anybody on the other side of the aisle suggest that it should be.

That is why, in the resolution drafted by the Democratic chairman of the Judiciary Committee, it says specifically that these things need not be released because it is prohibited by law. I only make that point, Mr. Speaker, because sometimes the headlines are all we read when they come through on our Twitter feed. Sometimes we believe the headline tells the whole story.

I want to make it clear that there is unanimity in this Chamber that transparency is valuable in our Republic. But it is also true that this is a nation of laws. The reason the special counsel exists is because we are a nation of laws, and the substance of the special counsel's report is going to be governed by those laws. To the extent allowable by law, our Attorney General has already said he wants to make the entire thing available.

I don't know how you want to characterize the resolution today, Mr. Speaker, whether you want to characterize it as an insistence of the House on how the administration should behave or just a big attaboy to our new Attorney General to say: You are doing a great job, and we are behind you 100 percent in what you have already promised the American people you were going to do.

However you characterize that resolution—we heard it in the Rules Committee, as my friend from California suggested—it is coming to the floor today under a closed rule. So if anybody has any additional changes they want to make, those changes will not be permitted. This is a take-it-or-leave-it resolution from the Rules Committee today.

But as a restatement of current law, it is quite clear. Again, you have to go all the way to the back of the resolution to find those 10 lines of substance. But when you get there, you will find these are already things the Attorney General has agreed to, and all Americans should be pleased about that outcome.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me join with my friend from Georgia in noting how important it is that you are presiding, my good friend, with lots of history between the two of us in our political life in California and our education, I might add to the Jesuits.

I want to say to my good friend, I look at this as one of those opportunities where we may not get a headline. Unfortunately, too many of the headlines talk about how divisive it is here. Certainly, there is a lot of that.

But when I go home and do town-halls—and I do a lot of them in northern California—when this question comes up about polarization, I talk about all the times we do work together that don't get out, certainly, in the headlines, because that is not what sells advertising, apparently. I think this is one of those moments that we aspire to that, that we actually aspire that somebody picks up on this; that all of us, in these extraordinary circumstances, are being faithful to our oath; that we make sure that the things that may have happened, that apparently did happen, that the public needs confidence in us.

When we look every day, including today, at the affronts and the attacks on so many institutions in America, and this institution having had challenges, this might be one of those opportunities, at least for us, to say: We agree. We may have differences of opinion about who did what, but we have faith.

For me, I think history will say that this special counsel is one of those providential Americans. With his background, with his determination to believe in fidelity and truth, we were lucky to have this person at this point in time.

I put my faith in this institution. I put faith in the special counsel. In this instance, I hear from you, my friend from Georgia, that we are going to put our faith in this institution and one another, that we can show the American people that this is, indeed, more important than party, and it is more important than any of our individual political careers.

I did want to mention, Mr. Speaker, that this is a sense of Congress and that this is not the first time we have brought a resolution like this to the floor. In fact, just last week, we brought a resolution to the floor to send a message to the American people that Congress is united in condemning anti-Semitism and bigotry in all its forms. There are people who criticized us for bringing that and thought that it was unnecessary, but we brought that to the floor.

A majority of Republicans joined Democrats, an overwhelming majority, in voting for it. Leader MCCARTHY called it a resolution to make a statement. Whip SCALISE said, regarding the resolution, “We must all take a strong

stand against hatred and bigotry wherever we see it, and I am glad this resolution makes" sense.

We agree with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that passing these types of resolutions can make a strong statement. Although they may seem to some as unnecessary, these statements on these kinds of important issues, I believe, are very necessary for this institution to make, particularly when they are bipartisan.

Today, we are letting Attorney General Barr and everyone else know that we are all united behind one common principle, which I believe he agreed to in his confirmation hearings, which the Member from Georgia alluded to. That complete transparency, consistent with law, is vital to the success of our democracy. The American people deserve to have access to this report.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a senior member on the Rules Committee and a subcommittee ranking member on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to the rule providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 24 to release the special counsel's investigation report, a report that, I may note, has not yet been issued.

The resolution we are considering here today will not change the law; it will not increase transparency; and it will provide no new benefit to the American people. Quite simply, this resolution merely states current law. This resolution simply restates current Department of Justice protocol.

We had a Member here in this House who was also a physician and who was a member of the other party, former Congressman McDermott of Washington State. I remember one time Republicans offered a sense of Congress resolution that had something to do with taxes. The gentleman took to the floor of the House and said, if you want to do something about taxes, do something about taxes, but a sense of Congress resolution, why you might as well be sending a get-well card to the IRS.

That is the force with which we are exercising our congressional time today. Speaker PELOSI and the Democratic leadership have decided to use valuable legislative time to consider a resolution that changes nothing and does not serve the American people.

In the time that we have spent debating this resolution, we could have been discussing more serious matters before this body. Let's just run through a few of them.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act has been brought to the floor 17 times, yet the current Democratic leadership refuses to bring up this legislation for a vote. I might remind the body that this bill is not

about abortion but saving the lives of children who are, in fact, born alive.

□ 1230

You know, I don't make it a habit of watching "60 Minutes" on television, but last Sunday night, "60 Minutes" had a news story on the dramatic advances in the treatment and perhaps—perhaps—inching towards a cure for sickle cell disease.

Sickle cell disease is a painful condition I witnessed many times as a resident at Parkland Hospital back in the 1970s.

For years, sickle cell received very little attention. Now, I am happy to say in the last Congress, under the leadership of DANNY DAVIS of Illinois, our subcommittee worked on and passed his bill dealing with sickle cell. It finally was passed by the Senate in October of last year, and it was signed into law by the President last December.

As a consequence, the push for sickle cell research has continued. The 21st Century Cures Act, which this Congress worked on at the end of the previous administration, certainly can be given some credit for that. But, I have to tell you, it was dramatic to have the Director of the NIH interviewed on "60 Minutes" talking about a cure for sickle cell.

So our work that we do here is important. It does impact the lives of real people, and I think that is just one dramatic example.

Well, another example was the first tax reform, 31 years, that was signed into law last year, and here we are a month out from tax day. We could use this time to strengthen the progress we made on the tax reform that was passed last year.

In the last Congress, we helped American people keep more of their hard-earned money. We should be working to continue that momentum, perhaps make those tax cuts permanent for the middle class.

We could be discussing the Democrats' government-run, bureaucratic, top-down healthcare plan that would strip hardworking Americans of their private health insurance and offer less coverage at more expense to American taxpayers, but we are not.

Today, we could be talking about patent abuse entities, so-called patent trolls, particularly troublesome in the eastern district of Texas, where most of those cases are litigated.

The House could be considering the Troll Act, legislation that I have introduced for three terms of Congress to limit patent assertion entities and protect Americans' intellectual property.

We could be using this time to discuss our Nation's critical need for border security to protect the American people and defend our borders.

In February of 2019, the shortest month of the year, only 28 days, more than 75,000 people that we know of crossed the border without legal status, in excess of a 100 percent increase

from the same period last year. People argue whether that is an emergency. I believe that it is, but we could be talking about that.

In a week in which more than 150 lost their lives, we could be using this time to discuss aviation safety and does Congress need to do anything further to ensure the continued safety of the American traveling public.

So time and again, we found that Members on the other side of the dais are far more interested in discrediting the President than working on policy that will help the American people, this President who, in the first 2 years and 2 months of this administration, has probably been more productive than any Presidency in the last 50 years.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, we could be using this time to address the false and misleading comments that a member of the Judiciary Committee made about the Department of Health and Human Services.

Last month, a Member of this House grossly mischaracterized the work being done by the Department of Health and Human Services to care for unaccompanied alien children by stating that the Office of Refugee Resettlement created "an environment of systemic sexual assaults by Health and Human Services staff on unaccompanied alien children."

Mr. Speaker, that accusation is false, and it was made without that Member ever having visited an ORR facility. Those comments are a discredit to the effort by dedicated personnel of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, those employees who deal with a problem that dates back to the Obama administration when the Office of Refugee Resettlement was unprepared for the task.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEYER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. If Democrats don't like the work that the Office of Refugee Settlement is doing, you are in the majority. You have the ability to introduce legislation and pass legislation to do something different.

Instead of standing here today discussing this superfluous resolution, the Democrats could be using this time to change a law that they clearly don't like.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the agency's Administration for Children and Families regarding this issue.

ADMINISTRATION FOR
CHILDREN & FAMILIES,

Washington, DC, February 28, 2019.

Representative TED DEUTCH,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DEUTCH: At the February 26th House Judiciary Committee hearing, you stated that ORR created "an environment of systemic sexual assaults by staff on unaccompanied alien children" and went on to conclude that you have seen "thousands of cases of sexual assault, if not by

HHS staff, then by staff HHS oversees.” (emphasis added). However, this is unsupported by the data you provided and none of the allegations involve HHS employees. By mischaracterizing the data during a televised hearing, you impugned the integrity of hundreds of federal civil servants who, like Commander White, work tirelessly to ensure the well-being of the nearly 50,000 unaccompanied alien children who they have been charged by federal law to protect annually. On behalf of these dedicated employees of HHS assigned to the UAC program, we request that you apologize to these career civil servants for your untoward and unfounded comments. Acknowledging that you were wrong is the moral, decent and right thing to do.

Child safety is our top priority in managing the UAC program. All but one of our care facilities are licensed by the authorizing state residential child care agency, and operate under intense state and federal oversight. Because ORR care facilities diligently track all allegations of a wide range of sexually inappropriate conduct, ranging from name calling or use of vulgar language to more serious claims, the data given to Congress by our agency reflects allegations much broader than just ‘sexual abuse’ (as defined in 34 U.S.C. §20341 and in ORR regulations at 45 C.F.R. §411.6), to also include ‘sexual harassment’ (as defined in ORR regulations at 45 C.F.R. §411.6) and ‘inappropriate sexual behavior’ (a catch-all category for sexual behaviors that do not rise to the level of sexual abuse or sexual harassment).

The total number of sexual conduct allegations reported to ORR decreased in FY2017 (1,069 total) but otherwise has generally remained relatively stable each year (FY2015: 1,000 total, FY2016: 1,226 total, FY2018 (through July): 1,261 total). The vast majority of the allegations reported to ORR are ‘inappropriate sexual behaviors’ involving solely UAC, and not staff or any other adults. Facilities can often resolve these allegations by, for example, counseling the minors about more appropriate behaviors.

More serious allegations rising to the level of ‘sexual abuse’ are reported to both ORR and the Department of Justice (DOJ). Of these, the vast majority involve ‘UAC-on-UAC’ allegations; the distinct minority involve adults. In FY2015, 279 allegations of sexual abuse were reported. Of these, 8.6% (24 instances) involved allegations of facility-staff-on-minor sexual abuse. These metrics fluctuated in subsequent years but remained relatively consistent. In FY2016, ORR and DOJ received 348 allegations of sexual abuse, and 16.1% (56 instances) involved facility-staff-on-minor allegations; in FY2017, ORR and DOJ received 264 allegations of sexual abuse, and 18.6% involved facility-staff-on-minor allegations (49 instances); in FY2018 (through July), ORR and DOJ received 412 allegations of sexual abuse, and 11.9% involved facility-staff-on-minor allegations (49 instances). Thus, the total number of incidents of alleged ‘sexual abuse’ involving facility-staff-on-minor misconduct across a four-year period spanning the previous administration and this administration was 178 out of approximately 182,806 children under UAC care or about 0.10% of all children placed in ORR custody during that period. None of the allegations involved ORR or other HHS federal staff. These allegations were all fully investigated and remedial action was taken where appropriate.

Your office staff requests an additional briefing from ORR program officials on these allegations. ORR will be happy to meet with you once you correct the hearing record and provide an apology to the dedicated men and women working tirelessly to protect and im-

prove the lives of unaccompanied alien children in our care.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN H. HAYES,
*Acting Director,
Office of Refugee Resettlement.*

Mr. BURGESS. So here is the bottom line: House Democrats do not like the President of the United States, and we know that.

Less than 3 months into the 116th Congress, the Democrats have shown that they will work against President Trump to the detriment of the American people.

We are here in the United States House of Representatives to serve the American people, and the legislation we are considering here today will not do that.

President Trump has urged us at the State of the Union, asked all the Members present, to reject the politics of revenge, resistance, and retribution and embrace the boundless potential of cooperation, compromise, and the common good. I also believe this is possible, and I recommend we get on with the task.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), the distinguished chair of the Committee on House Administration.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution today.

We have a responsibility to the American people to uphold the Constitution and rule of law, and we also have an obligation, as a separate and equal branch of government, to act as a check on the executive branch.

Without access to necessary information, we can’t fulfill our constitutionally prescribed duties. We must have not only this report, but the evidence collected to support the report.

If the President has nothing to hide, then he would also support this resolution by tweet or verbal approval.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation. It is very important for our country.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial and Administrative Law.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Special Counsel Mueller’s investigation has resulted in 199 criminal charges against 39 people and entities. Seven people have pleaded guilty, and five people have been sentenced to prison.

This investigation has been conducted on behalf of the American people, and they are entitled to know the results of this investigation.

This investigation was begun to safeguard our democracy, and the American people deserve to know the results of this investigation; and yet President Trump has repeatedly sought to attack and discredit the investigation, label-

ing it a witch hunt and even contemplating firing the special counsel.

The President’s pick for Attorney General, Bill Barr, has also made it clear during his confirmation hearing that he will only follow DOJ’s policies that are convenient for the President. Therefore, it is up to Congress to make sure that documents related to the special counsel’s investigation are preserved and published.

That is why I introduced the Special Counsel Transparency Act, with Congressman DOGGETT, to require the publication of the special counsel’s report.

No one person should decide what the public gets to see. The American people have a right to come to their own conclusions and to know that justice was served.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the American people. Allow them to see the results of the investigation conducted on their behalf. Bring transparency to this process. Support this resolution and signal a willingness to respect the right of the American people to see the consequences and the results of this important investigation which, again, was begun to safeguard our democracy.

This shouldn’t be a Republican or Democratic issue. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join us in our effort to preserve our democracy.

I thank, again, the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my friend from Rhode Island before he leaves the floor: The bill that he introduced, was that also a House resolution or was that an H.R. to insist on the revealing?

Mr. CICILLINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation that I introduced is an H.R. But if the point of the gentleman’s question is is that a more effective way to do it, I would welcome support on my resolution. I haven’t been as successful getting my Republican colleagues to join us.

We are hoping that this resolution is a way for him to find his way toward transparency, democracy, and spirit of bipartisanship and letting the American people know the results of the investigation.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Rhode Island introducing the bill.

And I think that is an important distinction, Mr. Speaker, and that is what you have heard, largely. You heard it in the Rules Committee; you have heard it down here on the floor, that: Listen, there are lots of things that we could be doing here, and if we wanted to pass a law that insisted that the entire report was released—those parts that are prohibited from being released under current law and those parts that are intended to be released under current law—we could do that. That is just not what we are doing.

What we are doing is saying: Hey, do you know what current law is? Follow current law. Follow current law. We, the House of Representatives, have thought about it, and in our deliberative wisdom, we are prepared to announce that we believe current law should be followed—Signed, U.S. House of Representatives.

There are those who would have you believe this is something more than that. It is not. There is nothing wrong with what we are doing today except that it is not a particularly valuable use of time.

When I opened, Mr. Speaker, you were not in the chair, but I mentioned that I think we do great damage to trust in our Republic when we seek division instead of highlighting our unity. To suggest that we are down here doing something to protect our Republic from its inevitable demise is just ridiculous. No such thing is happening here on the floor today. All that is happening on the floor today is saying that we, the duly-elected Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, believe U.S. law should be followed.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, in response to my friend from Georgia, I want to agree—and maybe we disagree a little bit.

I do think this is important. I think it is the unusual circumstance, and a lot of things that we have no direct control over have brought us to this circumstance.

Social media and the use of social media in our elections is relatively new, coming from the Bay area where so much of the genesis happened.

So I think it is important, and I do think there is lacking—and hyperbole is something that sometimes doesn't happen in this Chamber, but I think it is not a hyperbole to say that the U.S. House of Representatives, hopefully, unanimously says that the law should be followed to its letter.

So I think we agree, and I don't want to look for a way to disagree.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is in the Mueller report and neither do you. The American people don't know what is in the Mueller report, but they want to know. And I want to know, as you do, and why not?

Mr. Speaker, 81 percent of the American people polled say they want to know, and that includes 79 percent of the Republicans. That is good news.

Because what we do know, without knowing the details of the Mueller report, is that really bad stuff happened in the last election. Some of it was in a campaign, and some of it was in a foreign country that is our severe adversary; and I speak, of course, of Vladimir Putin's Russia.

But the bad stuff: a former campaign foreign policy adviser indicted and con-

victed, Mr. Papadopoulos; a former campaign manager on his way to jail, Mr. Manafort; a former campaign aide and Manafort's long-time junior business partner indicted; a former foreign policy national security adviser pleaded guilty, Mr. Flynn.

This is the high level of a campaign where crimes are not just being discussed; there have been convictions and guilty pleas. What is behind all of that? We need to know.

And, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the American people are footing the bill for this—about \$25 million, as far as we can tell. They have got a right to know.

But, in addition to whatever happened in the campaign, really bad stuff happened in Russia. We know from our own intelligence agencies that Russia made a concerted effort and a determined effort and a well-financed effort to interfere in our election.

□ 1245

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, outside interference goes to the heart of our democracy. The most important challenge for our country is that we, the citizens of this country, make the decision on who is our President, who are our Senators, and who are our Representatives.

We have to get to the bottom of what Russia did and how they did it so that we can take steps to make certain that that does not happen in the future. It is the American people who decide who is their leader.

Release the Mueller report.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am looking for something to disagree with my friend from Vermont about. I don't disagree with him about anything at all. I thought that was a very thoughtful presentation.

The only thing I would point out is the reason that he doesn't know what is in the Mueller report and the American people don't know what is in the Mueller report, is because as of today, there is no Mueller report. That is the only reason we don't know what is in it. It hasn't been released yet.

I don't mean released to the public. I mean, Mueller hasn't written it and handed it to the Attorney General yet, and so we don't know. When that happens, let me tell you what the Attorney General has said, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney General has committed to being transparent with Congress and the public consistent with the rules and the law. I don't think we would ask anything different of him.

The Attorney General has committed to providing as much information as he can consistent with current regulations. I don't think we would ask anything different of him than that, and,

certainly, this resolution does not ask anything different of him other than that.

He says that his objective and goal is to get as much information as he can to the public. That is exactly what this resolution asks for; exactly what he has already committed to. And he says, "I feel like I'm in a position in life where I can do the right thing and not really care about the consequences. I can be truly independent."

Well, that doesn't just mean truly independent from pressure put on him from the White House. It also means truly independent from statements of opinion sent to him by the U.S. House. He is going to do the right thing, as allowed by the law and resolutions. If he doesn't, this House can act and try to push a different outcome.

Just understand that that is not what this resolution does today. It is simply a statement of fact. To my friend from California, there are those Members of Congress that sometimes they speak and you just want to get out your sharp stick, Mr. Speaker, and poke them a little bit harder. They don't calm you down. They rile you up. My friend from California is one of those folks whose thoughtful words always recenter me and remind me what we have together.

He is right about the hyperbole, and I don't want to mischaracterize this resolution. It does do one thing that is not available in current law today, and that is, that it makes the official position of the United States House known. I have always presumed that the Attorney General would follow the law. This resolution says we expect the Attorney General to follow the law.

It is not that it does nothing. It is just that it does something so very little, perhaps our time would be better spent elsewhere, but I support the underlying premise.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for pointing out that I am not a poker, that I might actually be trying to be thoughtful. Maybe it is because I was once registered as a Republican. I don't regularly admit that sometimes, at least not in my district.

But I do think this conversation is important on multiple levels, and I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is here to present his side of the aisle's position.

I think there is a danger here for us to resume to our corners, and this is an instance where I really think it is important—and, hopefully, it is newsworthy—to the media and to the general public that we are coming to this moment. Although it is a resolution, I still think it is significant without indulging in hyperbole.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my friend and a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California,

and I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I have not heard you two be so agreeable. Disagreeable is what usually you are, but so agreeable, and the reason there is agreement here is, we all want to see what is in this report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying resolution, and I would like to remind everybody about what the Mueller investigation is about. Russia interfered in the 2016 U.S. Presidential election with, in my opinion, the goal of helping Donald Trump be elected.

This is a fact confirmed by the U.S. intelligence community, as well as by the House and Senate Intelligence Committees. This should concern every American, Republican, Democrat, or Independent.

In response to this unprecedented attack on our elections, Robert Mueller was appointed to serve as special counsel for the Justice Department to follow the facts wherever they may lead, whether they implicate people or exonerate people. We need to know precisely what happened, understand who was involved, how it was accomplished, and, ultimately, hold those responsible for this attack on our election accountable under our laws. This investigation will also ensure we better protect our elections in the future.

Now, we have had 2 convictions of Mr. Manafort, 7 guilty pleas, 34 people and 3 companies indicted as part of the Mueller investigation. Six of the people indicted were part of President Trump's inner circle with the campaign and business. So it is important for us to understand precisely what is in the report.

I appreciate the fact that the Rules Committee unanimously supported this particular rule and the underlying resolution, and I say to my friend from Georgia, you are right. The law is what it is and that it says the report should be withheld until fully written and prepared. And then if Mr. BARR does what he says he was going to do, it will be made available to all of us.

We are emphasizing that point because Americans should know precisely what happened and where this investigation has led. I thank my friend from California for bringing this rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I tell my friend, I do not have any speakers remaining at this point, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me thank the gentleman from California and congratulate him on his new distinguished post on the Rules Committee. My good friend who I have seen quite frequently over the years at the Rules Committee and I have known of his consistent concern with the rule of law and truly appreciate his comments today as it relates to the rule of law.

I would like my comments to be strictly on that question and really the

American people of whom each and every one of us come here to represent.

I don't want to recount in detail, but I do want to make mention that we know that the Intelligence Committee in January 2017 concluded—and that is the intelligence community concluded—in a report that Russian President Putin ordered and influenced the campaign of 2016 on the Presidential election. We all know recently there were attempts to influence the 2018 election.

We won't dwell on that. We won't dwell on the fact that there are discussions and review in the special counsel's work dealing with collusion or the questions dealing with the campaign of the present President and Russia.

I believe that the real point of this is to answer the questions of the American people. If we say that the purpose of appointing the special counsel to oversee the investigation is to ensure that the American public would have full confidence in the integrity of the investigation, regardless of what it says, I am here to say, regardless of what the Mueller report will say—and we know that there will be comments made by the general public, leaders of Congress, and that is their right as Americans—we want to reinforce the fact that the DOJ regulations themselves say that investigation results should be made fully extended to the American public in the public interest, and that the results of that report should be made available to the American people.

Obviously, being concerned about persons that are mentioned with no relevance whatsoever, as a lawyer, I would want to make sure such protections occur. But it is true that Special Counsel Mueller previously served in the Department of Justice as a prosecutor, and director of the FBI in the Republican and Democrat administrations where he built a reputation of competence, fairness, and nonpartisanship.

With that in mind, we thank him for the work he has done that has shown a number of guilty pleas and other responses.

But the main point is the American people need to know that their government adheres to the rule of law, and the integrity of the Constitution. All we are asking today is to reflect in a sense of Congress that you, the American people, that my colleagues in this House and the Senate should have the right to see the full report.

I ask for support of the underlying bill, and I ask us to do it in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on Judiciary, which has oversight of the Department of Justice, and as a senior member of the Committee on Homeland Security, which has oversight over our election security infrastructure, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 24.

Mr. Speaker, I take no glee in standing here.

In fact, there are many parts of the last 22 months, since the day that Deputy Attorney

General Rod Rosenstein appointed former FBI Director Robert Mueller to be Special Counsel, where I have been concerned for the state of our democracy.

And I know, from my travels back to the 18th Congressional District of Texas, around our Nation, and to nations involved, that many Americans are concerned about our democracy.

Since well before the 2016 election, Americans have been concerned about how Russia was manipulating our election and the extent to which that crime was aided and abetted by associates of the Trump Campaign.

American intelligence officials have been keenly aware of this threat to the democracy posed by Russia's active measures campaign to sabotage the election and secure the American presidency for its preferred candidate, the current occupant of the Oval Office.

Shortly after the President took office, James Comey, the former director of the FBI testified to the House Intelligence Committee in a public congressional hearing that there was an active FBI investigation into Russia's interference and the extent to which Russia and was aided and abetted by agents of the Trump Campaign.

Shortly after the hearing, the President fired James Comey as FBI Director and went on broadcast television and cited the looming Russia investigation as his reason for doing so.

The next day in the Oval Office, the President of the United States met with the Russian Ambassador and other officials from the Kremlin and told them that he had gotten rid of "nut job" Comey and had gotten the Russian investigation off his back.

Mere days later, the Deputy Attorney General, Rod Rosenstein appointed legendary FBI Director and Department of Justice prosecutor Robert Mueller as Special Counsel to investigate whether Russia interfered in our election and whether that effort was aided and abetted by members of the Trump Campaign.

Since that time, the investigation has secured numerous indictments, convictions or guilty pleas from the: President's campaign manager, his deputy campaign manager, his campaign's foreign policy advisor, his former personal attorney, his longtime confidante, and many others, including Russian agents.

The president has attempted to dismiss these crimes and other charges brought—like obstruction of justice, perjury, making false statements, etc.—as "process crimes," when in actuality they are crimes designed to safeguard the integrity of the criminal justice system and the rule of law.

But these are merely the headlines, when we look closer at just what we have learned from the Russia investigation, we have a roadmap on how to manipulate the electoral process in the world's oldest democracy.

We know that the Russians manipulated our social media systems.

They did this by turning our social media platforms like Twitter and Facebook, into rowdy and unwieldy debates that turned Americans against one another.

They did this by creating fake online social media accounts and populated them on social media platforms.

After infiltrating the social media accounts of real Americans, these fake accounts sought to sow discord in these online communities by purposely exacerbating divisions within our

Nation and creating new ones—all with the intent of pitting Americans against one another.

While they were distorting the social media landscape, they were also selectively disseminating emails stolen from the Democratic National Committee and the campaign of Hillary Clinton with the purpose of timing the dissemination to maximize political damage on Secretary Clinton's campaign.

Based on the statements from the Trump Campaign, we also know that it was actively trying to suppress the votes of groups traditionally aligned with the Democratic party, including women, African Americans and young voters.

We now know, due to information uncovered during the pendency of the Special Counsel's investigation, Russians affiliated with the highest ranks of the Kremlin were at Trump Tower during the middle of the 2016 election.

We know that then-candidate Trump asked Russia, "Russia, if you're releasing, I hope you will find Hillary's stolen emails."

In May 2017, Special Counsel Mueller was appointed with the task of getting to the bottom of this.

The American people deserve answers to know how their last presidential election was a crime scene so that we may learn to ensure that the next one is also not a crime scene.

And, the American people have every reason to have confidence in the report produced by the Special Counsel.

The Special Counsel is a decorated American hero and public servant. He has served as the FBI director for presidents of both parties.

He has served as a line prosecutor, a United States Attorney and a leader within the Justice Department.

Despite protestations by the President, this is not a witch hunt—it has yielded the public indictments of 34 individuals and 3 companies, 7 guilty pleas, and 1 conviction.

The American people are watching.

The most recent public opinion poll shows that a super majority of Americans—a full 68 percent—wants the Mueller Report made public.

The Mueller Report is one unparalleled way in which Americans can learn this information with confidence.

And, finally, we must tackle a serious issue that is being discussed among elected officials and the Justice Department.

Over the past two years, we have been told that it is Justice Department regulations that a sitting President cannot be indicted. I will note that this principle has not been tested in court.

That regulation was implemented during the Watergate investigation, under the theory that the President cannot be subjected to criminal process.

But, assuming *arguendo* that this regulation is correct, and the President cannot be subjected to criminal process and therefore cannot and should not be indicted, it is a logical fallacy to say that because he cannot be indicted by virtue of his office, and because it is Justice Department regulation not to reveal information about unindicted parties and individuals, the Justice Department cannot reveal any information of potential wrongdoing by the President and not reveal any information to the body that possesses the constitutional responsibility for holding this president accountable.

For these reasons, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 24, and urge my colleagues to support it and urge passage so the American people can learn how the 2016 election became a crime scene.

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

Mr. Speaker, I hope folks pay attention to some of those things that have brought folks together today, and I hope folks pay attention to some of those things that haven't brought us together today.

We have talked about whether there has been overstatement and hyperbole, whether it comes from that end of Pennsylvania Avenue or this end of Pennsylvania Avenue. None of us are advantaged by that. It breeds more distrust in the American public, and breeds more distrust in this institution.

We have talked about who is to blame within the administration. Of course, there is news today of Paul Manafort's sentence, not for anything related to the election, but for things related to his private business practices. There will be efforts to conflate those two investigations. Those are two different investigations, and I think the American people are disadvantaged if they are led to believe that those sentences are related to the election of the President of the United States.

But what you have heard is a lot of unanimity, as you would expect, that we are a Nation of laws and the rule of law should be followed, and transparency should be our touchstone, and the American People, the boss of each and every one of us, whether we work on that end of Pennsylvania Avenue or this end of Pennsylvania Avenue, have a right to know what their tax dollars have paid for and what their government is up to.

I find that very encouraging that we have that sense of agreement here today, Mr. Speaker. What is noticeably absent in this resolution is the dramatic overreach that I think has characterized most of the work we have done so far in 2019. Things that could have been partnership issues have been pushed further and further out to the edge of the political continuum that they became partisan issues.

This resolution does not make those mistakes of the past, and to my friend from California's point, these things are done incrementally. Trust is built incrementally; relationships grow incrementally; and success happens incrementally.

It is my great hope, Mr. Speaker, that those things that unite us, transparency, rule of law, trust in and of the American people will begin today to flourish in ways, perhaps, those common themes have not thus far. And both parties play a role in that disappointing outcome. But success has to begin on one day, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps success begins today.

I serve on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. There is no

such thing as a Republican road or a Democratic bridge. There is no such thing as sitting in traffic on a Democratic highway or missing your child's soccer game because of malfunctions on a Republican road. We are all in this together.

□ 1300

I do not plan to offer a previous question today, Mr. Speaker, because this isn't one of those issues that dramatically divides us. My friend suggested in the Rules Committee we passed this out in, I think, our first voice vote of the year out of the Rules Committee, and I intend to do exactly that today.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from California for yielding the time and leading the debate today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, it is a pleasure to see you up there. And to my friend from Georgia, in his long, illustrious public career, I want to thank him for his comity here today.

I can't help but think so many Americans now and people who are filled with adrenaline and hyperbole talk about what a difficult time this is, and I wouldn't underestimate the challenges ahead of us; but, arguably, a more difficult time, I was thinking of Mr. Lincoln's comments about appealing to the better angels of our nature, and perhaps this is a turning point.

Certainly we will be tested, and we will fail on occasion, but to my friend, for whatever time both of us have left here, I would like to personally say to the degree we can find things that are of interest to your district and my district, they are of interest to the United States, and I would love to work with the gentleman to find those things.

Lastly, I just can't help but comment on my observation about providential Americans in history. I was reading about Mr. Mueller and his comments when he was FBI Director in the context of his amazing life and career as a combat veteran, a Bronze Star winner in the Marine Corps in Vietnam. I think of my own father who was a devoted Marine Corps combat veteran who is buried in Arlington. My dad and all marines, although I was not one, liked to always recite "Semper Fidelis."

The special counsel, in his comments when he was FBI Director, assures me that the work he does in ways that I find profound, talked about fidelity as he talked to his agents, that the fidelity to this Constitution, to this country, and to the truth will find us true to the path that we want to take and to success as we look for the better angels of our nature.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple vote but an important vote. We need to get to the bottom of what happened and put faith in the special counsel's findings and put faith in the American public and the people that they can devise their own truth when we give them this investigation's report.

Mr. Speaker, you either believe the public and Congress should see the report or you don't. Fortunately, it looks like we are agreed that they should. We owe it to our constituents, the American people, and future generations to do the right thing always, but today, I think, in particular, to support the release of this report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and a "yes" vote on the previous question.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. WOODALL. 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.

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.

ACKNOWLEDGING LACK OF TRANSPARENCY IN FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS POSES A THREAT TO NATIONAL SECURITY

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 206) acknowledging that the lack of sunlight and transparency in financial transactions and corporate formation poses a threat to our national security and our economy's security and supporting efforts to close related loopholes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 206

Whereas money laundering and other financial crimes are serious threats to our national and economic security;

Whereas the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime has reported "The estimated amount of money laundered globally in one year is 2 - 5% of global GDP, or \$800 billion - \$2 trillion in current US dollars";

Whereas the scale, efficiency, and complexity of the U.S. financial system make it a prime target for those who seek to conceal, launder, and move the proceeds of illicit activity;

Whereas money launderers, terrorist financiers, corrupt individuals and organizations, and their facilitators have proven to adapt quickly in order to avoid detection;

Whereas given the global nature of money laundering and terrorist financing, and the

increasing interrelatedness within the financial system, a secure national and multilateral framework is essential to the integrity of the U.S. financial system;

Whereas extensive collaboration among financial regulators, the Department of the Treasury, law enforcement, and the private sector is required to curtail the illicit flow of money throughout the United States;

Whereas despite how extensive and effective these efforts are in the United States, there is still substantial room for improvement;

Whereas financial compliance, reporting, investigation, and collaboration, as well as courageous whistleblowers and investigative reporting have had significant impact in shining sunlight on the people and institutions behind dark money and markets;

Whereas in 2016, the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), the international standards setting body, evaluated the United States' anti-money laundering/combating the financing of terrorism measures and determined the United States has significant gaps in its framework;

Whereas in 2016, the FATF found that in the United States, "Minimal measures are imposed on designated non-financial businesses and professions (DNFBPs), other than casinos and dealers in precious metals and stones";

Whereas in 2016, the FATF recommended, "The U.S. should conduct a vulnerability analysis of the minimally covered DNFBP sectors to address the higher risks to which these sectors are exposed, and consider what measures could be introduced to address them";

Whereas dealers in arts and antiquities are not, by definition, covered "financial institutions" required to comply with the Bank Secrecy Act;

Whereas Federal authorities have cautioned that art collectors and dealers to be particularly careful trading Near Eastern antiquities, warning that artifacts plundered by terrorist organizations such as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant are entering the marketplace;

Whereas, according to the Antiquities Coalition, "because the United States is the largest destination for archaeological and ethnological objects from around the world, the discovery of recently looted and trafficked artifacts in our country not only makes Americans and our institutions accessories to crimes, but also threatens our relations with other countries";

Whereas the real-estate industry, both commercial and residential, is exempt from having to develop and implement a four-pillar anti-money laundering program pursuant to the Bank Secrecy Act;

Whereas it was asserted in a 2018 Conference Report by the Terrorism, Transnational Crime and Corruption Center at the Schar School of Policy and Government of George Mason University, money laundering in real estate (MLRE) has damaging effects on local economies by negatively impacting property prices and displacing residents;

Whereas in 2017, in response to evidence about significant money laundering through real estate in the United States, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) issued Geographic Targeting Orders (GTOs) requiring limited beneficial ownership disclosure in certain transactions involving high-end luxury real estate and "found that about 30 percent of the transactions covered by the GTOs involve a beneficial owner or purchaser representative that is also the subject of a previous suspicious activity report";

Whereas the influx of illicit money, including from Russian oligarchs, has flowed large-

ly unimpeded into the United States through these anonymous shell companies and into U.S. investments, including luxury high-end real estate;

Whereas the United States has not fulfilled the recommended steps to address the money-laundering loopholes that the FATF has identified with DNFBP sectors;

Whereas high-profile enforcement actions against some of the largest and most sophisticated financial institutions raise troubling questions about the effectiveness of U.S. domestic anti-money laundering and counter-terrorism financing regulatory, compliance, and enforcement efforts;

Whereas there are financial institutions and individuals employed therein which continue to engage in egregious violations of the Bank Secrecy Act and enter into deferred prosecution agreements and non-prosecution agreements rather than facing convictions and sentences corresponding to the severity of their violations;

Whereas effective anti-money laundering programs must emphasize sound corporate governance, including business-line accountability and clear lines of legal responsibility for individuals; and

Whereas anti-money laundering examinations in recent years at times failed to recognize the cumulative effect of the violations they cited, instead narrowly focusing their attention on individual banking units, thus permitting national banks to avoid and delay correcting problems, which allowed massive problems to occur before serious enforcement actions were taken: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) acknowledges that the lack of sunlight and transparency in financial transactions poses a threat to our national security and our economy's security;

(2) supports efforts to close loopholes that allow corruption, terrorism, and money laundering to infiltrate our country's financial system;

(3) encourages transparency to detect, deter, and interdict individuals, entities, and networks engaged in money laundering and other financial crimes;

(4) urges financial institutions to comply with the Bank Secrecy Act and anti-money laundering laws and regulations; and

(5) affirms that financial institutions and individuals should be held accountable for money laundering and terror financing crimes and violations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 206, a resolution I have introduced to inform the Congress and the American people about the persistent

money laundering loopholes and problems that continue to plague the American financial system.

I am pleased to bring this resolution to the floor in recognition of Sunshine Week. As part of Sunshine Week, the Financial Services Committee is shining a bright light on money laundering and discussing ways to strengthen our country's anti-money laundering and counterterrorism finance efforts.

Criminals like drug traffickers, human traffickers, fraudsters, kleptocrats, rogue governments, and other corrupt individuals and organizations know our financial system well and work hard to find ways to circumvent our anti-money laundering laws.

Congress has enacted numerous laws to improve the transparency of financial transactions that touch institutions in the United States and those on each end of a financial transaction. We have created reporting mechanisms, strengthened law enforcement and intelligence capacities, and promoted responsible, privacy-protecting information regimes to ensure that both the industry and the government have the tools needed to rid the economy of these illicit funds. However, there are still glaring problems and loopholes in our system that Congress must address.

The resolution that I have introduced highlights two significant loopholes that remain: the lack of transparency in, number one, the arts and antiquities industry and, number two, the real estate industry.

First, we know that ethnic and cultural artifacts are stolen and traded to garner funds for bad actors. According to the Antiquities Coalition: "The United States is the largest destination for archeological and ethnological objects from around the world." We know, too, that terror groups like ISIS have looted and sold these treasures to fund their operations, which the head of UNESCO, the United Nations' cultural heritage agency, said was worth millions of dollars and conducted on an "industrial scale." However, today, dealers in arts and antiquities are exempt from the Bank Secrecy Act, creating a huge loophole for bad actors to launder funds.

Second, the significance of the real estate loophole in the United States was acknowledged in 2017 by the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, FinCEN, when it issued Geographic Targeting Orders, GTOs, requiring limited ownership information to be disclosed and reported in some high-end real estate transactions. In fact, FinCEN has noted that "about 30 percent of the transactions covered by the GTOs involve a beneficial owner or purchaser representative that is also the subject of a previous suspicious activity report."

The movement of illicit funds throughout the global financial system raises numerous questions regarding the actors who are involved in these

money laundering schemes and where the money is going. This is precisely why the Financial Services Committee is investigating the questionable financing provided to President Trump and The Trump Organization by banks like Deutsche Bank to finance its real estate properties. The committee is also concerned that Trump-branded and managed condo buildings, for example, have taken millions from suspect Russians or individuals from former Soviet states through cash transactions, some well above the market value and many through shell companies.

Congress must close these loopholes, and financial institutions, including the biggest banks, also must do their part and fully comply with our BSA/AML laws. Although most do, we can continue to see not only failures in compliance, but also egregious acts where money laundering and terror finance are facilitated.

Further, many of our largest financial institutions have facilitated money laundering through our U.S. financial system from abroad. One scheme was carried out in Deutsche Bank's Moscow and London branches using mirror trading, in which corrupt traders in Russia managed to move \$10 billion in illicit funds out of Russia by buying blue chip stocks in rubles and selling them for U.S. dollars in London. Deutsche Bank was fined nearly \$630 million for allowing this mirror trading scheme to take place.

Another scheme involved Danske Bank, wherein \$230 billion in suspicious funds moved from Russia and other former Soviet states through one of Danske Bank's small Estonian branches to several U.S. financial institutions.

We also know that real estate is frequently used to launder dirty money. Bad actors like Russian oligarchs and kleptocrats often use anonymous shell companies and all-cash schemes to buy and sell commercial and residential real estate to hide and clean their money.

Today, these all-cash schemes are exempt from the Bank Secrecy Act. This must stop. In passing this resolution today, we also remind our colleagues in the banking industry of their responsibilities.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this resolution has benefited from the comments of the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. MCHENRY, and other members of the committee, and I thank them for their thoughtful consideration of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution that recognizes the need to close these loopholes and to urge financial institutions to comply with the law.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman WATERS of the House Financial Serv-

ices Committee for offering this resolution.

I rise in support of this resolution, and I look forward to working with the gentlewoman from California to incorporate its basic principles into future legislation produced by our committee to tackle the illicit drug trade, international financing that moves around the globe that is illicit in nature, as well as combating human trafficking and using the financial system to traffic in human beings, which I think is absolutely abhorrent.

This resolution reflects the Financial Services Committee's longstanding emphasis that we have on protecting our national security and ensuring the integrity of the financial system. The size and scope of that system, along with the preeminent role of the U.S. dollar in global trade, requires us to remain vigilant against illicit finance, money laundering, and other significant threats.

Already this Congress, the House has passed several of our committee's bills designed to identify new risks in illicit finance and to strengthen our banks' cooperation with law enforcement authorities. We are also looking forward to addressing a more comprehensive reform of processes under the Bank Secrecy Act in order to crack down on money laundering much more effectively.

We believe technology can be a great driver of those reforms and more efficiently and effectively enforce those laws. We are working together to achieve that bipartisan outcome and update to that very important piece of legislation. This, I think, represents a down payment, rhetorically, on that interest that we have of combating illicit finance wherever it may be.

I hope that we can continue to engage in a meaningful way in that bipartisan dialogue to achieve reforms to the Bank Secrecy Act, with the understanding it is important to safeguard our national security, while upholding a financial system that is open, transparent, and efficient and that is, in many ways, the envy of the rest of the world, without unduly burdening businesses in a manner that ends up turning away legitimate trade and commerce. Striking that balance is obviously that fine art that this Congress seeks to do, and we hope to do that well coming out of our committee.

Now, Republicans and Democrats should also be able to agree that these laws and regulations require us to strike a balance. That has to be a stated objective, and I am hopeful that the chairwoman will continue to work with us based on that principle. I am encouraged by that opportunity on the Bank Secrecy Act and Illicit Finance for us to tackle those items.

I thank the chairwoman for sponsoring this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), who is a senior member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important and timely resolution because, in recent years, the lack of sunlight and transparency in financial transactions and corporate formation has brought us to the forefront of the very dangerous role that dark money plays in our financial system.

Money laundering; loopholes in markets like real estate, the arts, and antiquities can be taken advantage of by criminals who facilitate their nefarious deeds. And, Mr. Speaker, according to the Financial Action Task Force, real estate alone accounted for one-third of all the criminal assets confiscated worldwide between 2011 and 2013, in that 3-year period.

Even more concerning, Mr. Speaker, is this: some of these transactions are conducted by anonymous shell companies who are exploiting loopholes in our financial system, creating a lack of transparency for who really is the beneficial owner of the assets.

This is very important, Mr. Speaker.

This critical resolution offered by my colleague and chairwoman, Ms. MAXINE WATERS, recognizes how important this issue is not only to the stability of our financial system but to the national security of our great Nation.

It urges that much more be done with these loopholes and lets us shine a bright light into the darkest corners of our financial system.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage my colleagues to support this resolution that will protect our financial system from abuse and corruption. I am hopeful that it will be unanimous, with all of our colleagues supporting this important resolution.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOODEN), my colleague and a new member of the House Financial Services Committee, for the purposes of a statement.

Mr. GOODEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 206, legislation that acknowledges the grave threat that terrorist organizations and international drug cartels pose to our Nation's financial system and economic system.

Introduced in the Financial Services Committee, this resolution reaffirms that the House of Representatives supports efforts currently under way in American and international financial institutions to identify bad actors and hold them accountable for their crimes.

The stakes couldn't be higher. Just as financial transparency has already helped us combat weapons of mass destruction, traffickers, corrupt foreign actors, and terrorist financiers, it also serves as a powerful weapon against organized criminal networks.

When criminals like El Chapo seek to exploit a complex and interconnected financial system, we must seek to untangle and bring clarity.

As we enhance financial transparency, we diminish a criminal's ability to commit crimes. In fact, I would consider this an important part of President Trump's efforts to secure our borders from those who are actively trying to infiltrate our country to finance drug trafficking and other criminal or terrorist activities.

Just as we need to build the wall at our southern border to keep out drug cartels and gangs, we need to be securing our economy from those who use the United States to conceal, launder, and move money generated from illegal activity.

Given the global nature of money laundering and terrorist financing, a secure national and multilateral framework is essential to the integrity of our financial system here at home.

Simply put, we should be doing all that we can to give financial institutions the tools they need to catch those who support the drug cartels that infiltrate our southern border or illegally engage in money laundering and terrorism financing.

For those reasons, I support this resolution and would like to thank the ranking member and Chairwoman WATERS for the time this afternoon.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), the chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the chorus of persons who are complimenting the chairwoman for many jobs well done. This, of course, is just another of the many wonderful things that she is doing to help people across the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I support H. Res. 206 because it addresses the launderability of money at the foundation of criminality.

When it comes to arts and antiquities, according to an Art Basel report by UBS, the United States remains the largest art market, valued at \$26.6 billion, and it accounts for 42 percent of the global total in 2017.

This means, of course, that the United States is likely to be the largest destination for stolen ethnic and cultural arts—black market, black market art, black market money. That is why we have to find a way to prevent the laundering of this money.

The United States of America should not allow ourselves to be the financier for those who perpetrate dastardly deeds in many countries around the world. An example might be Syria, where you have terrorists who will take stolen artifacts, find a way to put them into commerce, and use that money to support terrorist activities.

That is not what we are about. We must find a way to close the loopholes that allow persons in this country to

purchase these artifacts and allow that money to get back to those who would perform these dastardly deeds. I call them dastards. That is with a "D," dastards.

These dastards must be stopped. This resolution is a great step in the right direction to prevent the perpetration and perpetuation of this activity.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), a longtime member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership on this issue and also for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 206, a resolution that acknowledges the threat to our national security posed by loopholes in our financial transaction laws.

Today, our anti-money laundering and antiterrorism finance laws are dangerously outdated. Billions of dollars in bribes are paid around the world every year, and the amount of money laundered globally is estimated to be 2 to 5 percent of global GDP. Far too much of this cash flow comes through the United States financial institutions.

The international community agrees. The Financial Action Task Force—the global standard-setting body—has said that we have significant gaps in our security laws.

By passing this resolution, Congress can show it understands that illicit financing networks are the root and branch of any terrorist or criminal organization's operations.

We can also show that we understand by addressing those gaps and loopholes in our laws. We can move toward a safer society and a safer world.

Money laundering and other financial crimes support human trafficking, terrorism, and corruption around the world. These crimes endanger Americans every day, and we need to do more.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H. Res. 206. I want to thank the chairwoman, again, for her kindness.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to note for the House that the original draft of this resolution that was put forward and made public by committee Democrats was not one that committee Republicans had vetted. And, in that conversation, we had revised the text of this resolution.

So, out there today is the original text Chairwoman WATERS had offered. She undertook, through her staff and through my staff, and we worked out the changes, so the language here is something that should receive unanimous approval of the House of Representatives.

In fact, it states some very important things that we find important in

the House Financial Services Committee.

Now, if there is illicit financing and our laws are not detecting it, that is a problem, is it not? And we should address that problem, however it manifests itself.

And we have two examples here, using artwork and using real estate; but we also would use money in order to possess that artwork, that real estate. So we want to make sure that we are getting at that money, that flow, within our financial markets and getting at that.

There is bipartisan agreement, and the language here is not the original language Chairwoman WATERS offered and maybe, perhaps, the one that she would want to pass. But, in her effort at bipartisanship, she worked with committee Republicans, changed the resolution, and now before us we have a new resolution.

This new resolution should meet the approval of everyone in this House.

I want to state that very clearly. This is not a Democrat product. Actually, it is because Chairwoman WATERS did author it, but she was willing to hear our feedback on the Republican side. That is helpful.

What this would be is the fifth bill that we have passed out of the House Financial Services Committee that has received bipartisan support. That is a good sign. That is a good sign, in a broken Washington, that we can actually do some sensible things.

And outlined here, this resolution got out of, really, prescriptive positions that we are still negotiating on on this idea of beneficial ownership, which our colleague, Subcommittee Chair MALONEY, has been working on intensely, as have FRENCH HILL from Arkansas and BLAINE LUETKEMEYER from Missouri on the Republican side.

And they are still working through the contents of that, and we are still not in agreement. So we removed that language, and I think that is a very hopeful thing.

I didn't really want to get into the mechanics of how we came to this, but I think it is important for the House to note that that work has been done. Before us is a new resolution that should be able to meet the support of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to finish by saying this, that Chairwoman WATERS said she would work with us on this; she worked with us on this. I am grateful for that.

Recognizing that there are more Democrats than Republicans in the House, the gentlewoman could have passed this resolution if she saw fit, on a partisan basis, but she thought it was important to actually have a bipartisan outcome so we can have bipartisan legislating following this.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot describe how pleased I am working with Mr. MCHENRY and the way that he

has expressed to you in his presentation how we have worked together, and I thank him for that. I am very appreciative of that, and I will continue to work on those issues that the gentleman alluded to.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the chair of the Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this very important resolution.

For too long, criminals and terrorists have used our financial system to launder their dirty money and to hide all of their assets.

This issue is incredibly important to me because I have been working on legislation to crack down on anonymous shell companies for about 10 years, and Chairwoman WATERS has always been a strong supporter and is, in fact, an original cosponsor of my legislation.

So I want to highlight one particular passage from this resolution which talks about the pilot program that FinCEN conducted in 2016 where they collected beneficial ownership information in certain real estate transactions in Manhattan and Miami.

The findings from the pilot program were shocking. They found that about 30 percent of the transactions involved a beneficial owner that had previously been the subject of a suspicious activity report from a bank, which strongly suggests that criminals and other bad actors are using anonymous shell companies to launder or hide money.

Requiring companies to disclose their beneficial owners would provide transparency to law enforcement. It would also protect Americans from terrorism financing by cracking down on the ability of terrorists to get financing in our country. And it would also help financial institutions keep the bad actors out of the financial system.

That is why I have been working so hard to pass my beneficial ownership bill, and I look forward to continuing to work in a bipartisan way with Ranking Member MCHENRY and others to address this important issue.

I must say that this issue was brought to me by law enforcement, and they told me they will be tracking money that they think is terrorism financing. They hit an LLC; they cannot get any more information about who owns this real estate or company in our country. We have to stop that.

So I strongly urge support for the chairwoman's resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it as well and to support the bipartisan beneficial ownership bill which will shortly be on the floor.

□ 1330

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

I want to reiterate that what my colleague, Mrs. MALONEY, the chair of the

Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets outlined, outlined is an ongoing conversation we are having on her piece of legislation around beneficial ownership. We are still working through that process. I think the talks have been productive, but there is a lot of work to do. There is not quite consensus yet on how we achieve that right balance.

Notwithstanding that, you have to look at the contents of the resolution before us. I think this is, while not perfect—if I had drafted the resolution, I would have also included the international drug trade and human trafficking as two highly important areas that need our attention and focus as policymakers. But that is a sin of omission rather than commission.

I would also target a broader set of regimes. ISIS is targeted in this, and I think that is strong. We have bipartisan agreement that we have to fight this terrorism network and evil ideology that they have put upon the world, and how they act out in this, and we have to have a concerted effort, as Americans, in a bipartisan way, to fight them.

I would also add to that the regimes in China, Russia, and North Korea as other state actors that are doing really horrible things in terms of cyber threats, but also through money laundering—not just a regime, but there are a lot of regimes around the world.

So this is not a complete resolution, but I think it is worthy of our support. I think this is a first step in that longer conversation about modernizing the Bank Secrecy Act and making sure that we are targeting illicit financing.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this resolution, and I look forward to continuing the conversation with my Democratic colleagues on more bipartisan outcomes.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I include in the RECORD the following letter of general support for H. Res. 206 from the Fraternal Order of Police.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL
ORDER OF POLICE®

Washington, DC, March 13, 2019.

Hon. MAXINE M. WATERS,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. EMANUEL CLEAVER II,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Security,
International Development and Monetary
Policy, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. PATRICK T. MCHENRY,
Ranking Member, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. STEVEN E. STIVERS,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on National Security,
International Development and Monetary Policy, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM CHAIRMAN, MR. CHAIRMAN AND REPRESENTATIVES MCHENRY AND STIVERS: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our continued support for the collection of beneficial ownership information to

combat terrorist financing, money laundering and other criminal activities. We strongly agree with many of the points raised in H. Res 206 as they pertain to the collection of this information and we look forward to working with the Committee on Financial Services and the Subcommittee on National Security, International Development and Monetary Policy to address these issues, in the months ahead.

For years, the FOP has supported the collection of beneficial ownership information and we've been proud to partner with Representatives Carolyn B. Maloney (D-NY) and Peter T. King (R-NY) on legislation entitled the "Corporate Transparency Act." A discussion draft sharing that same title is being considered by the committee today and the FOP is once again prepared to support this important legislation.

Transnational criminal organizations and terrorist operations are using our banks, financial institutions and other means to profit from their illegal activity. This is a well-documented problem for our financial institutions and for law enforcement as we work together to shut down these sophisticated criminal enterprises.

Congress and this committee have played a leadership role in identifying the problem and working with law enforcement to develop legislation like the "Corporation Transparency Act." In addition, this Administration also agrees with this approach—last July U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Steven T. Mnuchin testified before this committee and stated that there is a real need to "have access to beneficial ownership information for law enforcement and for combating terrorist financing."

The Secretary's remarks were very clear that this is a pressing issue and the vulnerability of our financial institutions poses a genuine threat to public safety and national security. Under current laws, shell corporations may be used as front organizations by criminals conducting illegal activity such as money laundering, fraud, and tax evasion. Legislation like the "Corporation Transparency Act" and other measures identified in H. Res. 206, propose to combat this misuse of U.S. corporations by requiring the U.S. Department of the Treasury, specifically the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN), to collect beneficial ownership information for corporations and limited liability companies formed under State laws unless the State is already collecting this information. It is vital that such information, once collected, be available to law enforcement at every level—local, State, tribal and Federal—upon a lawful request. The sharing of this information will help speed the ability of law enforcement to investigate any possible connection between these corporations and terrorist funding.

All too often, investigations will hit a dead end when we encounter a company with hidden ownership. Just as robbers or burglars wear masks to hide their faces and make identifying them more difficult; the criminals we are chasing in these cases use shell corporations as masks, concealing themselves while still profiting from their crimes. When we are able to expose the link between shell companies and drug trafficking, corruption, organized crime and terrorist finance, law enforcement will be able to bring these criminals to justice and make our citizens and our nation safer.

We would also like to raise our concerns about proposals that would increase the monetary threshold for filing Currency Transaction Reports and Suspicious Activity Reports, thereby reducing the information law enforcement currently receives. It is not clear what policy or public safety aim such a change is intended to accomplish. Organized

criminal enterprises are already aware of the current thresholds and often take steps to avoid triggering these alerts and bringing scrutiny to their operations. Increasing these thresholds may negatively impact law enforcement and investigations into money laundering and other financial crimes.

On behalf of the more than 345,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I want to thank this committee for its leadership on this issue and most of all, for its willingness to engage and work with the law enforcement community on the collection of beneficial ownership information. By working together, I believe we can make our financial system and our nation safer from criminal and terrorist organizations. If I can provide any additional information on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me or my Executive Director, Jim Pasco, in my Washington office.

Sincerely,

CHUCK CANTERBURY,
National President.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, as we join together during this Sunshine Week to highlight the importance of transparency in our economy and our national security, and the preservation of our rule of law, we cannot ignore the insidious harm that is being done by institutions like Deutsche Bank, Danske Bank, and others that facilitate money laundering and financial crime.

Kleptocracy and corruption around the world and here at home, as the Trump family and its companies have proven, can only thrive with the cooperation or willful blindness from financial institutions that move, hide, and launder their ill-gotten money, money that can come in and out of the financial system through investments in real estate, art, and other luxury markets across America.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would agree that we need to close loopholes that allow criminals and terrorists to hide from sunlight and scrutiny, and I urge the House to support H. Res. 206, as amended.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 206, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Acknowledging that the lack of sunlight and transparency in financial transactions poses a threat to our national security and our economy's security and supporting efforts to close related loopholes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 24, EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE REPORT OF SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC AND TO CONGRESS, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 15, 2019, THROUGH MARCH 22, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 208) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24) expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress, and providing for proceedings during the period from March 15, 2019, through March 22, 2019, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 195, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—233

Adams	Delgado	Krishnamoorthi
Aguilar	Demings	Kuster (NH)
Allred	DeSaulnier	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	Españillat	Levin (MI)
Bonamici	Evans	Lewis
Boyle, Brendan	Finkenauer	Lieu, Ted
F.	Fletcher	Lipinski
Brindisi	Foster	Loebsack
Brown (MD)	Frankel	Loftgren
Brownley (CA)	Fudge	Lowenthal
Bustos	Gabbard	Lowe
Butterfield	Gallego	Lujan
Carbajal	Garamendi	Luria
Cárdenas	García (IL)	Lynch
Carson (IN)	García (TX)	Malinowski
Cartwright	Golden	Maloney,
Case	Gomez	Carolyn B.
Casten (IL)	Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Castor (FL)	Gottheimer	Matsui
Castro (TX)	Green (TX)	McAdams
Chu, Judy	Grijalva	McBath
Cicilline	Haaland	McCollum
Cisneros	Harder (CA)	McEachin
Clark (MA)	Hastings	McGovern
Clarke (NY)	Hayes	McNerney
Clay	Heck	Meeks
Cleaver	Higgins (NY)	Meng
Clyburn	Hill (CA)	Moore
Cohen	Himes	Morille
Connolly	Horn, Kendra S.	Moulton
Cooper	Horsford	Mucarsel-Powell
Correa	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 (IL)	Panetta
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Pappas
Davis, Danny K.	Khanna	Pascrell
Dean	Kildee	Payne
DeFazio	Kilmer	Perlmutter
DeGette	Kim	Peters
DeLauro	Kind	Peterson
DeBene	Kirkpatrick	Phillips

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

NAYS—195

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

NOT VOTING—3

Abraham	Mooney (WV)	Speier
---------	-------------	--------

□ 1359

Messrs. TAYLOR, COLLINS of Georgia, UPTON, YOUNG, CALVERT, and

Mrs. WAGNER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SPANBERGER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1146

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. CLAY Higgins of Louisiana be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1146.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. 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, 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. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule the born-alive bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

REMEMBERING LOUISE SLAUGHTER

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, a year ago this week, our country lost one of its greatest legislators, Congresswoman Louise Slaughter.

In her 33 years in Congress, Louise Slaughter never backed down from a righteous fight. Here is just one example of Congresswoman Slaughter's grit. When she arrived in Congress, every single clinical trial at the National Institutes of Health was aimed at White men, so Congresswoman Slaughter secured the first \$500 million of Federal funding for breast cancer research.

My father and I both had the privilege to serve alongside Congresswoman Slaughter. We knew her as a fierce champion for women and workers throughout the country. There was something disarming about her Kentucky drawl that really made you feel at home. She was a thoughtful leader who could cut bad ideas down with her wit and determination.

Every time I left her presence, I left with a smile. Congresswoman Slaughter was truly one of the best human beings I ever met in my life. Her lifetime of service to this Nation will be celebrated by the American people for decades.

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, a few minutes ago, I rose to call for a vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which requires any baby who survives an abortion to receive the same medical care that any baby born at the same age would receive. It requires the baby to then be transported to a hospital.

As a doctor, I strongly believe that every patient, especially these infants born alive, should be given appropriate medical care. This should not even be a question.

New York recently celebrated passing a law that removes protections from babies born alive after an abortion attempt. Other States also fail to protect abortion survivors.

Therefore, it is our duty, as Members of Congress, to defend the God-given right to life for every baby in this situation. It is our duty, as compassionate human beings, to ensure that these uniquely vulnerable babies receive the care that they deserve.

It is past time to vote on H.R. 962.

REMEMBERING LOUISE SLAUGHTER

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

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, today, I would like to speak about my dear friend, Congresswoman Louise Slaughter.

Louise was larger than life, a force of nature, and a trailblazer for women. She was an embodiment of her district's long history in the women's rights movement, going back to Susan B. Anthony and Frederick Douglass.

She would have been so proud to see the record number of women elected to Congress this year. She would have been an extraordinary mentor. She was the best retail politician I have ever known.

I have never served in this body with Louise, but, as a Cabinet member, I knew her well and joined her in her district eight times and had numerous phone calls over the years.

She held degrees in microbiology and public health. Her knowledge of health policy and her political smarts helped her shepherd critical legislation. Thanks to Louise, we have the Affordable Care Act, the Violence Against Women Act, and the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act, just to name a few.

She was the first chairwoman of the Rules Committee. I am proud to now serve on this committee. It is Louise's spirit that keeps all of us going through long Rules Committee meetings. We should all aspire to be the person she was, to tirelessly serve our constituents, the Constitution, and this country.

HONORING JOHN POPRIK

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life and the memory of a very special member of our Bucks County community, John Poprik, who our community recently lost.

Born in Philadelphia, John attended Father Judge High School and Drexel University, where he graduated in 1970 with a degree in accounting. He was a respected business executive, having served as the CFO of Better Material Corp. before becoming the CFO of Sommer Maid Creamery.

John was truly a dedicated man, dedicated to making our community a better place through public service. He served on the Water and Sewer Authority, the Bucks County Drug and Alcohol Commission, and the Pennsylvania Unemployment Compensation Board of Review.

More than anything, however, John was a dedicated family man. He spent some of his most treasured moments with his five grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I extend my deepest condolences to his beloved wife of 50 years, my dear friend, Pat Poprik, and their sons, Brad and Matt.

May John, a good, decent, and honorable man, enjoy the eternal reward for a life he spent serving others.

REMEMBERING LOUISE SLAUGHTER

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, 1 year ago, this body and our Nation lost one of its brightest lights with the passing of an extraordinary congresswoman and my dear friend, Louise Slaughter.

I first came to know Louise in the early 1980s when we served together in the New York State Assembly. We remained close until her passing on March 16, 2018. While I will always miss her presence, her legacy lives on in many, many ways.

It lives on in the renaming of the STOCK Act, an effort that I was proud to sponsor last Congress.

Louise's legacy lives on in the Fairport post office, renamed after Louise and her husband, Bob, a fitting tribute to a loving couple. I thank my colleague, JOE MORELLE, for making that happen.

Her legacy lives in the Rochester train station, named after Louise after years of her advocacy and determination to make it an improved destination and a special place of connection.

Most importantly, her legacy lives in the freshman class of this United States House of Representatives. Louise used to represent Seneca Falls and was proud of the women's rights movement that had its strongest, deepest roots in upstate New York.

This year, more than 100 women serve in this body for the first time in American history. Of course, if Louise were here, she would surely remind us that 100 is much less than half of 435 and that our work was far from over.

Madam Speaker, to my friend, Louise, our thoughts and prayers are with her as we mark 1 year since her passing. Today, we celebrate an incredible legacy, a legacy that is alive and burning bright with hope.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate The American Legion on its centennial anniversary.

On Friday, March 15, The American Legion will celebrate 100 years since it was formed in Paris, France, after World War I. More than 1,000 people gathered for The American Legion's first caucus at the American Club in Paris on March 15, 1919.

Since then, The American Legion has grown to be the Nation's largest wartime veterans service organization, boasting more than 2 million members and 13,000 posts across all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, France, Mexico, and the Philippines.

Its dedication to veterans, service-members, and their families extends from local community programs to State and Federal policy initiatives, including the establishment of the Veterans Administration in 1930 and the GI Bill in 1944. Hundreds of local American Legion programs and activities strengthen the Nation one community at a time.

Madam Speaker, I thank The American Legion for its service and wish its members a happy 100th birthday this Friday.

HONORING DONALD HERBERT EATON, JR.

(Mr. ESPAILLAT asked and was given permission to address the House

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, New York suffered a heartbreaking loss with the passing of Donald Herbert Eaton, Jr., a Harlem native, a Korean war veteran, and an accomplished community activist.

His life was marked by selflessness and perseverance, common threads that guided him to serve his community and his Nation.

He was raised in a tough environment. Discrimination was at its peak. Yet, when his Nation called on him, he went to war and served honorably as a member of the 369th "Harlem Hellfighters" Infantry Regiment.

Upon his return, Eaton's longstanding commitment to service led him to spend 20 years leading efforts to help those in need: veterans, seniors, and the underprivileged.

Madam Speaker, may he rest in peace and may God comfort his children, Donald Eaton III and Geoffrey Eaton, Sr., and his two grandchildren, Geoffrey Eric Eaton, Jr., and Geoffrey S. Eaton III.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, celebrated each March, Women's History Month serves as a time to honor and recognize the momentous achievement of women who have continued to shape the United States today.

What began as a week-long celebration in 1981 is now a month-long celebration starting in 1995.

This year, I am especially proud to highlight a group of women making history right now in Texas' Third Congressional District. Collin County, Texas, has 11 State district courts with 11 presiding judges, and 7 county courts at law with 7 presiding judges.

In 2017, an addition of a new judge brought the total number of female judges serving on district courts to six, meaning that, for the first time in history, a majority of the court seats are now held by women. But just this year, with the election of another woman in Texas' 219th district court, there are now seven women serving on the county's district benches. Making this accomplishment even more remarkable, just 12 years ago, there was only one female judge on the county's benches.

While only 33 percent of the judges throughout the United States are women, Collin County is leading the way with 64 percent of the district court judge benches held by women judges.

I salute Judge Corinne Mason, Judge Angela Tucker, Judge Jennifer Edgeworth, Judge Andrea Thompson, Judge Cynthia Wheless, Judge Jill Willis, Judge Piper McCraw, and Judge Emily Miskel.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S BUDGET

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the Trump administration released what has to be the cruelest and most irresponsible proposed budget in our Nation's 243-year history.

The Trump budget adds trillions of dollars to our national debt. The Trump budget cuts \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid, \$845 billion from Medicare, and \$26 billion from Social Security. Meanwhile, it cuts over 90 percent of the funding for freshwater in the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.

We are not going to be able to combat deadly algal blooms in Lake Erie. We are not going to be able to contain invasive species like the Asian carp. We are not going to be able to restore the Great Lakes and its environmental integrity.

The President promised he would never cut Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid, yet he has done exactly that. His proposed budget adds trillions to the national debt while also undermining the financial pillars of Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid.

Madam Speaker, budgets are a reflection of our values, and President Trump's values are clearly with the 1 percent. He is out of step with the majority of the American people and, surely, those living in northern Ohio.

□ 1415

REMEMBERING LOUISE
SLAUGHTER

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

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in paying tribute to my dear friend and predecessor, Louise Slaughter.

As evidenced by the many laudatory statements being made today, Louise's contributions to this institution were immeasurable. Louise left a remarkable legacy:

The only woman to chair the Rules Committee;

A stalwart for women and children;

A leader who was instrumental in passing landmark healthcare legislation.

But what I remember most about Louise and what was at the heart of all her accomplishments is how much she cared for her friends and for her community.

Louise was my dear friend not only on the best of days, like when she encouraged me to run for my first elective office or celebrated with me when I was chosen to be the majority leader of the New York State Assembly, but also on the most difficult of days.

When my daughter Lauren passed away, Louise was there that afternoon spending hours at my house with our family. That is just who she was.

She had one of the biggest hearts of anyone I know. I am better for having known her, and I know that our entire country is better for her many years of dedicated service.

May you rest in peace, Louise Slaughter.

REMEMBERING LOUISE
SLAUGHTER

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

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues to honor my friend and colleague, Congresswoman Louise Slaughter.

It is inconceivable to me that it has been 1 year since the passing of this force of nature. I am consoled by knowing that her legacy lives on in this Chamber.

The brilliant former chair of the powerful Rules Committee was sharp-tongued, sharp-witted, and sharp-eyed.

Everyone who knew her was made better by her presence.

Anyone who came up against her in an argument knew they were facing a steel backbone, but her disarming sense of humor and southern drawl were irresistible.

She even taught me how to speak Southern. "Bless your sweet heart" doesn't mean bless your sweet heart.

Congresswoman Slaughter knew fake when she saw it and was not afraid to call it out. She knew truth when she saw it and stood strong in its defense.

It is in her honor that we must continue to fight for this democracy that she never gave up on, and I hope that we will consider naming the Rules Committee room in her honor.

There are many people I like in our Chamber; few, I truly love. I loved Louise Slaughter.

REMEMBERING LOUISE
SLAUGHTER

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

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, a year ago we said good-bye to Louise Slaughter, our dear, dear, friend.

Louise Slaughter was a titan of Congress. She was unforgettable.

When I first joined the Rules Committee after getting elected, I was immediately drawn to Louise. Louise took me under her wing. She even made fun of people that I thought were really wonderful, and she laughed because she knew we shared a joke.

Honestly, Louise was somebody who even made the late hours in the Rules Committee fun, too, with her wittiness and her intellect and the fact that, beneath it all, she absolutely loved serving in this wonderful House.

Louise lived in perfect balance. She was charming, yet intense; witty, yet resolute.

After spending time with Louise, you knew her heart was with the people of

western New York, and you knew she wasn't going to back down from her beliefs.

She loved her family. She loved her district as if they were her family, also. And we loved Louise because she loved everyone and gave support.

We miss you, Louise.

REMEMBERING LOUISE
SLAUGHTER

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

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Speaker, I first met Louise Slaughter 32 years ago during our freshman orientation. From the first day, she stood out.

Louise was an unbelievable, kind, beautiful person. She was a born leader who was thoughtful, mindful, and she didn't take any stuff.

I loved Louise. She called me Brother John, and I called her Sister Louise.

We miss Louise.

I can see her standing up on this floor now speaking truth to power. She never gave up; she never gave in; she kept her faith; and she kept her eyes on the prize.

Madam Speaker, I thank Louise for her service, and I know she is with her beloved Bob.

REMEMBERING LOUISE
SLAUGHTER

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

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I am so blessed to have known Louise McIntosh Slaughter, and I am so pleased to speak on her behalf today.

Louise was a legislator, with a capital L, and she lived up to the legacy of the ladies of New York. She represented Seneca Falls, and not only because it was her district, but she represented it in terms of her sentiments.

She was the sponsor of the Violence Against Women Act. She was the head of the Pro-Choice Caucus. She focused on medical research for women.

She was a thought leader. Consistent with her training in chemistry, she fought to decrease the amount of antibiotics, eliminate antibiotics in animals for consumption. She led on the issues of getting rid of lead, and, also, she really understood chemistry.

The first time she saw Bob Slaughter, she said, "I have just got to have him," and she went and got him.

She was a bridge to leadership. These freshmen would have really, really enjoyed being around the head of the Rules Committee, their bridge to the leadership.

And let me tell you, I loved her because she really knew how to make people happy. Madam Speaker, she gave me an orange purse because she thought that orange was a happy color and that I deserved to be surrounded by it.

REMEMBERING LOUISE
SLAUGHTER

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, it is fitting that we are honoring Congresswoman Slaughter during Women's History Month because her legacy is planted firmly in the history books.

She wasn't the daughter of wealth or privilege, but she traveled from the coalfields of Kentucky to become the first woman ever to chair the House Rules Committee.

Louise's 30 years of service here embodied what it means to be a public servant: writing the STOCK Act and the Genetic Information Non-discrimination Act, shepherding through the Affordable Care Act. I could go on and on.

There was no special interest too influential for her to take on, no politician too powerful.

Many of us saw her determination firsthand, whether we were with her on an issue or especially if we were on the opposite side. We are all better for it. This Chamber and this country are better for it.

I am proud to have worked alongside her. I am glad that she will be joining so many pioneering women in the National Women's Hall of Fame this year.

Madam Speaker, and on behalf of all the Members of this Chamber and on behalf of her staff, especially in the Rules Committee, let me just say we loved her, and we miss her a lot.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST ME-
MORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 2302, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council:

Mr. ZELDIN, New York
Mr. KUSTOFF, Tennessee

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO
BRITISH-AMERICAN INTER-
PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Member on the part of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. HOLDEN, North Carolina

FIVE PILLARS OF WHAT WE
BELIEVE SAVES US

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, what we are going to do right now is, and we are going to hopefully only take about a half an hour, actually walk through sort of the continuing theme of how at least our math—and particularly in our office, we have been trying to put together sort of a unified theory of how do we deal with the reality of what is happening in our country with our demographics. We are getting older much faster, and our birth-rate has fallen dramatically.

Repeatedly, we have come up here with other boards that basically show, over the next 30 years, the greatest threat to our economy, to our society, to our country's priorities, is the fact that our interest, Social Security, Medicare, healthcare entitlement costs consume everything. The rest of the budget is functionally imbalanced.

I know this is uncomfortable because it is one of those things that is hard for us to talk about. It is not Republican or Democratic. It is demographics. It is math.

Part of that baseline, to understand 2008 to 2028, take those 20 years, 91 percent of the spending increase here in Washington, if you remove interest, 91 percent of the spending increase is—actually, I think it does include interest—interest, Social Security, healthcare entitlements.

We need to understand the basic math. And now, how do you actually deal with it?

How do you maximize economic growth?

How do you maximize labor force participation?

How do you encourage people, if we built the incentives, to actually stay in the labor force longer?

How do you actually embrace technology, particularly disruptive technology that crashes the prices and makes our society healthier and more efficient?

And then, how do we have an honest conversation of those earned benefits and build them so they have incentives in there that, if you are fit and healthy and happy, you are willing to stay in the labor force longer? Are there certain spiffs and benefits we can design into these?

So those are sort of our five pillars.

Today, we are going to do something that is fun.

We just grabbed a handful of concepts that are about technology, and the tough part—when you start talking about disruptive technology—it makes you sort of giddy for what the future is and the opportunities.

But there is this thing we call incumbency, particularly in economics—incumbency: the incumbent business; the incumbent medical provider; the incumbent over here.

These technologies are going to be a real challenge.

□ 1430

The running joke in our office is how many of us went to Blockbuster Video

last weekend. We sort of woke up one night and all decided to go home and hit a button called HBO Go, Netflix, those things. We no longer stood in line and got movie suggestions and went home with a little shiny disc.

We are going to walk through, first, some of the healthcare IT and why this is so important. I want you to first think about some of the technologies that are starting to roll out.

If you got to take home or had in the back of the office or we had on the back of the floor here something that looked like a gigantic kazoo that you could blow into and it told you whether you had the flu or whether you had a bacterial infection and, instantly, it could ping your medical records that you are carrying around both on your phone or in the cloud and instantly order your antivirals and they were delivered to your house, did we just crash parts of the price of healthcare? Of course we did.

Did we just make a lot of incumbent businesses? We are challenging part of their business model because you used this technology instead of going to the urgent care center or going to the emergency room or going to the hospital or even going to the pharmacy. But we have to be willing to think about these things. These types of technologies are rolling out all around us.

An Israeli company—the picture over in the far corner—actually has, and I guess it is being certified all across Europe right now, a desktop blood test that actually does a whole plethora of different blood tests with just a few drops. Remember, we talked about this 10 years ago. It turns out the technology now actually exists.

In a couple of blog posts, even the concept of going into an autonomous healthcare center—and we actually have about 10 of these up in the Phoenix area where you go in and sign up on an iPad. You take a picture of your driver's license and a picture of your insurance card.

You go into a booth alone. You put your arm in this thing. It does blood pressure and does a number of readings. You pick up this particular tool, and an avatar on the screen says: Can you shine this down your throat? Can you bend? Can you turn? Now do your ears, your eyes. It actually does algorithmic healthcare.

What if that few-drop blood test—actually, as a couple of blog posts talked about, you put your hand on something and it pricks your finger. It takes the blood test right there, and before you walk out the door, 5 minutes later, it is giving you a full blood workup.

What did you just do using technology to disrupt parts of healthcare costs?

These things are real. They are rolling out right now. There are amazing technologies in almost everything you can think of. But we are going to have to think about both the ecosystem and the complications of how it is paid

for—are these things that Medicare, Medicaid, and other insurers will pay for?—and how we do it.

Also, the data. What happens in a society where you are now going to be walking around with certain wearables?

You have the fancy watch that helps you manage your hypertension, the patch that does your blood oxygen, the port that helps you actually manage your blood sugar. There is lots of data coming off of those wearables. We, in our office, call them digiceuticals. How does that all tie into the rest of the ecosystem?

And that data, how do you actually get that data so a doctor or the algorithm can see, when you open your pill bottle—because the pill bottle has a sensor in it, we know when you took your pill, and 15 minutes later we see this on your EKG that is coming from your watch, we see this reaction, can that data become incredibly usable? Can that data be blinded from your own personal information and help all of society get healthier because we gained more data in those algorithms?

This is cutting edge, but it is not utopianism. We actually have those things right now today.

If you start to think about it, you can actually go to Amazon, or I am sure others online, and see that it exists today. For under a couple of thousand dollars, you can buy a handheld ultrasound. Think about that.

Apparently, there are other versions, faster, better, even ones coming in the future where the algorithm will actually read the ultrasound. You hold it up on your iPhone, and as you are using this handheld ultrasound to look at the picture, the algorithm is also going to help you interpret it.

What did an ultrasound system cost a few years ago? You can buy this online today. It exists, and we are doing experiments with it right now in a VA, I believe, just right here in Maryland. Apparently, they are having terrific outcomes because the doctor can walk up and check something.

These technologies exist. How do we start to have these technologies start to disrupt the price of healthcare? Because to be absolutely intellectually honest, if you actually look at the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, or Republican alternatives, we have spent a couple of decades in this body having a debate on who pays, not how to disrupt.

With the ACA, we are going to have government pay a lot more. Over here, in our version, we are going to try to create incentives to have individuals actually get market competition.

They have been debates on paying. We have almost never stepped up and said: What are our barriers at the State level? What are our barriers at the regulatory level? What are the barriers at the HHS levels that actually prevent the adoption of disruptive technologies?

These things do exist today. We need to actually embrace the concept of

rapid disruptive adoption of these technologies because, remember our five pillars, if we do not have a disruption in the cost of healthcare as we are getting older very quickly as a society, remember, in only 9 years, we have two workers for every one person in retirement.

In 9 years, if you pull interest out, half the spending here coming out of Washington, D.C., will be to those 65 and older, and it is, substantially, healthcare.

We all carry around these smartphones. Should our health records be on those? Of course they should be, because they should be portable with us because health data, health records are going to become something dramatically different than the record that is sitting there at the hospital. It is going to be living.

How many of you ever use something like Waze or a crowdsourcing on your phone? You are going to be having these things on your body, or the pill bottle that knows when you opened it. That data should be living with you so you are constantly managing.

There is a debate going on with those folks who build these algorithms. The fact that you had a surgery 7 years ago that is sitting on your health record or the health data that is coming off your wearables from the last 48 hours, which one is actually more valuable to your healthcare? The living data has incredible value in keeping you healthy. We need to find a way to embrace this and build this ecosystem.

This next one I put up, even though there are a dozen, we are going to show a couple of versions of this just for the fun of it. Think about the debates we are having here in Washington, D.C., and for those of us on the Ways and Means Committee in regard to drug pricing.

We need to fix many of the incentives. We need to actually deal with the fact that some of the games that are played on patents and other things—okay. That is an honest debate. But understand, the data says that half the pharmaceuticals that will be picked up at pharmacies today or delivered in the mail today, half of them will either not be used or will not be used properly.

Think about that just conceptually. Half of the pharmaceuticals that will be taken home today aren't going to be used properly. Is there a data solution?

We have everything from just the pill bottle top that lets us know that you opened it and when it opened and would tag your healthcare record, hopefully, be portable with you on your phone so we know that you actually took it, to actually, now, for those who may be on the severely mentally ill side who have certain maintenance medications that are providing miracles—they actually have a super small tiny chip that is actually in the pill itself that we can actually read that we know you are digesting it, that we know you took your meds.

Think about it. We need to embrace these types of technologies, even down to this type of pill dispenser for someone who may have a little more complicated issue where they take some of their pharmaceuticals either at multiple times during the day or they have certain complications.

Here is one that was shown at the Consumer Electronics Show in Las Vegas about 6 weeks ago. You put your cup under it and it automatically dispenses at a certain time and tells us what pharmaceuticals were delivered to you. It is technology dealing with the fact that we have documented that half the pharmaceuticals aren't properly used or used at all.

It turns out the data that will flow off of these things actually will help us. When you have a wisdom tooth taken out, do you really need 30 pills or do you need 3? It turns out, the data from this may actually help us dramatically change the way we do prescriptions in the first place.

So I am making the argument, it turns out that data and technology are also one of the solutions as we talk about pharmaceutical pricing.

Now we are actually going to move on to something else we, as a body—and this is going to take my brothers and sisters on the Democratic side and Republican side. We need to have a very, hopefully, math-based, honest conversation about how we are going to finance miracles that are coming, and some of them are going to be here before the end of this year.

We just put up this slide as part of the thought experiment. In America, we have about 8,000 Americans who have hemophilia A. The price range, we have actually found some documents that say the blood clotting factors and those things may be a half million dollars a year to keep that American stable.

What happens this November or December—which we are actually very hopeful is about to happen—when a single shot cures hemophilia A? How do we pay for it? What are we willing to pay for it? How do you value that in society? It is a single shot of a very small population so it is not like the next day there is going to be a competitor drug in the pipeline like we had with other drugs. In this case, it is a single-shot cure.

But we actually know that over 50 percent of all of our healthcare expense is to 5 percent of our brothers and sisters who have chronic conditions. What happens when we start having miracle drugs like a genomic biological like this that is curing diseases that are part of our brothers and sisters, that 5 percent who actually have the chronic conditions that consume over half of our healthcare dollars?

We are actually, as an office, proposing ideas of a type of healthcare bond so you can actually finance the adoption of the distribution of these disruptive, revolutionary drugs and then pay for it using some of what

would have been the future costs, pull those forward so you get the disruption of the future savings.

These individuals are out of that chronic condition, but we are going to have to have a very tricky conversation. How do you price it? What is the value of a pharmaceutical that is functionally a miracle that cures something like hemophilia A? How do you price it? There is only going to be one producer of it, would be my guess, because there is such a small population. There are only 8,000 Americans with hemophilia A. Is it worth \$1.5 million an injection?

There is actually a math way to get there dealing with the reality of this is a population that costs us a quarter of a million dollars a year to keep them healthy, and this is the life expectancy. What was the research cost, because we want these miracle drugs as part of our society to help us have that disruption as part of the holistic theory of technology, these new miracle drugs that are coming, to disrupt the future healthcare costs.

Now, I want you to take this concept a bit further and spread it beyond healthcare. Think of some of the crazy debates we have actually had here on the floor in regards to—forgive me—environment. I want to argue with you that there is a technology disruption that can make our environment cleaner but we don't actually hurt the economy. We can actually help it grow.

So here is my first thought experiment. This has been a fixation of mine for a few years here.

Think of the community you live in. What if tomorrow, instead of today's current model—you want to open up a paint shop or you want to open up a bakery or this and that. You go out and fill out forms. You send them down to the local environmental regulator. You may also file them with the State. If you are doing certain types of volatile organics, you may have to file with the EPA. You are basically filling up file cabinets. Do filled-up file cabinets make the environment, the air quality in your community cleaner?

□ 1445

It is an honest concept because we functionally have a 1938 regulatory model of file—lots and lots of paper—maybe even do quarterly audits, maybe annual audits, fill out more paper, and fill up file cabinets full of paper that functionally a lawyer gets to come and look at a couple years later.

Does that make the environment in your community cleaner?

What would happen if you had a few hundred or a few thousand people traveling around in your community that actually just had the little sensor traveling with them that they were collecting data on hydrocarbons, on volatile organics, and on ozone, and you could actually see the map of your community? If all of a sudden you had a hot spot over here because you find out you have clowns painting cars in

the backyard of their house, you would know about it instantly, and the environmental regulator, instead of putting paper in file cabinets, they would get in, hopefully, their electric vehicle, and go over and actually stop the clowns from painting cars in their backyard.

Which made the environment cleaner?

The trade-off here is actually very elegant because I don't need you to file lots of paperwork. I don't need you to actually be doing quarterlies and annuals because if you screw up, we catch you instantly.

What made the economy grow, what reduced the bureaucratic burden in our society, and what actually made our communities healthier and cleaner?

It is just technology.

Mr. GAETZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

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

With all due respect to the gentleman from Arizona, he is very weird in that he runs his congressional office like a think tank where people contemplate the ways that technology can improve healthcare and the environment in a nonpartisan way, because these are not issues that have anything to do with whether someone is a Republican or a Democrat.

But so many of these ideas that the gentleman and I have discussed for years fail to make their way into the most dynamic economy and marketplace in the world, which is the United States of America.

So my question for the gentleman is: How do we go from the innovative space of great Americans coming up with sensor technology to action in the Congress or within our government that is worthy of the great people we serve?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Will the gentleman enter into a colloquy?

Mr. GAETZ. I will.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. The gentleman is one of my buddies from Florida. He actually gets this, but he also knows I actually love the technology disruptions, because none of us has figured out if it is Republican or Democrat yet, which actually makes it possible for us to do it. Now, eventually, we will break it into partisan because everything has become weaponized and partisan around this body.

But, right now, think of this: this is a natural gas electric facility. It can power 5,000 homes. It is up and running outside Houston. It doesn't have a smokestack. All the ACO₂, so all the carbon is captured. They actually came up with this brilliant technology that the carbon actually flows through. My understanding of the engineering is it helps spin the turbines, and then the excess carbon that is generated is safe and sold.

We actually have a tax credit that we adjusted that hopefully made it more

robust as we did tax reform that if you want to take some of that carbon you can put it in concrete, or a piece of plastic, or do it for certain types of oil recovery.

Mr. GAETZ. Was it a refundable tax credit or was it an upfront credit?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. It is actually a tax credit according to the amount of tonnage you produce of ACO₂.

Mr. GAETZ. So it is a production tax credit?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Yes. But the beauty of it is that model has said that we have actually already created a value on this carbon, and if you don't put it into the environment but actually use it for other things as a filler in plastics, as a filler in concrete, in putting it back in to the ground to enhance recovery, we are already doing it. This technology isn't utopianism, it exists. It is already running.

How many times around here have we talked about that we can actually have a hydrocarbon generation without a smokestack?

The technology exists. If we are going to talk about a green agenda, then we actually all need to sit down and actually meet with the really smart researchers and scientists and actually understand the math and science. That science is way ahead of where our heads are.

The gentleman from Florida has some amazing technologies coming out of his State right now on everything from biogeneration to the ways to manage the environment.

Mr. GAETZ. I would ask the gentleman, as we try to take these good ideas that seem to not be emerging from the Federal Government but from several States and from local communities that are doing some of their own great work, I feel at times like you have got one party here that thinks that Big Government is always the answer, and you have another party who thinks that big business is always the answer, and at times these technological solutions come from neither. They come from the creative class, the innovative class.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. That is actually a brilliant way to phrase it.

My continuing thought experiment, and this is a little beyond where we were going, but it makes the point, visit Washington, D.C., or a bunch of other locations now. They are not going to give you a straw or they are going to give you a paper straw.

The math is—and this actually, I believe, comes from the United Nations—90 percent of all the plastic in the ocean—and, look, it is a big deal. I am looking at my data here, roughly 8 million tons a year of plastic goes in to the ocean. The gentleman is from a coastal State—comes from 10 rivers, eight of them in Asia, two of them in Africa.

If you actually really cared about plastic in the ocean, that 8 million tons, we would actually take our environmental policy, our trade policy, and

our foreign aid policy and say that we are going to actually help these 10 rivers that are responsible for 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean and work on those. But instead we do these feel-good, absurd, theatrical things of “my community isn’t going to do straws, don’t we feel better that we did something for plastic in the ocean?”

It had nothing to do with plastic in the ocean. It is these 10 rivers. Let’s grow up and stop the political theater.

Mr. GAETZ. So what is the get-out-of-jail-free card so that we can liberate ourselves from a policymaking climate that seems to be more robust in virtue signaling than in actually following data?

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I knew you were going to say virtue signaling.

This is a little bit sarcastic, and I mean it to be slightly on the humor side, one of the first things every Member of Congress should put into their budgets is the ownership of a calculator, because we functionally work in a math-free zone where our feelings become public policy instead of the baseline data where we can actually have an impact of making our society and the world healthier and more economically prosperous. If you actually, genuinely cared about plastic in the ocean, we have 10 rivers, 90 percent of the plastic, we know exactly where they are; focus there, instead of the absurdity of the straw at your local whatever.

Mr. GAETZ. I appreciate the gentleman mentioning our oceans. As someone from a coastal State that means a great deal to me.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Coming from Arizona we have sort of this utopian view that one day Arizona may become a coastal State.

Mr. GAETZ. Based on the current rate of climate change you may get your wish.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Or an earthquake.

Mr. GAETZ. It doesn’t strike me as an enviable outcome. I do thank the gentleman again for yielding for this discussion.

It is my sincere hope that this is a discussion that we can have with Members of Congress from urban districts, rural districts, liberal Members, and conservative Members, because as the gentleman correctly points out, these are actually solutions that do not lend themselves to a partisan tilt.

I am sincerely hopeful that the gentleman will continue to lead on this subject, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. You are very kind, and I thank you for the colloquy.

Look, many of us just want to solve the problems. I have the best little girl in the world sitting in the back right now. She is 3 years old.

What does her future get to be like? We have a demographic crisis. It is just math. We are getting older very quickly. If we don’t grow the economy, if we don’t have lots of labor force participation, and if we don’t use trade

and tax policy and innovation, we need these things to grow.

But instead, Madam Speaker, if you listen to the speeches that often end up behind these microphones, it is an absurdity that is partisan because we care about power more than actually doing those things that are so important for our future of this society.

So I want to give you one last, ultimate thought experiment. I am still just stunned this article hasn’t gotten more coverage around the country, but it is going to require many of us to actually deal with some of our political constituencies that have lots of folklore built into their belief systems.

About 6 weeks ago, an article came out. University of Illinois U.S. Agricultural Research Service published a paper saying—now, you all remember your high school or your first botany class or when you were actually learning about cell biology—there is actually a weird inefficiency in plant cells on how they grab a carbon molecule or oxygen molecule—we won’t geek out too much—but they found a way through a bit of genetic engineering to make the cell wall superefficient.

They basically believe that they have broken the Holy Grail that plants, commodity crops—right now they did it on tobacco plants, because the reason they do research on tobacco plants is we have known the genome of tobacco plants for quite a while now—40 percent increase in efficiency.

We have got to think this through. Now, there is a really disruptive side of that. Forty percent, tomorrow if you could plant a corn seed or wheat or something else, and it had 40 percent more yield, what does that mean to feeding the world 50 years from now?

Yay.

What does that mean to commodity prices?

Scary.

But you need functionally now 40 percent less land, 40 percent less water, 40 percent less fuel, and we actually have some data here from the IPCC 2014 report which is from the United Nations that just a little under one-quarter of all the human emissions, functionally greenhouse gases, come from agriculture.

If you do the math—think about this—this 40 percent increase in yield for agriculture would functionally equal removing every car off the face of the Earth.

Think about the conversations we have here talking about the environment. Here is a miracle. And the reality we know from other disruptions in seeds that it can be rolled into society very quickly as these new seed stocks, except we are going to have to deal with our brothers and sisters saying: well, that is a genetically modified seed.

Yes, but it has this amazing disruption in the world. If you truly care about greenhouse gases, if that is your fixation, just moving to this new disruptive technology that I hope is real,

I hope the research continues to demonstrate a 40 percent production increase, this here could be the fastest, biggest disruption in greenhouse gases in the world because you could actually adopt these seed crops within just a few years.

That is an example of technology not just bringing a small improvement or even a disruption, in many ways it is a major disruption, but you have to deal with the politics of belief systems. It is genetically modified, but it is not a genetically modified seed stock to deal with pests or this and that, they just dealt with the inefficiency of the cell wall. It is a miracle. If it is true, it is a miracle. Think about it, though, but understand the disruptions that are going to roll through our society.

What happens to the value of agricultural land?

What happens to the ability of nations to ultimately feed themselves if all of a sudden they had a 40 percent increase in productivity?

But also what happens in our world if I come to you right now, Madam Speaker, and say that agriculture produces functionally, by my math, a bit more than 2½ times the amount of emissions of every car on the Earth?

So this technology would be as if you just removed every car off the Earth.

How come we don’t have these types of conversations here on the floor?

It is because it doesn’t fit our political folklore model of what has become just a stunningly partisan gotcha weaponized body.

As we go through our five pillars for the future one more time, the reason for the fixation on this, we have 74 million of our brothers and sisters who are baby boomers, the last baby boomer hits 65 in 9 years, many of the things we should have done we should have done a decade or two decades ago, and we didn’t have the political appetite. We have to deal with the reality that we have this population bubble that is getting older and our birthrates have substantially collapsed.

If we are going to keep our promises to those folks who have worked their entire lives who will be moving into their benefit years, we have to think disruptively. We have to be willing to do everything from tax policy, trade policy, and regulatory policy that we have talked about here using technology, to labor force participation, encouraging people all up and down the spectrum to actually enter the labor force.

We have to be willing to talk about redesigning some of the programs to incentivize, if you wish to work, you get to work. We are going to have to actually also embrace the miracle of these disruptive technologies and not be scared of them.

But this body is going to also have to deal with something that is very difficult for a political body, and that is a lot of our friends are going to either have to change their economic models and a lot of our States are going to

have to change their regulatory models just as we will. But it is these disruptions that give us the economic robustness to actually keep our promises over the next 30 years.

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

□ 1500

MEDICARE FOR ALL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the Special Order today.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I am honored to co-chair this Special Order for the Congressional Progressive Caucus with my amazing colleague from California, KATIE PORTER.

This is a privilege for me to be able to work with so many of my colleagues on the issues that they are very passionate about, from healthcare to environmental justice to LGBTQ rights. It has been an honor to lead this and to be part of this.

Today, we are talking about an important, important issue to one of my colleagues whom I have known for over 15 years as a community organizer and, later, as an immigration rights attorney working on civil rights issues. It is an honor to introduce my colleague from the State of Washington, the leader on healthcare for all, our wonderful, great colleague, Representative PRAMILA JAYAPAL.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, let me say how pleased I am to be with Ms. TLAIB today, leading the Special Order hour, and, Madam Speaker, how pleased I am to see you at the podium.

This is a fantastic group of individuals who have joined us here in Congress, and I couldn't be prouder to serve with both of you and with others who are here as well.

The topic of this Special Order hour is so important. It has been important to me, of course, but also to Members of Congress in general and to communities across the country, and that is the topic of healthcare.

I wanted to break this down a little bit, in terms of where we are on this issue for people who are watching, because this is one of the beauties of the Special Order hour, that we get to talk about the issues that matter; we get to explain things; and we get to put forward our proposals and our ideas.

I am so proud to say that, on February 27, I and my colleague, Representative DEBBIE DINGELL, introduced the Medicare for All Act of 2019, and we had 107 original cosponsors. Those are the folks who sign on right as it is getting introduced.

Of course, a bill gets introduced, and we always add people on after that. But this is 107 original cosponsors for this act that would build upon, improve, and expand Medicare so that it covers every single person in this country—universal healthcare, the idea that healthcare is a right and not a privilege.

Let me start by saying that we Democrats are absolutely united around the need to shore up the Affordable Care Act. There is no question that there is work to do immediately on some of the things that were done to take away access to those with pre-existing conditions, to strip away the benefits of the Affordable Care Act. We are 100 percent united around continuing to do that.

However, we have to have a bold vision that addresses the healthcare crisis in this country that leaves 30 million people uninsured and 40 million people underinsured, without access to healthcare.

We have to understand, in doing that, in the United States today, we spend, depending on what estimate you look at, about \$32 trillion to \$39 trillion on healthcare costs over 10 years. That is going up to about \$50 trillion over the next 10 years on healthcare. That is about 18½ percent of GDP.

If you look at every other major industrialized country in the world, what you see is that they provide healthcare, comprehensive care, to everybody in their country, and they do it at about half the cost, or less, of what the United States spends.

You might think that you could look at costs of healthcare in this country and you could say: Well, America has the best healthcare system in the world, and that is why we spend so much. We have the best healthcare outcomes.

Well, let's talk about that for a second. In the United States, we spend 18½ percent of our GDP on healthcare costs, yet we have the worst health outcomes of any peer country in the world.

Today in the United States, we have the highest maternal mortality rate. We know what that is; that is moms dying in childbirth.

We have the highest infant mortality rate. That is kids dying at young ages.

We have the lowest life expectancy rate of any of our peer countries. In fact, we are the only industrialized country in the world where life expectancy is going down and not up.

So we don't even have good health outcomes to show for our healthcare system.

That is why Representative DINGELL and I and our 105 additional cosponsors of the bill, and Representative TLAIB

and many others who are part of this effort, have introduced the improved Medicare for All Act of 2019.

What this bill does is it offers, first of all, comprehensive coverage to everyone in the country. We say that that includes primary care; it includes vision, dental, hearing; it includes mental health and substance abuse; it includes long-term services and supports, maternal healthcare, and more.

Everybody in the country will have access to healthcare when you get sick, not when you need an emergency room, not when you simply can't take your illness anymore, but when you actually get sick.

This bill is the first time that we will actually have long-term care supports and services included in this coverage. This is very, very important because it covers seniors, obviously, our elderly, as they get toward the end of their life, and it includes people with disabilities who have, traditionally, been left out of this entire sphere.

What we do is we say that, instead of the current system where you have to get so poor that you have to be on Medicaid—you have to have a low level of income, be on Medicaid—if you want long-term supports and services, and the automatic default is institutional care instead of home care, we flip that on its head and we say you get to stay at home with the people you love. You get to be in your home as you are dealing with these incredible challenges that you may have.

Our bill says no premiums, copays, and deductibles. We don't want you to have to think about that as you go to the doctor.

This is very important, because you will hear this is a government takeover of healthcare. That is what opponents of my bill are already trying to tell you.

I want you to hear this really clearly, if you are listening: We use the same network of doctors and hospitals that is already here.

In fact, I bet, if we had a roomful here and I were to ask people how many of you have been told, or have a family member or a relative who has been told, that you can't go to a certain hospital or doctor because it is out of network, or you only get a certain coverage if you go, I bet everybody would raise their hands. I see people raising their hands right now. Good for you. I feel like I have an audience here.

What our plan says is that you can go to any doctor or hospital. The government isn't taking over those services. It is not going to be a different government service. It is just the same as what you have right now.

The only thing that changes is, instead of having to argue with five insurance companies—because maybe you have Medicare and you have Medicare Advantage; maybe you don't have anything at all; maybe you have a combination of things put together. Instead of having to argue with five insurance companies, you get to just say:

This is a government insurance program. This is covered by one insurance program, a single payer.

If you have heard that statement, that is what that means. This is the way that almost every industrialized country in the world does it.

I think that we have to think about what the problem is here, why have we not been able to do this. We have, increasingly, seen our healthcare system, unfortunately, being moved more and more to a for-profit system that puts those profits over patients.

If you look at, for example, the cost of pharmaceutical drugs in our country today, it is so much more expensive to get insulin treatment or cancer treatments or even an MRI in the United States. I have clients and constituents who drive to Canada, who go to other places, because they can't afford the drugs here, and they can buy the exact same thing across the border for significantly cheaper.

We are having a crisis, Madam Speaker, where people are going to bed at night thinking about how they are going to pay their rent and pay for their cancer treatment, how they are going to afford to get the insulin treatments that they want. People are foreclosing on homes.

In fact, two-thirds of all the bankruptcies today in the United States are due to medical issues, medical costs. GoFundMe has become one of the most popular insurance plans around, where people are just banking on the goodness of people to take care of their healthcare costs. That is simply not acceptable.

If we want to take on this question of universal healthcare coverage, which, by the way, Teddy Roosevelt talked about in 1910, Harry Truman in 1945, President Johnson—this is not a radical idea. It is actually something that has been tried and tested.

But here in the United States, the idea that we could provide universal healthcare for everybody, make sure that people get the healthcare access that they need, this is the time for it. Seventy percent of the American people actually agree with us. You might hear that that support goes down if you say some other things, but let's be really clear that the fearmongering out there is driven by for-profit industries that, unfortunately, have a lot to lose if a plan like this were to pass, because we would actually make sure that we are not only providing universal coverage but that we also have cost containment built into our system.

That is what my bill does. We build in cost containment measures so that we can actually bring down the overall cost of healthcare in this country to what is standard in other countries around the world.

This is incredibly important to us, and as we think about who gains and who loses in this, I believe that it is actually a win-win for everybody who is concerned about putting patients over profits.

It is a win-win for doctors who have been trained to take care of patients but, instead, spend 25 to 30 percent of their time dealing with insurance companies and trying to do all the paperwork that needs to be there, trying to argue for a patient of theirs to be able to get the care they need.

It is a win for hospitals that want to make sure that they know what kind of budgets they are going to have and that they can work within that. We have something built into our plan called global budgeting, which is actually the standard in other countries but is being tested in Maryland to great effect, where hospitals get an overall amount of money, and they get a global budget. We have that built in as well.

It is a win for patients. This is the thing that is so important to emphasize again and again.

Actually, before I get to the patients, let me say it is also a win for our businesses, particularly our small- and medium-sized businesses. I have a lot of business owners who might disagree with me on a few other issues, many of them are across the aisle—they are Republicans; they are independents. They come up to me and they say: Representative, I don't agree with you on this or this or this, but please, can you get the Medicare for All bill passed, because we cannot, as small businesses and even medium-sized businesses and, by the way, even large-sized businesses, deal with the growing cost of these insurance premiums that we are paying that are really just going to line the pockets of top CEOs.

The CEO of UnitedHealth took home \$82 million, even as people are not able to afford treatments and are dying. The other CEOs have taken in \$52 million, \$29 million.

We have to make sure that the balance of something like healthcare, which is an essential, I believe, a common good in this country, that we are able to provide that to people.

There are lots of other places where markets can work, but in this marketplace where you need to make sure that healthcare is provided to everybody regardless of whether you are rich or poor, regardless of where you live, regardless of the color of your skin, this is where the government comes in to try to help make sure that that is actually possible.

This is a really important bill for us, and I am absolutely honored to have so many of my colleagues who are so smart on these issues, not only in liberal districts like mine but also in frontline districts, places that were held by Republicans for a very long time.

My Democratic colleagues flipped those districts, and they ran on this issue. They ran on this issue, and they won on this issue, because they know, and their constituents know, that it is time to take profit out of this system and make sure that it once again gets focused on the healthcare of people.

We also have an incredible coalition of labor unions that have come on board for the first time ever. Our teachers are on board, our machinists, our steelworkers. We have so many different unions that are on board this time.

Our disability rights community is on board.

Our women's organizations are on board, because for the first time, we make sure that everybody gets the care they need, whether they are a woman or a man, and we make sure that people have control over their reproductive choices.

We are absolutely thrilled about this.

I want to be clear about one thing, as I turn this back over to my incredible colleague from Michigan. This is not a messaging bill. I want to be clear about that.

For the first time in the House of Representatives, this bill is over 120 pages long. It is a detailed analysis and layout of exactly how this would work. It ensures that everybody gets healthcare. It keeps the existing system of delivery that we have. We are not changing the system of delivery.

It does not in any way say that insurance companies can't continue to operate. They just can't provide the same benefits that we are providing through the government insurance plan. That is actually the way Medicare works right now.

□ 1515

You can't provide the same benefits because we don't want a two-tiered system.

Now, if they want to provide benefits outside of what we provide, they are welcome to do so. That is how Medicare Advantage originally came in to being. Medicare Advantage plans, the benefits that are offered under those, would be included in our plan, so we wouldn't need those plans. But insurance companies are free to continue to innovate as they need to; and we have built in 1 percent of the cost of the bill for the first 5 years actually goes to a fund that ensures transition and appropriate support for workers in the insurance industries who may actually end up having to lose their jobs or to eventually transition into this new system that we have.

We will, for the first time, thanks to Speaker PELOSI's support, and others' support, we will have hearings on this bill. And whether you agree or you disagree with the premise, what I would ask is that you understand how critical it is to address and finally get to universal healthcare in this country.

This is a debate that should have been had on the House floor and in our committees a long time ago. We are finally going to have that with a number of different committees; and I am looking forward to continuing to help lead with all of my colleagues on ensuring that healthcare is a right and not a privilege; that you don't have to be wealthy to get basic healthcare; and

that we improve the ultimate competitiveness of our businesses, our families, our communities, and the health, the basic health, the right to live with dignity and respect for all of our people.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, that was incredible. And obviously, many of us in the Congressional Progressive Caucus have fully supported so much of what Medicare for All stands for. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for her leadership and courage for taking on such a bold move.

Madam Speaker, I am very honored to be here representing the community that raised me. I was raised in Southwest Detroit, in the 13th Congressional District. Growing up in Southwest Detroit, I actually thought that smell was normal, all the pollution that I kind of grew up in, all the truck traffic. As I got older, I realized it wasn't normal. It wasn't normal that so many of my neighbors were getting cancer or had respiratory issues. It wasn't normal that one of five children have asthma.

We have one of the highest—one of the worst air qualities in the State of Michigan in the 13th Congressional District; and it is the third poorest Congressional District in the country.

So the deadly consequences of being uninsured is real for my constituents at home; through no fault of their own, but for the fact that they live in communities that are polluted and communities that lack so much opportunity to be able to thrive.

So this is an important issue, not only to millions of Americans today, but to my residents; this need for universal healthcare. It is a topic that most, if not all of us in this Chamber were sent here to work on. It is a topic that is always on the minds of our residents every single day. It is a topic that is literally a life or death situation, and an issue that has bankrupted many of our families; an issue that we should not be worried about in this country.

We are the richest country on the planet, but the United States is the only industrialized country without universal healthcare.

Fifty thousand residents in my district are uninsured. This is why I am thrilled and excited that over 100 of my colleagues have signed on to sponsor the Medicare for All Act.

More than 30 million Americans are without access to healthcare right now without insurance, with an additional 40 million who cannot afford co-pays and the deductible.

Pharmaceutical companies make billions, Madam Speaker, in profits, while working Americans are forced to go through extraordinary measures to pay for care.

Just the other day, I heard a mother talk about losing her 6-year-old child, her little girl, because she couldn't afford insulin. This is why we need something bold, courageous, transformational, and that is supporting Medicare for All.

We spend the highest amount per capita in the world on healthcare. We need a better system for our constituents. We need Medicare for All.

This system is one that many more of my colleagues should get behind. It provides a system where our constituents will know that they are secure and getting healthcare that they need today. This is a system that will take away the worry of our constituents who have constant, day-in, day-out thinking about the cost of healthcare, and whether or not their current insurance even covers it.

It is really important to be clear about Medicare for All. One, it includes comprehensive coverage for primary care, for hospital, outpatient services, prescription drugs, reproductive health services, newborn care, long-term care services. This is so critical for my residents.

Constantly do I hear, day-in, day-out of families that are taking care of their parents and not having access to long-term care coverage.

It supports mental health and substance abuse treatment, laboratory and diagnostic services, and so much more.

Patients will have complete freedom to choose their doctors. I am going to say this again. Patients will have complete freedom, under the Medicare for All Act, to choose their doctors, hospitals, and other providers that they wish to see.

Long-term care, again, in support for our older Americans, our neighbors, and those with disabilities, will be covered.

Medicare for All will decrease the costs by reducing inefficiency; preventing healthcare corporations from overcharging; and increasing transparency in our system.

Medicare for All will also decrease prescription drug costs by allowing Medicare to finally negotiate our prices.

The legislation also preserves healthcare programs for our veterans and our Native Americans.

Healthcare is a right, Madam Speaker, not a privilege for the wealthy.

And not only is this the most incredible class, and not because I am part of it, but it really is, it is the largest incoming class since Watergate but, more importantly, it is the most diverse.

We not only ran because we wanted to be first, or we wanted to be diverse, we ran because we speak differently; we serve differently; and we are much more courageous than, I think, previous classes ever have been.

So, I am asking our colleagues to please stand up and support Medicare for All. Give it a chance. See the possibility of finally being able to provide for our constituents' universal healthcare.

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

AND STILL I RISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise because I love my country. And I rise tonight on the Republican side of what we call the aisle.

I do so, Madam Speaker, because the issue that I will call to the attention of this august body is not an issue that I consider a Republican issue. I don't consider it a Democratic issue. I consider this an issue for the American people, past, present, and the future.

This is an issue that has plagued our country almost since its inception. It is an issue that we have avoided with intentionality, avoided because of discomfort, avoided through the years. But it is an issue that we have to address.

So I rise tonight, Madam Speaker, with love of country at heart on the Republican side of the aisle. And I rise to announce, as I have before, that we have to take up the question of impeachment.

I rise, Madam Speaker, to say this and to give some explanations. There are many things that are being misunderstood. I trust that I can bring some degree of clarity to the issues that are misunderstood.

And I know, Madam Speaker, as I rise, and understand that this will come to a vote in this House; I know that it will be a tough vote for many people. I understand. It will be a tough vote for a multiplicity of reasons. It will be a tough vote.

I know what tough votes are like, so I understand. I have people in my community, one example, members of the clergy that I have had to explain some very tough votes to. I have some that have, to this day, not agreed with the tough votes that I have had to take.

Tough votes. I came here to take tough votes. I came here to deal with tough issues, the difficult. I came to do what I believe should have been done long before now; but the opportunity to do it has presented itself since I arrived in Congress, so I take on this challenge. And I understand that this will be a tough vote.

Before I get to some of the nuances of the explanation that I would like to give, let me just tell you who I will be voting for when I take this tough vote. I will be voting for the slave mother who had a baby ripped out of her arms, taken to the auction block.

This is why I can relate to those mothers on the border who had their babies ripped out of their arms; and still, many have not been returned to their mothers, their fathers. I can relate because I understand the historical context. I will be voting for them.

Tough vote, but I will be voting for the slave father who never got to see his child because the mother and the child were taken away, auctioned off, sent to some distant plantation; never allowed the opportunity to enjoy the love that a father ought to with a

child. That is the historical context of why I will be voting and what I will be voting for.

I will also be voting for the elderly mother who was of African ancestry, who had to say “yes, ma’am” and “yes, sir” to the 3-year-old children of the master. At that time it would have been called the boss, but it was the master; had to say “yes, ma’am” and “yes, sir” to the children.

To the father, I will vote for the father who was called “boy,” demeaned in the presence of his son. I know. I saw that happen to my father. I know about that elderly mother. I saw it happen to her, the elderly black mother. I will be voting for them. They have come through the years to get me here. I won’t forget them.

I will be voting for the LGBTQ person who was fired for showing up at work and saying I married the love of my life, who happens to be the same sex as that person was. I am an ally of the LGBTQ community.

I am going to vote for those persons who have been discriminated against.

□ 1530

I will be voting for those who lost their lives in the Tree of Life synagogue, lost their lives to bigotry, hate.

I will be voting for those who lost their lives at the church in Charlotte.

I will be voting for the woman, who was a peaceful protestor, who lost her life in Charlottesville among the bigots, the KKK, the neo-Nazis, the xenophobes, the homophobes. I will be voting for her.

And here is why I will be voting for all of them: because these Articles of Impeachment will be about bigotry emanating from the Presidency—in policy, I might add, bigotry in policy. There is clear and convincing evidence that we have bigotry in policy. I will be voting for the people who are the victims.

To those who would tell me this is not something that the Congress ought to entertain, here is what I would say. I would say, if the Congress of the United States of America could, in 1868, impeach President Andrew Johnson for speaking ill of Congress, this Congress can impeach for bigotry in policy.

It is just a question of whether 218 people, assuming all are present, will vote for it. That is what it is. It is just a question of whether we have the will to do it. The way is before us.

Article II, Section 4, all of the noted constitutional scholars—maybe there is some exception; there probably is one someplace—have concluded that Article II, Section 4 not only allows a President to be impeached for criminality, a President can also be impeached for misdeeds.

As a matter of fact, those who desire to edify themselves can read Federalist 65, read the words of Hamilton and Madison and Jay. Read their words. Let them communicate with you through the vista of time.

You will find, when you read their writings, that they were prophetic in their thoughts, that they understood that there would be a time such as this, and they have given us the recipe for this time and the means by which we can take corrective action.

When you read, you will find that, without question, they indicate that impeachment is not something that will be done without some degree of turmoil, that impeachment will be something that will sometimes be along party lines. Party lines occur when impeachment is brought before this august body.

By the way, I brought impeachment twice before, so I am talking about something that has occurred and something that will occur again.

So impeachment is something that was anticipated. It is something that is a remedy that is constitutional, and I plan to bring that remedy before this body so that we may take a stand.

Dr. King was a great man and somebody I admire, and I talk about him quite regularly. Dr. King reminded us that the truest measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience, but where you stand in times of challenge and controversy. When you have hard votes to take, where do you stand?

I don’t believe bigotry should be a talking point, something that we use to get the base out at election time. We go out and we talk about, oh, how bad certain people are and we announce that they are racist, that they are bigots. I don’t think it ought to be a talking point. I think it should be an action item.

I am bringing the vote because it is going to be an action item for Congress at last. Again, it will be an action item, not just a talking point. I am going to put the moral imperative to vote for all of these people that I called to your attention and countless others above political expediency.

Political expediency allows us to push this issue to the next generation. Political expediency has allowed us to reach this point in our history where bigotry is rearing its ugly head. It is no longer covert, but it is now overt. We have reached this point in our history. So I refuse to except political expediency as a remedy.

Why not wait? Let’s defeat at the polls as opposed to impeach here in the House.

I don’t buy into that.

Now, there are many who would say let’s wait on the Mueller report. The Mueller report has nothing to do with bigotry. It most likely has to do with criminality associated with obstruction of justice, probably has something to do with emoluments, could have something to do with collusion, which is a layperson’s way of saying conspiracy. It could have something to do with all of these.

But I assure each and every person who is within the sound of my voice by whatever means, it will have nothing

to do with bigotry. So there is no need to wait for the Mueller report because the Mueller report won’t address bigotry. Those who would rather impeach for some other thing, then wait for the Mueller report.

By the way, I don’t plan to get in the way of the Mueller report, but I will say this: The Framers of the Constitution never intended for the executive branch to investigate itself, and that is what is going on.

The Framers of the Constitution understood the implications of having the executive branch investigate itself. One such implication that we see now is that the Mueller report may not be presented to Congress. It is going to the President before it gets to Congress.

The Framers never intended for the executive to investigate itself. That is the responsibility of Congress. That is why I brought Articles of Impeachment.

Pardon me for using a personal pronoun. My mother taught me better.

That is why I brought Articles of Impeachment in a previous Congress when we had Republicans in charge.

I am not going to be hypocritical and conclude now that Democrats are in charge, we don’t have the same duty, responsibility, and obligation. I am not that kind of guy. We are going to go on record. It will be a hard vote, but we are going to go on record.

Some would say: Well, how do you get the proof of the bigotry?

Easy answer—it appears to be a tough question. Easy answer: the same way we got the proof that we brought to the floor of the House for colleagues who had resolutions that were to condemn for bigoted statements. Same way, we get them from news sources.

We have plenty of empirical evidence to show us by clear and convincing evidence as a standard, or whatever standard the House uses, because there is no standard codified in the law for the House. But by whatever standard the House should use, there is plenty of empirical evidence to support bigotry in policy emanating from the Presidency, plenty of them: S---hole countries; and then you go out, by the way, where people of color happen to reside, I might add, and you go out and develop an immigration policy that adversely impacts those people of color, changing the law to adversely impact them.

Bigotry in policy? Ha. I talked about the babies at the border—people of color, I might add—separating them. We didn’t do that at Ellis Island. We didn’t do that when 12 million people came from Europe, Scandinavia. We didn’t do that. We didn’t separate them from their children. We didn’t have a flotilla out there to stop them. We didn’t try to build walls to keep them out. They came.

The people who are at the border, by the way, are exercising their rights under the law that we promulgated, that we, the United States of America,

put in place that says that they can come up and ask for asylum.

By the way, I do not contend that all who seek asylum should be granted asylum. I do think that the process, the law that we put in place, ought to be honored. And if we don't like the law, then we should change the law. There is plenty of opportunity to do so. There has been plenty of opportunity to do so. Change the law if you don't like the way we have decided to deal with these issues.

There is plenty of evidence that in the past we have accommodated persons who were trying to flee harm's way, bringing their children with them. When those persons were fleeing Castro's Cuba and traversed the shark-infested waters of the Gulf of Mexico—I say "shark-invested" because there are so many people who are saying: Well, we don't want them to do this because they can be harmed along the way.

We didn't say that about the people who were traversing the shark-infested waters of the Gulf of Mexico. We created a policy called wet foot, dry foot. One foot on dry land, and you had a pathway to citizenship. That was the policy of the United States of America, to accommodate.

I am not saying bring the world in. I am saying follow the law. It seems to me that is what we are all about. I believe in the law of the land that I live in and that I love. And I love my country.

So I want to assure persons that we will use the same standard of proof that we have been using on previous occasions.

Now, the next question: Impeachment is like voting to go to war. Casting a vote to impeach is comparable to casting a vote to go to war.

I visit the VA hospital annually, Madam Speaker, and I take flags to every veteran in that hospital. This year, we took 600 flags, and we needed more.

I would ask persons who believe that this is comparable to casting a vote to go to war, go to the place where you can see the price of freedom. Go to the place where you can see what the cost is, where you will see that it is not in silver and gold. Go to a VA hospital, a VA hospital where you will see persons who have lost an arm, lost a leg, no longer have vision. Many of them leave and don't return the way they left. Just go and see what the price of freedom is like.

They fight for our freedom. They are willing to give their lives for our freedom. That is what a vote for war is all about. Many don't ever return. They are the liberators. They accord us our freedom by putting their lives on the line, and it is that freedom that we have that allows us to vote to impeach.

Voting for impeachment is not a vote to go to war. You ask somebody who has lost a leg in those hospitals, talk to them. Oh, you may find one person whom you can use and try to equate

that to the rest of the world, but I assure you, those veterans don't consider impeachment comparable to voting to go to war.

I would also add this: There are those who believe that bigotry is something that the Senate won't take up.

If we use that line of logic, I shouldn't have gone to law school for fear of failure.

If we use that line of logic, we shouldn't have sent H.R. 1 over to the Senate, because it has been prognosticated that the Senate won't take it up in any meaningful way.

□ 1545

If we use that line of logic, there are bills that we send to the Senate quite regularly that we would not send because of a belief that the Senate won't take up these bills. So I don't buy into that logic. But I do believe that we should give the Senate an opportunity to do its job. It ought to have that opportunity.

Remember now, this is not about Mueller, this is about bigotry emanating from the Presidency. This is about having the country, by and through its representatives, go on record in terms of where we stand in this time of challenge and controversy as it relates to bigotry emanating from the Presidency.

Impeachment is something that we all should respect because it is constitutional. It is what the Constitution permits. It is also what I believe I have a duty to bring before the Congress. I will do so.

I don't guarantee more than one vote, and that is my vote. There are people who seem to think that if they can convince me, that the people who voted for it previously won't be voting for it this time. That the people who voted for it previously, they have changed their minds, they are going to be against you. They are not against me. I am not against them. I say to them, vote your conscience. Stand where your convictions are now.

But there are people who seem to think that by convincing me that I will be alone, that somehow this will cause me not to act. My dear brothers and sisters, how you have underestimated me. My dear brothers and sisters, I didn't come here to go along so that I could get along and move along. My dear brothers and sisters, you have grossly underestimated me.

If I stand alone and there is but one vote cast, I assure you that one vote will be cast and I will stand alone. I understand that in the eons to come, people will look back on this time and they will query what was wrong with them. What was wrong with them? How could they tolerate an unfit person holding the highest office in the land? How could they tolerate it? They will want to know what was wrong with them.

But I also know this. They will see that there was at least one person who stood on the ground of righteousness,

who put the moral imperative above political expediency.

And I will know also that the world will know where this country stands on the issue of bigotry. I didn't come here to manage bigotry. That is what we do. We always want to get back to bigotry as usual after it rears its ugly head. Let's put that head down and get back to bigotry as usual. Let it be covert, but not overt.

My guess is some people have said to the President: Mr. President, you can do all of these things without displaying your bigotry. They didn't say it that way, but they probably tried to convince him. You don't have to be raw. Do it the way others have done it and you will be appreciated.

I don't want to get back to bigotry as usual. I think we send a message to the world when we impeach a President for bigotry and policy, and that is what I am talking about: bigotry and policy. Not just his words—I don't think that we ought to have a bigot in office, but not just his words—but for what his words have been transformed into, what they have metamorphosed into: bigotry and policy.

I think that we would send a positive message to the world in terms of where we stand, and we would also send a message to many of the people in this country as to how much we care about them, those who suffer from bigotry on a daily basis. If you take out the head bigot, you will send a message to the bigots along the way at the lower end of the ladder.

Now, about the people who are suffering; they have elected us time and time again, many of them, on the belief that this time they are going to take up racism. This time they are going to take up homophobia, xenophobia, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, and nativism. This time they are going to take up the issues that impact my life on a daily basis. Yes, it is still here. The glass ceiling exists because of bigotry. There is a glass ceiling. Yes, it is still here.

There are people who have jobs of color and they have to train persons of a different hue to take the job that they have and become their supervisor. It still happens. It is still occurring in the United States of America. The country I love, by the way.

You can love your country and want to see it improve. That is what all of these bills are about here. Everybody that is filing a bill wants to improve the country. That is all I want to do, too. The unfortunate circumstance for a good many people is I want to deal with an issue that we have, for too long, placed on the back burner of our contemporary agenda. I am going to place it on the front burner. There will be a vote.

How do you know there will be a vote? Well, the rules allow it. The rules allow any Member of this august body to come forward with a privileged resolution.

Now, if you want to change the rules, you can do so. Republicans didn't do it

when they were in control of the House. But you can do it. Let's let history show that because one Democrat wanted to bring articles of impeachment, that a Democratic Party did what a Republican Party did not do. Let history reflect that. Change the rules. You have to live with the history. I don't. I am going to be on the right side of the history.

Now, someone would say: But, Al, you will be on the wrong side of politics. Do you know what? The people that I know suffered, the people who lived and died so that I could have this opportunity, the people who found out what a billy club hits like, found out what a 90-pound German Shepherd bites like, found out what a high pressure water hose stings like, the people who lost loved ones to a cause so that I could have this opportunity, I don't know that they want me to be on the right side of politics. I think they want me to be on the right side of history. But I also believe that they want me to be on the right side of this moral issue of our time, and that is whether we will tolerate bigotry emanating from the Presidency.

So to everyone, understand this is not going to be about obstruction of justice. I came to the floor and called that to the attention of the country. There is evidence to move forward on obstruction of justice, but I choose not to do so. It is not going to be about conspiracy. There is evidence, but I choose not to do so.

This is going to be about bigotry, and it is going to be about where do you stand? The truest measure of the person is not where you stand in times of comfort and convenience, but where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy? Where do you stand when bigotry is the issue that you have to vote on?

And to all of my colleagues, I want you to know I love you. It doesn't matter what side of the aisle you are on. I respect you. And I only say to you, vote your conscience. Decide what side of bigotry, what side of history, what side of righteousness you are going to be on.

I know where I will stand. I will hold my head up high, notwithstanding all of the slings and arrows that are going to come against me. They are coming. They are going to demean me in every way. My mother probably wouldn't know who I am when they are done with me. I understand it.

Gandhi gave us the formula. First they ignore you. These are the words of Gandhi. Then they laugh at you. Then after they have ignored you and they have had a moment of laughter and they see that you are not going away, then they fight you. Then they demean you. I understand.

So do what you may. Say what you may. But I know, within me, that I am doing the right thing.

I know that Gandhi is right. He said that after they have ignored you, after they have laughed and had their mo-

ment of pleasure about it, then they fight you, but then, Gandhi reminded us, then you win.

I am prepared to suffer through until victory. I won't give out. To quote my good friend, Mr. LEWIS, who crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge on Bloody Sunday, "I won't give up. I won't give in." I will do that which my ancestors call upon me to do. I pray to God that this House will vote its conscience. Vote your convictions.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 14, 2019, at 9 a.m.

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. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ALLRED, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CISNEROS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROW, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELGADO, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HARDER

of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIM, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LAMB, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCADAMS, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PHILLIPS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. PORTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. STANTON, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 5. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, Financial Services, Oversight and Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 1704. A bill to foster commercial relations with foreign countries and support

United States economic and business interests abroad in the conduct of foreign policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. DEAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. SOTO, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 1705. A bill to prevent the purchase of ammunition by prohibited purchasers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1706. A bill to limit assistance for areas of Syria controlled by the Government of Syria or associated forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. HIMES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SABLON, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TRONE, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 1707. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. HILL of California, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 1708. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to include the Rim of the Valley Corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 1709. A bill to amend the America COMPETES Act to establish certain scientific integrity policies for Federal agencies that fund, conduct, or oversee scientific research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 1710. A bill to require a study of the well-being of the United States automotive industry and stay the implementation of tariffs until the study is completed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LAMB, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 1711. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for current year inclusion of net CFC tested income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of

California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILD, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois):

H.R. 1712. A bill to end offshore corporate tax avoidance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 1713. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of service-connection for certain veterans exposed to certain herbicides while serving in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Ms. OMAR, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. AMASH, Ms. BASS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCCINTOCK, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1714. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to make certain limitations on the transfer of personal property to Federal and State agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 1715. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deductibility of charitable contributions to certain organizations for members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1716. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to conduct coastal community vulnerability assessments related to ocean acidification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. MCEACHIN):

H.R. 1717. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a new tax credit and grant program to stimulate investment and healthy nutrition options in food deserts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington):

H.R. 1718. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for clarification regarding the children to whom entitlement to educational assistance may be transferred under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1719. A bill to amend regulations relating to the eligibility of Federal employees, during a Government shutdown, for supplemental vision and dental coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 1720. A bill to amend the National Emergencies Act to provide that a national emergency declared by the President terminates 30 days after the declaration unless a joint resolution affirming such declaration is enacted into law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and 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 Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1721. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct reviews of certain budget requests of the President for the medical care accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1722. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require congressional approval before the appropriation of funds for the Department of Veterans Affairs major medical facility leases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself and Mr. MARSHALL):

H.R. 1723. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to make institutions of higher education eligible for assistance for community food projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. LANDEVIN):

H.R. 1724. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the financial aid process for homeless and foster care youth; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 1725. A bill to promote neutrality, simplicity, and fairness in the taxation of digital goods and digital services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 1726. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to include firearms in the types of property allowable under the alternative provision for exempting property from the estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr.

PETERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 1727. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for qualified conservation contributions which include National Scenic Trails; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1728. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to end speculation on the current cost of multilingual services provided by the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 1729. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Office of Biometric Identity Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. HIGGINS of New York (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. OLSON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. BERA, Mr. COLE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCCAUL, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1730. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide for cost sharing for oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the cost sharing provided for anticancer medications administered by a health care provider; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. HECK, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 1731. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to promote transparency in the oversight of cybersecurity risks at publicly traded companies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 1732. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to specify that the waiver authority under such Act includes the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 for purpose of construction of physical barriers along border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. MOULTON (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. EMMER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RYAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. LAMB):

H.R. 1733. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to enter into contracts with industry intermediaries for purposes of promoting the development of and access to apprenticeships in the technology sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1734. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to prohibit the use of questions on citizenship, nationality, or immigration status in any decennial census, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRIJALVA,

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RYAN, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1735. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the proper tax treatment of personal service income earned in pass-thru entities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SOTO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SIREN, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1736. A bill to require the disclosure of certain visitor access records; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. WILD, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 1737. A bill to make housing more affordable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Education and Labor, and 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. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1738. A bill to protect children through eliminating visa loopholes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. LESKO, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee):

H.R. 1739. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for charitable donations to nonprofit organizations providing workforce training and education scholarships to qualified elementary and secondary students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 1740. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for an H-2C nonimmigrant classification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, 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 Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1741. A bill to reauthorize Department of Justice programs that combat violence against women, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Natural Resources, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 1742. A bill to make innovative technology loan guarantee support available for battery storage technologies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 1743. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out an energy storage research program, loan program, and technical assistance and grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. TAKANO (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 1744. A bill to provide for the consideration of energy storage systems by electric utilities as part of a supply side resource process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 1745. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that persons subject to firearm restraining orders and persons convicted of violent misdemeanors are prohibited from possessing firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 1746. A bill to direct the President to establish a unified United States Space Command; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 1747. A bill to encourage partnerships among public agencies and other interested persons to promote fish conservation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1748. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for the minimum size of crews of freight trains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1749. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to State and local entities to carry out peer-to-peer mental health programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZELDIN (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 1750. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide financial assistance for supportive services for very low-income veteran families in permanent housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky):

H. Res. 220. A resolution recognizing the interdependence of diplomacy, development, and defense as critical to effective national security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H. Res. 221. A resolution reaffirming the importance of upholding democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in United States foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. WALTZ):

H. Res. 222. A resolution emphasizing the importance of alliances and partnerships; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H. Res. 223. A resolution affirming the historical relationship between the United States and the Kingdom of Morocco, condemning the recent provocative actions of the Polisario Front and its foreign supporters, and encouraging efforts by the United Nations to reach a peaceful resolution of the Western Sahara conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mrs. LURIA):

H. Res. 224. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Deaf History Month; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. BACON):

H. Res. 225. A resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H. Res. 226. A resolution electing Members to the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library and the Joint Committee on Printing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Res. 227. A resolution recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni to the lives of the people of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. WATERS:

H. Res. 228. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Financial Services in the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 1751. A bill for the relief of Emilio Gutiérrez Soto and Oscar Emilio Gutiérrez Soto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAUBER:

H.R. 1752. A bill for the relief of David Beasley; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 1686.

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

Article 1, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, providing "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 5.

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

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 1704.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 1705.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1706.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1707.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 1708.

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

Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act is constitutionally authorized under and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 1709.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises" in order to "provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States."

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 1710.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 1711.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 1712.

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

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 1713.

H. Res. 214: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. BANKS, and Ms. GABBARD.

**DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

H.R. 1146: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

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



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 2019

No. 45

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 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:

O God, our righteous judge, the upright will behold your face. Lord, we thank You for Your power that keeps us from stumbling on life's road. Today, give our Senators the wisdom to find in You their refuge and strength. As they face complex challenges, may they flee to You for guidance and fellowship. Lord, as they make You the foundation of their hope and joy, empower them to run life's race without weariness, knowing that Your bountiful harvest of goodness is certain.

We pray in Your merciful 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. BLACKBURN). Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will pro-

ceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Neomi J. Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday the Senate confirmed a well-qualified jurist chosen by President Trump to serve on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. Paul Matey of New Jersey will bring a wealth of experience to the bench, and I was proud to support his nomination.

We also voted to advance the nomination of Neomi Rao to the DC Circuit. This nominee is yet another of the President's excellent choices to serve as a Federal judge.

Ms. Rao graduated with honors from Yale and the University of Chicago School of Law. Her record includes a distinguished tenure in academia, public and private sector legal experience, as well as a clerkship on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Most importantly, in testimony before our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, she demonstrated a commitment to maintaining the public trust and upholding the rule of law. So the committee favorably reported Ms. Rao's nomination, and soon the Senate will have an opportunity to continue fulfilling our advice and consent responsibilities by voting to confirm her to the Federal bench.

We will also vote this afternoon on the nomination of William Beach, who has been waiting for over a year to take his post as Commissioner of Labor Statistics. Our colleagues on the HELP Committee recommended Mr. Beach to the floor in December of 2017. A full year later, with no progress, he was returned to the White House. Now he is

finally getting a floor vote. This pointless obstruction needs to change, but I am glad we can at least confirm Mr. Beach this week.

YEMEN

Madam President, now, on another matter, the Senate will soon vote on a resolution under the War Powers Act. I strongly oppose this unnecessary and counterproductive resolution and urge our colleagues to join me in opposing it.

From the outset, let me say this. I believe it is right for Senators to have grave concerns over some aspects of Saudi Arabia's behavior, particularly the murder of Jamal Khashoggi. That is not what this resolution is about, however. In December, the Senate voted on a resolution that addressed this institution's concerns about Saudi Arabia.

If Senators continue to have concerns about Saudi behavior, they should raise them in hearings and directly with the administration and directly with Saudi officials, as I have done, and they should allow a vote on the confirmation of retired GEN John Abizaid, whose nomination to be U.S. Ambassador to Riyadh is being held up once again by Democratic obstruction.

They should also allow a vote on the nomination of David Schenker to be Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs. He has been held up here for nearly a year. If we want to solve problems in the Middle East through diplomacy, we will need to confirm diplomats.

Regarding Yemen, it is completely understandable that Senators have concerns over the war, the American interests entangled in it, and its consequences for Yemeni civilians. I think there is bipartisan agreement, shared by the administration, that our objective should be to end this horrible conflict, but this resolution doesn't end the conflict. It will not help Saudi pilots avoid civilian casualties. It will

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1807

not enhance America's diplomatic leverage. In fact, it will make it harder to achieve those very objectives.

This is an inappropriate and counter-productive measure. First, the administration has already ended—ended—air-to-air refueling of coalition aircraft. We only provide limited noncombat support to the U.N.-recognized Yemeni Government and to the Saudi-led coalition. It certainly does not—does not—constitute hostilities.

Second, there are real threats from the Houthis in Yemen whom Iran, as we all know, is backing. Missiles and explosives are being aimed at civilians, anti-ship missiles are being fired at vessels in key shipping lanes of global importance.

If one of those missiles kills a large number of Saudi or Emirati civilians, let alone Americans who live in Riyadh or Dubai, say goodbye to any hope of a negotiated end to this conflict. These threats will not evaporate. They are not going to go away if the United States ends its limited support. So I think of the American citizens who live in the regions.

Third, our focus should be on ending the war in Yemen responsibly. Pulling the plug on support to our partners only undermines the very leverage and influence we need to help facilitate the U.N.'s diplomatic efforts. The United States will be in a better position to encourage the Saudi-led coalition to take diplomatic risks if our partners trust that we appreciate the significant, legitimate threats they face from the Houthis.

Fourth, we face real threats from al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula. We need cooperation from Yemen, the UAE, and Saudi Arabia to defeat those terrorists. So we should think twice about undermining these very partners whose cooperation we obviously need for our own security.

Here is my bottom line. We should not use this specific vote on a specific policy decision as some proxy for all the Senate's broad feelings about foreign affairs. Concerns about Saudi human rights issues should be directly addressed with the administration and with the Saudi officials. That is what I have chosen to do. That is what I recommend others do.

As for Yemen, we need to ask what action will actually serve our goal; that is, working with partners to encourage a negotiated solution.

Withdrawing? Would withdrawing our support facilitate efforts to end the war, or just embolden the Houthis? Would sending this signal enhance or weaken our leverage over the Saudi-led coalition? Would voting for this resolution strengthen the hand of the U.N. Special Envoy, Martin Griffiths, or in fact undermine his work? Would we prefer that Saudi Arabia and the UAE go to China and Russia for assistance instead of the United States?

The answers to these questions is pretty clear. We need to vote no on this misguided resolution.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Madam President, now one final matter. Yesterday, I continued the discussion we have been having about the strange ideas that seem to have taken hold of Washington Democrats.

Ideas like the Democrat politician protection act, a scheme to limit America's First Amendment right to political speech and force taxpayers to subsidize political campaigns, including ones they disagree with. It did not earn a single Republican vote in the House, by the way. Thank goodness.

Ideas like Medicare for None, which could spend more than \$32 trillion to hollow out seniors' health benefits and boot working families from their chosen plans into a one-size-fits-all government scheme.

Even the soaring costs and massive disruption that plan would cause American families are dwarfed—dwarfed—by the grandiose scheme they are marketing as the Green New Deal.

By now, we are all familiar with the major thrust of the proposal: powering down the U.S. economy, and yet somehow also creating government-directed economic security for everyone—for everyone—at the same time.

Naturally, accomplishing all this is quite a tall order. According to the Democrats' resolution, it will require overhauling every building in America to meet strict new codes, overseen, of course, by social planners here in Washington. It would require banning the production of American coal, oil, and natural gas in 10 short years and cracking down on transportation systems that produce any emissions, which, as one hastily deleted background document made clear, is just a polite way of saying Democrats want to eventually ban anything with a motor that runs on gasoline. They want to ban anything with a motor that runs on gasoline.

I thought "Abolish ICE" was bad enough when Democrats were rallying to close down all of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, but now what do we get? The far left also wants to abolish the internal combustion engine. I gather somewhere around that time is when the miraculous, promised universal job guarantee would kick in as well. It is just a good, old-fashioned, state-planned economy—garden-variety 21st-century socialism.

Our Democratic colleagues have taken all the debunked philosophies of the last 100 years, rolled them into one giant package, and thrown a little "green" paint on them to make them look new, but there is nothing remotely new about a proposal to centralize control over the economy and raise taxes on the American people to pay for it.

Margaret Thatcher famously said that the trouble with socialist governments is "they always run out of other people's money." How often have we heard that? Well, this dangerous fantasy would burn through the American people's money before it even got off the launchpad.

The cost to the Treasury is just the beginning. It is hard to put a price tag on ripping away the jobs and livelihoods of literally millions of Americans. It is hard to put a price tag on forcibly remodeling Americans' homes whether they want it or not and taking away their cars whether they want that or not. It certainly is difficult to put a price tag on unilaterally disarming the entire U.S. economy with this kind of self-inflicted wound while other nations, such as China, go roaring by—roaring by.

By definition, global emissions are a global problem. Even if we grant the Democrats' unproven claim that cratering American industries and outlawing the energy sources that middle-class families can afford would produce the kinds of emissions changes they are after, we need to remember that the United States is only responsible for about 15 percent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions—only 15 percent of the global total.

According to the Department of Energy, the United States cut our own energy-related carbon emissions by 14 percent from 2005 to 2017. So we cut carbon emissions in this country significantly from 2005 to 2017. Well, it is appropriate to ask, what did the rest of the world do? They kept soaring higher and higher.

In the same period that the United States cut our energy-related carbon emissions by 14 percent, the International Energy Agency found that worldwide, energy-related carbon emissions rose by 20 percent everywhere else. China—the world's largest carbon emitter—increased its emissions dramatically over that period. So, believe me, if Democrats succeeded at slowing the U.S. economy and cutting our prosperity because they think it will save the planet, China will not pull over by the side of the road to keep us company; they will go roaring right by us.

The proposal we are talking about is, frankly, delusional—absolutely delusional. It is so unserious that it ought to be beneath one of our two major political parties to line up behind it.

The Washington Post editorial board—not exactly a bastion of conservatism—dismissed the notion that "the country could reach net-zero greenhouse-gas emissions by 2030" as "an impossible goal."

In a clear sign of how rapidly Democrats are racing to the far left, President Obama's own Energy Secretary said the same thing. He said: "I just cannot see how we could possibly go to zero carbon in the 10-year timeframe."

These Washington Democrats' leftward sprint is leaving Obama administration officials in the dust and even parts of their own base. Listen to what Democrats' usual Big Labor allies have to say about this socialist nightmare. Union leaders with the AFL-CIO say this proposal "could cause immediate harm to millions of our members and their families." That is what the AFL-CIO union leaders said. Immediate harm to American workers,

American farmers, American families, and America's future, and nowhere near enough reduction in global emissions to show for it. It is a self-inflicted wound for the low price, by one estimate, of somewhere in the neighborhood of \$93 trillion.

This is not based on logic or reason; it is just based on the prevailing fashions in New York and San Francisco. That is what is defining today's Democrats.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the Beach nomination, the Senate resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, and that there be 30 minutes of debate controlled by Senator ERNST or her designee.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, tomorrow, the Senate will vote on a resolution to terminate the President's emergency declaration—a declaration that undermines our separation of powers in order to fund the President's wall with American taxpayer dollars, despite Candidate Trump's repeated promises that Mexico would pay for it.

The resolution could not be any simpler. All it says is this, one single sentence: "Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, pursuant to section 202 of the National Emergencies Act . . . the national emergency declared by the finding of the President on February 15, 2019, in Proclamation 9844 . . . is hereby terminated."

That is it in the entirety. There are no political games here. There is no "gotcha." There is no discussion as to whether we need a wall, whether there is a crisis on the southern border. It simply says that this is not an emergency.

The vote tomorrow boils down to something very simple for our Republican friends: Do you believe in the Constitution and conservative principles? There are all of these self-proclaimed conservatives. Well, the No. 1 tenet of conservatism is that no one, particularly an Executive, a President, should have too much power. That has been what conservatives have stood for through the centuries, and all of a sud-

den, because Donald Trump says he wants to declare an emergency, are people going to succumb?

The Founding Fathers would be rolling in their graves. They would be rolling in their graves for any President, let alone this one who we know overreaches in terms of power and who we know has no understanding of the exquisite and delicate balance that James Madison, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and so many others created in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Do our Republican friends stand for conservative principles? Do they stand for any principles at all, or do they just take a loyalty pledge to President Trump and meekly do whatever he wants? It is that simple.

There are a lot of issues on which we disagree. There are lots of times our Republican friends bow to President Trump, but there ought to be an exception. And if there ever were an exception, it should be this.

Many of my Republican colleagues rightly stood up and told the President not to take this action. Leader MCCONNELL himself said it was a bad idea, a bad precedent, contravenes the power of the purse, a dangerous step, an erosion of congressional authority. And they, our Republican friends, were right. The President himself said he "didn't need to do this." That is not an emergency.

Are we going to say that anytime a President can't get his or her way with Congress, they can declare an emergency and Congress will meekly shrug its shoulders and walk by and bow in obeisance to any President, Democratic or Republican? What a disgrace.

This is one of the true tests of our Republican colleagues—one of the true tests—because it has always been the Democratic Party that has been for a stronger Executive. Dwight Eisenhower was worried about too much power going to the President, and so was Ronald Reagan. Where are our Republican friends now? Has Donald Trump turned this Republican Party and its conservative principles so inside out that we can't even get four votes to declare that this isn't an emergency, that we can't get 20 votes to say to the President that we will override this, because this is far more important than any view on the wall or the southern border, which we all know has been going on for a long time. While the President thinks it is an emergency, Congress clearly didn't. Even when Republicans controlled the House and Senate, they did nothing about the wall.

I have talked to a lot of my Republican colleagues. They know what this is all about. Everyone here knows the truth. The President did not declare an emergency because there is one; he declared an emergency because he lost in Congress and wanted to go around it. He has no principles in terms of congressional balance of power. We know that. We all know that. So to bow in obeisance to him when we all know

what he is doing is so wrong—a low moment for this Senate and its Republican friends.

When it comes to the Constitution, you ought to stand up to fear and do the right thing no matter who is in the White House. My Republican friends know the right thing to do. They should not be afraid to do it.

Last I checked, we all took the same oath of office. What did it say? "Uphold the Constitution."

There are different views on the Constitution, but I haven't heard one constitutional scholar—left, right, or center—say that this upholding the President on this emergency is the right thing to do in terms of the Constitution. I hope my Republican friends will join us.

Now, it seems, from what I read in the press reports this morning, that some Senators are in search of a fig leaf. They want to salve their consciences. They know this is the wrong thing to do.

They came up with this idea that will change the emergency declaration for future moments. Reports indicate that a group of Republican Senators are pushing legislation that would ignore the President's power grab but limit future emergency declarations—what bunk, what a fig leaf. That will not pass.

To my friend, the Senator from Utah, who I know does have constitutional qualms, he is squirming. His legislation will not pass.

Let me just read you what Leader PELOSI said a few minutes ago. This is from her statement:

Republican Senators are proposing new legislation to allow the President to violate the Constitution just this once in order to give themselves cover. The House will not take up this legislation to give President Trump a pass.

Do you hear me, my colleagues—my Republican colleagues? This will not pass. This is not a salve. It is a very transparent fig leaf. If you believe the President is doing the wrong thing, if you believe there shouldn't be an emergency, you don't say: Well, in the Congress we will introduce future legislation to change it, and, then, when the President declares another emergency, we will do new legislation to allow that too.

Come on. This fig leaf is so easily seen through, so easily blown aside that it leaves the constitutional pretensions of my Republican colleagues naked. The fig leaf is gone. Don't even think that it will have anything to do with what we are doing.

I hope my colleagues will stand strong. What the Republicans want to say with this fig leaf is, to paraphrase St. Augustine, "Grant me the courage to stand up to President Trump, but not yet."

Next time and next time and next time they will say the same thing.

Let's do the right thing. Let's tell the President that he cannot use his overreaching power to declare an emergency when he couldn't get Congress to

do what he wanted, and let's not make a joke of this by saying that there is some legislation that will not pass in the future that gives me the OK to vote for this, to vote against this resolution. That fig leaf makes a mockery of the whole Constitution and the whole process.

BUDGET PROPOSAL

President Trump put out his budget yesterday. It says "promises kept." That is one of the biggest lies I have ever seen because if you look at the booklet, it is promises broken.

The President said he would never cut Medicare and Medicaid. He slashes them. It is an \$845 billion cut to Medicare and \$1.5 trillion cut to Medicaid.

The President says he believes in a strong infrastructure bill. Promises kept? This bill cuts transportation by over 20 percent.

The President said that education is the civil rights of this generation. Promises kept? The President cuts education dramatically.

On issue after issue after issue, the President's budget shows the real President Trump and how far away he is from the promises he makes to the working people of America. Many of them are catching on, many more will, and this budget will be a way to show who the President is.

Even worse—not "even worse," but compounding the injury—there are huge giveaways to the wealthy, more tax breaks for the wealthiest of Americans. At a time when income distribution is getting more and more skewed to the top, when so much of the wealth of America and even the income of America goes to the top few, to have a budget that hurts the middle class, that hurts those trying to struggle to get to the middle class and makes it even easier for the wealthy to garner even more money—how out of touch is this budget?

I repeat my challenge. Leader MCCONNELL, this is your President. You seem to go along with him. Put this budget on the floor. Let's see if even a single Republican will vote for it. I would like to ask every one of my 53 Republican colleagues: How many of you will say, "I support this budget"? I bet not one—not one.

This budget is a slap on the face to every American who has worked hard every day, paid his or her taxes, expects Medicare in retirement, expects some way to afford healthcare for retirement.

President Trump's budget is inhumane. We Democrats will fight it and fight these heartless cuts at every single turn.

TARIFFS

Finally, on China, yesterday U.S. Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer told the Senate Finance Committee that he could predict the success of a trade agreement with China, saying there are major issues left to be resolved. I hope these major issues are the sinew—the meat—of what China does to us.

This is not an issue of soybeans or imports or balance of trade, which is getting worse, even with what President Trump did. This is an issue of China's stealing the greatness of the American economy. This is an example of China's being able to cascade huge amounts of products into America and not letting us sell our products freely there, or seldom, under such conditions that it isn't worth it, such as turning our intellectual property and know-how to China or to Chinese Government-controlled companies.

Lighthizer is doing a good job, but I worry that the President is more focused on getting a win than getting a good deal. The President should be proud that he stood up to North Korea and walked away. He should do the same thing here.

President Xi is not going to give him much, and the President should have the guts to walk away because China is in a much weaker position, in part, because of the tariffs that the President correctly imposed on China.

If the President walks away from a weak deal, the odds are very high that he will be able to come back to the table with a much better deal because China will have to relent. Stay strong. Don't cave. This is America's whole future at stake.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Hawaii.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, two weeks ago, the Senate broke a century of precedent and confirmed a judge, Eric Miller, to the Ninth Circuit over the objection of both home State Senators.

Last week, the majority leader filed cloture on two circuit court nominees, Paul Matey for the Third Circuit and Neomi Rao to replace Brett Kavanaugh in the DC Circuit.

Yesterday, Paul Matey became the second person in Senate history, after Eric Miller, to be confirmed without blue slips from both home State Senators. By eliminating the blue slip—a century-old policy that requires meaningful consultation between the President and home State Senators on judicial nominations—Senate Republicans have been able to speed through confirming partisan judges with strong ideological perspectives and agendas.

Donald Trump appointed 30 circuit court judges in his first 2 years in office. That is 17 percent of the Federal appellate bench. By contrast, President Obama appointed only 16 circuit court judges in his first 2 years in office, and President George Bush appointed 17.

Donald Trump and the majority leader, with the help of the chair of the Judiciary Committee, are breaking nearly every rule that stands in their way to stack, at breakneck speed, the Federal courts with deeply partisan and ideological judges.

And why are they doing this? They are packing the courts to achieve, through the courts, what they haven't

been able to accomplish through legislation or executive action—undermining *Roe v. Wade*, dismantling the Affordable Care Act, eliminating protections for workers, women, minorities, LGBTQ individuals, immigrants, and the environment.

The courts, with non-Trump judges, have been the constitutional guardrails stopping the Trump administration's deeply questionable policies and decisions, such as separating immigrant children from their parents, summarily ending DACA protections, and asking whether census respondents are U.S. citizens. All of these administration decisions have been stopped, for now, by Federal judges.

Trump's judicial nominees have extensive records of advocating for right-wing, ideologically-driven causes. In fact, these records are the reasons they are being nominated in the first place.

The nominees tell us to ignore their records and trust them when they say they will follow precedent and rule impartially, but after they are confirmed as judges, they can ignore promises made under oath during their confirmation hearing because they can. Short of impeaching these judges, there is nothing we can do about it—great for them, not great for Americans.

By the way, the average Trump judge tends to be younger, less diverse, and less experienced. They will be making rules that affect our lives for decades.

This week we are considering yet another Trump nominee, Neomi Rao, who should make us seriously ask how far the majority leader is willing to go to let Donald Trump pack the courts with extreme nominees and undermine the independence and impartiality of the Federal judiciary.

Neomi Rao is a nominee who has not only expressed offensive and controversial views in her twenties, but she has also continued to make concerning statements as a law professor. Her recent actions as Donald Trump's Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OIRA, have shown that her controversial statements in her twenties cannot be ignored as merely youthful indiscretions.

At the hearing, I asked her why, as a law professor, she defended dwarf-tossing by arguing that a ban on dwarf-tossing "coerces individuals" to accept a societal view of dignity that negates the dignity of an individual's choice to be tossed.

Does she seriously believe that dwarfs who are tossed do not share a societal view of dignity that being tossed is an affront to human dignity?

Ms. Rao asserted that she was only talking about a particular case and not taking a position one way or another on these issues. It is hard to understand what distinction she is making, but describing a ban on dwarf-tossing as not coercion is bizarre, especially coming from someone who purports to worry about the dignitary harm caused by affirmative action or diversity in education programs.

When I asked her about the strong ideological perspectives reflected in her writings and public statements, she claimed that she “come[s] here to this committee with no agenda and no ideology and [she] would strive, if [she] were confirmed, to follow the law in every case.”

Ms. Rao would have us ignore all of her controversial statements and positions and simply trust her blanket assertion that she has no agenda or ideology. In this, she is like the other Trump judicial nominees.

As a college student, Ms. Rao criticized environmental student groups for focusing on “three major environmental boogymen, the greenhouse effect, the depleting ozone layer, and the dangers of acid rain . . . though all three theories have come under serious scientific attack.”

More than two decades later, Ms. Rao demonstrated the same disregard for environmental concerns as the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OIRA. In this position she has consistently used her power and influence to strip away critical protections for clean air and clean water. For example, Ms. Rao supported efforts to replace the Clean Power Plan, which would have reduced greenhouse gas emissions with a rule that would actually increase air pollution and could lead to up to 1,400 additional premature deaths.

Her claim that she would simply follow precedent is also contradicted by her statements and positions relating to racial injustice. In her twenties, while discussing the Yale Women’s Center and what she called “cultural awareness groups,” she argued that “[m]yths of sexual and racial oppression propagate [sic] themselves, create hysteria and finally lead to the formation of some whining new group.”

I just wonder, what are these whining new groups that she refers to? Could it be women who want to support programs that support women?

In 2015, as a law professor, she disparagingly described the Supreme Court case that reaffirmed the Fair Housing Act’s protections against disparate impact discrimination as a “rul[ing] by talking points,” not law.

In Texas Department of Housing v. Inclusive Communities Project, the Supreme Court recognized that the disparate impact doctrine is an important way “to counteract unconscious prejudices and disguised animus” based on a policy’s discriminatory effects. Despite the Supreme Court precedent, when Ms. Rao became the OIRA Administrator, she began working to weaken rules protecting against disparate impact discrimination—upheld by the Supreme Court, by the way—particularly in the area of housing.

Her writings and actions related to sexual assault and rape are another reason we should be hesitant to believe her claim that she will merely follow the law free of her strongly held ideological views. In her twenties, Ms. Rao

repeatedly wrote offensive statements about date rape and sexual assault that disparaged survivors. In writing about date rape, she argued that if a woman “drinks to the point where she can no longer choose, well, getting to that point was part of her choice.”

In criticizing the feminist movement, she asserted she was “not arguing that date rape victims ask for it” but then argued that “when playing the modern dating game, women have to understand and accept the consequences of their sexuality.”

At her hearing and in a subsequent letter to this Committee, Ms. Rao tried to walk away from these offensive writings, stating that she “regret[s]” some of them and believes “[v]ictims should not be blamed.” But at the hearing she continued to insist that her prior controversial statements were “only trying to make the commonsense observation about the relationship between drinking and becoming a victim.” That is not how her statements came across.

She seems to acknowledge that by further claiming that if she were addressing campus sexual assault and rape now, she “would have more empathy and perspective.” That claim rings hollow, as she only recently oversaw the Trump administration’s proposed title IX rule that would make it harder for college sexual assault survivors to come forward and obtain justice.

Among other things, the proposed rule would require schools to conduct a live hearing where the accused’s representatives can cross-examine the survivor. It would also have the school use a higher burden of proof for sexual misconduct cases than for other misconduct cases.

I will close by noting that Ms. Rao previously criticized the Senate Judiciary Committee’s confirmation hearings for judicial nominees. In writing about the Supreme Court confirmation process, she complained that nominees are “coached to choose from certain stock answers,” such as “repeatedly alleg[ing] fidelity to the law.”

Back then she readily acknowledged that “judges draw on a variety of tools in interpreting the law, and that these tools differ for judges based on their constitutional values.” But now that she has been nominated to become a judge, she is the one giving the Judiciary Committee the formulaic “stock answers” that she criticized.

Before she became a judicial nominee, she indicated that nominees should not be confirmed “based on incantations of the right formulas without an examination of their actual beliefs.” We should hold her to her own words.

An examination of Ms. Rao’s record and actual beliefs show that the controversial views she held in her twenties are not so different from her statements and actions as a legal professional. That is why I will be voting against Ms. Rao’s nomination, and I strongly urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, desperate to distract from the \$93 trillion price tag of their so-called Green New Deal, the Democratic leadership here in the Senate has been coming down to the floor to claim that Republicans are ignoring climate change.

On February 14, the Democratic leader came to the floor and said: “Since Republicans took control of this Chamber in 2015, they have not brought a single Republican bill to meaningfully reduce carbon emissions to the floor of the Senate. Not one bill.” That is a quote from the Democratic leader just a month ago.

That would be news to me, and I think it would be news to some Democratic Senators here, as well. On January 14 of this year, for example, the President signed into law the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act. That legislation, led by Republican Senator BARRASSO and cosponsored by both Republicans and Democrats, paves the way for new advanced nuclear technologies, which will help further reduce carbon emissions.

Here is what the Democratic ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee had to say about this bill:

Nuclear power serves as our nation’s largest source of reliable, carbon-free energy, which can help combat the negative impacts of climate change and at the same time, foster economic opportunities for Americans. . . . This is another important step in our fight against climate change.

That is from the Democratic ranking member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. Let me repeat that. “This is another important step in our fight against climate change.” That is coming from a key Democrat on a key committee that deals with this issue. That is not a Republican talking; that is the Democratic ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee.

Then, of course, there is the Furthering Carbon Capture, Utilization, Technology, Underground Storage, and Reduced Emissions Act. Granted, that is a fairly long title. Several Republicans are original cosponsors of that. It became law as part of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018. The FUTURE Act, as it is referred to, extends and expands tax credits for facilities with carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration technologies, which are referred to as CCUS technologies.

Here is what the Clean Air Task Force had to say about this legislation:

[T]he U.S. Congress took a landmark step by passing one of the most important bills for reducing global warming pollution in the last two decades.

That is a quote from the Clean Air Task Force and what they had to say about that legislation.

Then there is the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act, led by Republican Senator MIKE CRAPO, which

became law in September. This legislation will help support the development of advanced nuclear reactor designs, which will increase America's supply of clean and reliable energy.

Here is what the junior Democratic Senator from Rhode Island had to say about this legislation:

Partnerships between the private sector and our world-class scientists at national labs will help bring new technologies forward to compete against polluting forms of energy. . . . I am proud to have worked with Senator CRAPO to get this bipartisan energy legislation over the finish line.

Here is what the junior Democratic Senator from New Jersey had to say:

Reducing our carbon emissions as quickly as possible requires prioritizing the development and commercialization of advanced nuclear reactors, which will be even safer and more efficient than current reactors. Passage of this legislation will provide critical support to startup companies here in the United States that are investing billions of dollars in these next generation reactor designs.

Here is what the Democratic whip himself had to say:

I was proud to join Senator CRAPO on this bipartisan bill.

I could go on. I could talk about the 2018 farm bill, which, in the words of Earth Justice, contains "a number of provisions that incentivize more climate-friendly practices." I serve on that committee. I was involved in the conservation title and the drafting of that, including a number of provisions in there. I could talk about the provision in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 to ensure the completion of our first two new nuclear reactors in a generation, which will prevent 10 million tons of carbon dioxide emissions annually; or the extension of wind and solar clean energy tax credits; or the bipartisan America's Water Infrastructure Act, which will help advance hydro-power projects—a significant source of emission-free energy.

Suffice it to say that Republican Senators have passed more than one bill to protect our environment and help America achieve a clean energy future, and we are not stopping here. So why all the misdirection on the part of the Democrats? I am sure Democrats think it is politically advantageous to portray themselves as the only party that is invested in clean energy.

Then, of course, Democrats are desperate to distract from the details of the \$93 trillion Green New Deal that their Presidential candidates have embraced. That is right—I said \$93 trillion. One think tank has released the first estimate of what the Green New Deal will cost, and the answer is between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion over 10 years. That is an incomprehensible amount of money.

For comparison, the entire Federal budget for 2019 is less than \$5 trillion. The 2017 gross domestic product for the entire world, the entire planet, came to \$80.7 trillion—more than \$10 trillion less than Democrats are proposing to spend on the Green New Deal. Ninety-

three trillion dollars is more than the amount of money the U.S. Government has spent in its entire history. Since 1789, when the Constitution went into effect, the Federal Government has spent a total of \$83.2 trillion. That is right—it has taken us 230 years to spend the amount of money Democrats want to spend in 10.

Even attempting to pay for the Green New Deal would devastate working families, who would be hit with incredibly high new taxes. Let's be very clear about this. This is not a plan that can be paid for by taxing the rich. Taxing every family making more than \$200,000 a year at a 100-percent tax rate for 10 years wouldn't get Democrats anywhere close to \$93 trillion. Taxing every family making more than \$100,000 a year at a 100-percent tax rate for 10 years would still leave Democrats short of \$93 trillion.

Of course, the amount of money we are talking about, as horrifying as it is, is just one negative aspect of the Green New Deal. Democrats' Green New Deal is a full-blown socialist fantasy that would put the government in charge of not just energy but healthcare and all the other various aspects of the American economy.

One of the Green New Deal's authors posted and then deleted a document from her website noting that the Green New Deal would provide economic security for those unable or unwilling to work. That is right—in the Democrats' socialist fantasies, apparently the government will provide you with economic security if you are unwilling to work. Let's hope there are enough willing workers to fund those who are unwilling to work. After all, that \$93 trillion has to come from somewhere.

It is no wonder that Democrats are trying to change the subject when it comes to the Green New Deal. They don't want to have to defend the specifics of their plan because their plan is, frankly, indefensible.

If the Democrats would like to have a serious discussion about energy, they should repudiate the unfathomably expensive Green New Deal and join Republicans in focusing on ways to secure a clean energy future without devastating the economy or bankrupting working families.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTIAN COOK

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise to recognize a gentleman by the name of Christian Cook.

Christian Cook has been a vital member of the staff on the Senate's Select Committee on Intelligence for the last 8 years and has been my personal des-

ignee on the committee for the majority of that time. Throughout Christian's career, he has continuously put his country above himself and has been tirelessly dedicated to achieving excellence in all areas of his work across the national security spectrum.

His passion to serve first led him to become a special agent for the U.S. Secret Service, where he expertly conducted investigations of violations of Federal criminal law and threats against the President and Vice President. He worked diligently to ensure that the safety and security of the President, the Vice President, and numerous foreign heads of state were without question. Christian also served a pivotal role in the design, preparation and execution of the security plan for the 2005 Presidential Inaugural Parade. Christian's focus on supporting national security efforts continued when he transitioned to the private sector.

While working with Booz Allen Hamilton, he skillfully developed time-sensitive and complex tactical solutions for classified U.S. intelligence clients. With The Cohen Group, Christian provided strategic insights that enabled key clients to meet their evolving global security needs. At the USIS, he also seamlessly managed complex, classified programs for the U.S. intelligence community and for Federal law enforcement Agencies, substantially strengthening their counterterrorism capabilities.

Christian subsequently joined the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. It is hard to know where to start to list his many accomplishments. In the last 8 years, he has done everything, and he has done it all to his own exceedingly high standards. He initially served with the audits team and was intricately involved in the committee's oversight of the U.S. intelligence community's 17 intelligence Agencies. By conducting thorough reviews of specific intelligence programs, his expert knowledge and deep insight enabled the committee to identify items of concern and outline proposals for their improvement.

It quickly became clear to me that Christian had an unsurpassed capability to conduct intelligence oversight but also a unique ability to analyze complex challenges and identify solutions. At that time, I personally selected him to be my designee on the committee. As my designee, he expertly analyzed and advised me on the myriad of threats across the intelligence landscape.

He also flawlessly facilitated the development, passage, and implementation of critical intelligence-related legislation in this body.

Several of Christian's colleagues have had the privilege to work with him for years. When asked what words best describe Christian, numerous clear themes resound, such as dedication, his passion for our Nation and its security,

very high standards, devotion to mission, and for always ensuring that the trains run on time.

Without fail, Christian is the person all staff goes to for insight, for guidance, and assistance with getting their job done. His colleagues appreciate his honesty, his integrity, and his ability to disarm anyone with a laugh and a warm word of appreciation.

When I became chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Christian was my clear choice to serve as my senior policy adviser and deputy staff director. In these critical roles, Christian expertly led the development and implementation of the strategic direction for the 15 Members of the U.S. Senate who sit on this committee and the committee staff. Regularly arriving at the office long before sunrise, he directed the day-to-day planning and execution of the committee's key oversight functions, to include establishing and managing the committee's complex open and closed hearing schedule, facilitating the confirmation process for numerous Presidential nominees, and managing the ongoing interactions between members of the committee and the leaders of 17 intelligence Agencies. He also adeptly coordinated the collaboration with other congressional committees and managed the daily activities of the committee's professional staff and administrative staff.

Separately and concurrently, Christian also continued to serve as my intelligence and national security advisor, providing keen insight and valuable advice on the full range of national security challenges. Throughout my time as chairman of the committee, I have always known I could count on Christian to provide me with critical background and sage advice on every issue, without fail, thanks in part to his uncanny ability to call to mind any facts he picked up in the last 8 years.

I note for the record the length of this list of responsibilities reflects Christian's hard work, long hours, and dedication. It also highlights the value he brings to me and to the committee. Christian has the foresight to anticipate problems, the instinct to pick the right time to drive forward, and the superior judgment to know the path right ahead.

Christian's tireless service was made possible not just because of his own dedication and character but because he was confident in the love and support of his wife Christina and the adoration of three young and precious sons—Casson, Callen, and Caulder. For their own sacrifice and for their willingness to share Christian with the committee, we are indebted to them.

I might say, on a personal note, at times he could, on weekends or breaks, be home with his three boys and his wife, instead he has been on an airplane with me flying somewhere around the world that nobody would consider a vacation site—traveling halfway around the world and back in

less than 3½ days, and that was done regularly. Now he will have an opportunity to get some normalcy to his life.

Christian's unwavering support to me has been impeccable. I am delighted to have the opportunity to publicly thank him and to note my personal appreciation for his dedication. He has earned our deepest respect, our admiration, and we will miss his devotion and his friendship. His positive impact on U.S. national security and his legacy within the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence will remain for years to come. I know I join the other 14 members in publicly saying to Christian that we wish him great success in the next chapter of life. We hope this one gives him the opportunity to see his children grow and to grow his relationship with his wife.

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

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

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the news cycle is relentless here in Washington, DC, and between cable TV and social media, it is pretty hard to remember what happened an hour or a day or a week ago, but it is important to talk about the context surrounding today's circumstances, and that is why I wanted to come talk a little bit more about what is happening on our southern border.

Twelve hundred miles of Texas is common border with Mexico, and we are at ground zero when it comes to what comes across the border and what happens at the border. Frankly, it is a lot more complicated than most people seem to appreciate, at least by the way they talk about it.

Not only is the border a source of economic energy for our country, by trade and legitimate travel, we know our border communities themselves are among the safest in the country. Their crime statistics are basically equivalent to that of any other comparable city in any other part of the country, but what happens across the border is a very different story.

Some of the most dangerous cities in Mexico are right there along the border, primarily because they are still controlled by the cartels that operate what are called plazas where they essentially take tolls or shake down people who are trying to come across for whatever purpose it might be, whether it is people coming across to find a job in the United States or drug traffickers or human traffickers—people selling women and children for sex or human servitude.

So it is a complicated scenario, to be sure, but one thing I can tell you is, there is a humanitarian crisis at the

border that was not manufactured by the Trump administration. In fact, the denial in which a lot of our Democratic colleagues find themselves I think is more related to the fact that President Trump is the one currently identifying it rather than the facts on the ground because, in 2014, President Obama called what was happening at the border a humanitarian crisis, and that did not seem to be a controversial comment at the time, but now that President Trump is calling this a crisis and emergency, people, unfortunately, can't take off their partisan jersey, and many call it a fake emergency or fake crisis, which is demonstrably false.

Let's go back to 2014. That year, about 68,000 families were apprehended at the southern border, an overwhelming number. This, coupled with an unprecedented surge of unaccompanied children, led President Obama, as I mentioned, to call this a "growing humanitarian and security crisis." That was President Obama. He was right, especially about the growing part.

Let me just pause for a moment to talk about why are we seeing children and families coming across the border as opposed to adult men.

We detained about 400,000 people coming across the border last year, but we are seeing more and more unaccompanied children and family units coming across the border. The simple fact is, the criminal organizations that exploit this vulnerability at our border have figured out what our laws provide for and where the gaps are, and they realize, if an unaccompanied child or a family unit comes across the border, current law requires us to separate the adult from the child—because we don't want to put a child in a jail or detention facility—and place them, through Health and Human Services, with a sponsor, ultimately, in the United States.

Once they get a sponsor in the United States, then it may be years, if ever, before their asylum claim is actually heard in front of an immigration judge. The fact is, in the vast majority of circumstances, that asylum claim will be granted—or I should say mooted by the fact that people don't show up months and years later for their hearing in front of the immigration judge but simply melt into the great American landscape.

In this case, the cartels win, and American border security loses because our Democratic colleagues simply refuse to work with us to make commonsense fixes to this broken asylum system which allows the cartels and children and family units to essentially exploit the vulnerabilities in our laws and successfully make their way into the country.

That is what they call a pull factor. There are push factors because of the violence occurring in countries in Central America, but the pull factor is the fact that if you try to come to the United States as an unaccompanied

child or a family unit, you will likely succeed. So it should be no surprise to any of us that these numbers continue to grow.

Back when President Obama talked about this being a growing humanitarian and security crisis, there were 68,000 family units apprehended at the border. In the last 5 months alone this year, there have been more than 136,000 family units apprehended along the southern border.

Historically, we witness the highest numbers of apprehensions in the spring and summer months, so I anticipate things will not get better—they will only get worse—in the months ahead. My State and our border communities are certainly feeling the brunt of these growing numbers.

We also know, as the Border Patrol has told us, that the cartels that move illegal drugs into the United States frequently try to flood the border with migrants, these family units, in order to distract law enforcement personnel from the heroin or the methamphetamine or the synthetic opioids, mainly fentanyl, that come across our border and poison so many Americans.

We know that last year alone, more than 70,000 Americans died of drug overdoses. A substantial amount of that was opioids, including the synthetic fentanyl. Frequently, the precursors come from China through Mexico and into the United States, and 90 percent of the heroin used in the United States comes from Mexico. This is a serious matter, and we should not turn a blind eye to it.

Compared to this time last year, family unit apprehensions have grown 200 percent in the Rio Grande Valley Sector. That is McAllen, TX, and that area. They are up more than 490 percent in the Del Rio Sector, and, most staggering, in the El Paso Sector, family unit apprehensions have increased more than 1,600 percent.

For those who believe this is somehow a fake emergency or not really a crisis, I would ask them: If those numbers were doubled or tripled, would they believe there is a crisis or an emergency? I believe there is now, and I believe those who deny that a crisis exists are simply turning a blind eye to it for, unfortunately, mainly partisan purposes.

Despite what many on the left claim, there is indeed a humanitarian crisis on the border. In addition to the waves of Central Americans arriving by the thousands, we are also trying to stop the flow of illegal narcotics, as I said, and combat the disgusting practice of human smuggling.

Last week, the Senate Judiciary Committee heard from U.S. Customs and Border Protection Commissioner Kevin McAleenan, who leads the more than 60,000 professionals working to provide security and a safe place for trade to come across our ports of entry. Many of these employees of Customs and Border Protection call Texas home and work alongside of State and

local law enforcement to protect us and our neighbors from the dangerous goods and, yes, persons trying to cross the border illegally.

Of course, the C in CBP stands for Customs, and they are also charged with promoting the safe and efficient movement of legitimate trade and travel. In Texas, given our proximity to the border, given our location, that is a big task. Our State is the No. 1 exporter in the country, with exports last year totaling more than \$315 billion. That is exporting things that we grow, livestock that we raise, and manufactured goods that we make. We sell those to Mexico, our biggest customer far and away.

Folks who live and work along the southern border are proud of the strong bonds our country has with our southern neighbor and the dynamic culture in the region. Many have family on both sides of the border, which makes it an extraordinarily unique place in our country. Thanks to the dedicated Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials, flourishing businesses, and a vibrant community, the border region is thriving.

I was on the telephone with one of my constituents from McAllen, TX, yesterday. He said: Our cities on the border are safe. You would think, from what you hear from the national discussion and debates in Washington, that people have to wear body armor in McAllen, TX.

I said: Well, part of the problem is that people are confusing the dangerous flow of goods and people across the border with actual violence occurring on the border.

Just to reiterate, our border communities on the U.S. side are some of the safest in the country. On the other side, for example, Juarez, which is on the other side of the border from El Paso, has historically been one of the most dangerous places on the planet, as well as Tamaulipas, which is the Mexican State right opposite of McAllen—again, a hot bed of cartel activity and violence.

But U.S. cities, I would say, are relatively safe, just like any other comparable city in the United States. So people perhaps not knowing better or, maybe, perhaps just trying to make a better story out of the facts, and I think conflate these ideas. But there is no doubt that the drugs, the human trafficking, and the masses of humanity coming across our border are creating a crisis at the border of a humanitarian and security nature.

Of course, between the ports of entry—and the ports of entry are where the legitimate trade and travel come across our international bridges—there are vast swaths of land that are relatively unpatrolled. The closest Border Patrol agent could be miles away—something human smugglers know and they exploit. These aren't good Samaritans leading immigrants to a better life. They are criminals who put profit before people and have zero regard for human life.

According to a 2017 study by Doctors Without Borders, 68 percent of the migrants reported being victims of violence during transit from Mexico or through Mexico, and 31 percent of the women surveyed had been sexually abused during the journey. These are the migrants who turn themselves over to the tender mercies of these criminal organizations. Sixty-eight percent have been victims of violence, and 31 percent of the women have been sexually assaulted. The journey these families face on their way to the United States is a harrowing one, and some of them don't make it. We have to continue working to stop anyone even considering this journey from attempting it.

I still remember going to Falfurrias, TX, which is away from the border but is a Border Patrol checkpoint. What happens is that the coyotes will bring people across the border, put them in stash houses in sickening and inhumane conditions, and, then, when the time is right, put them in a vehicle and transit them up our highway system. The Falfurrias checkpoint in Brooks County is one of the ones that checks people coming through on their way into the mainland.

But what happens is that the smugglers will tell the migrants: Get out of the car before the checkpoint. Here is a milk carton or jug full of water.

Maybe they give them some candy bars or the like, and say: We will see you on the other side.

So many of the migrants—particularly in the hottest part of the summer in Texas—unfortunately, die making that trip. I have been to Brooks County and have seen some of the unidentified bones and remains of migrants who died trying to make that trip.

Of course, you can imagine coming from Central America in the first place. By the time they even get to Falfurrias and Brooks County and the checkpoint, many of them are already suffering from exposure, including dehydration.

As you can imagine, during the time I have been in the Senate, I have spent a significant amount of time along the border meeting with CBP personnel, law enforcement officials, small businesses, landowners, community leaders, and other citizens about the challenges they and we are facing and what it is we might be able to do here in Washington to help. What I have heard repeatedly is that we need a three-pronged approach.

I know we are primarily focused on or obsessed with physical barriers, and that is certainly a piece of it, but that is only one of the three elements that we need to deal with border security. We need barriers in hard-to-control areas. We need personnel. We need the Border Patrol. And, yes, we need technology. Technology can be a force multiplier, we all know, to help the Border Patrol identify drug smugglers or human traffickers or coyotes bringing human or economic migrants across. What works best in one sector isn't

what is necessarily best for another. So this idea that we would build a physical barrier across the entire State is just nonsense. That is not what the President has proposed.

I remember that former Secretary of Homeland Security John Kelly, later the Chief of Staff, said: We are not proposing to build a wall “from sea to shining sea”—because he knew what we know, and that is that what works best in one sector doesn’t work well in another.

So we need to keep both the funding and the flexibility to provide the most needed resources that will work best. That is not something we should be trying to dictate or micromanage from thousands of miles away. As I mentioned, the humanitarian crisis has evolved significantly since 2014, and I have no doubt that it will continue to evolve in the coming years. We need to continue the conversation with experts on the ground and stakeholders on the ground and make sure that we can adapt as the threat evolves.

Based on feedback from my constituents in Texas, the funding bill we passed last month included five specific areas, including the Santa Ana Wildlife Refuge and the National Butterfly Center, where barriers cannot be constructed. It also included language stating that DHS must consult with local elected officials in certain counties and towns. I happen to believe that kind of consultation can be very positive and can lead to a win-win situation.

I will mention just one location in Hidalgo County, TX. They are right there on the river, and they had to improve the levees because they were worried about the rains leading to floods and the destruction that would follow. In order to deal with improvement of the levee system, they actually worked with the Border Patrol to come up with what they called a levee wall, which helped the Border Patrol control the flow of migrants to places where they could be accessed most easily, but it also provided the improvement in the levee system that helped the Rio Grande Valley, and, particularly, Hidalgo County to develop those counties without prohibitively high or even nonexistent insurance coverage. So that is an example of how, by consulting with local stakeholders, we can come up with win-win scenarios.

The border region’s future is bright, thanks to the dedicated law enforcement professionals, elected officials, and business community leaders who keep it safe and prosperous, but we simply can’t turn a blind eye and ignore the high level of illegal migration and substances moving across our border. We can’t turn a blind eye to the migrants being left for dead in the ranchlands by human smugglers. We can’t ignore the humanitarian crisis that continues to grow at an exponential rate.

The President’s emergency declaration was his commitment to finally ad-

dress the problems that overwhelmed our communities along the southern border—both in 2014, when President Obama identified it, and today. It is our duty to deliver real results—not only for the people of Texas but for our friends to the south.

I have heard the concerns raised by my constituents and colleagues about the use of emergency powers in this situation, and I share some of those concerns. I still believe that the regular appropriations process should always be used, but, unfortunately, we saw a refusal on the part of the Speaker of the House and others to engage in bona fide negotiations on border security funding, and that left the administration with what it deemed to be an inadequate source of revenue to do the border security measures they felt they needed in order to address the humanitarian crisis.

Rather than engaging with the President and debating whether the President has the authority to declare a national emergency for border security—which he clearly does—I think our discussions should focus on the structure of emergency powers laws moving forward and whether Congress has delegated too much power, not just to this President but to any President under these circumstances.

I think Brandeis University did a survey of all of the congressional grants of emergency powers that Congress has made over the last years and has identified 123 separate statutes which, if the President declares a national emergency, will allow the President to reprogram money that has been appropriated by Congress for various purposes. I think that is a serious over-delegation of authority by Congress to the executive branch, which is why I intend to cosponsor a bill introduced by our colleague, Senator LEE from Utah, to give Congress a stronger voice in the processes under the National Emergencies Act.

I am going to continue to come to the floor to argue with my colleagues about what we need in that unique part of our country, which is the border region, not only to have a prosperous region in America but also to have a safer America. It is not as simple, frankly, as some people would have it be, and it should not be the subject of partisanship and game-playing, like we have seen the debate over border security under the President’s request become.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Thank you, Mr. President.

It is good to hear from my colleague from Texas. I am here to talk about two different issues, but I did just want to say that I have had the pleasure and honor of visiting Senator CORNYN’s wonderful State. In fact, I was at the border last spring. It is a beautiful State that is full of hard-working and welcoming people. Certainly, our men

and women on the frontlines at the border are working incredibly hard and have a lot of excellent ideas about how to secure the border.

I do just want to make one point, which is simply that in addressing a humanitarian crisis at the border, we shouldn’t create another one by separating families at the border. To be clear, there is nothing in our law that requires families to be separated at the border. We simply should not be harming children as we deal with this issue.

I would welcome Senator CORNYN to our Homeland Security Committee, where we have discussed the various options that would keep us from hurting children in our care.

TITLE X

Mr. President, I am here today to rise in opposition to the Trump administration’s domestic gag rule on the title X program.

For more than 40 years, title X has provided women and families with comprehensive family planning and preventive health services. Congress created title X with a strong bipartisan vote, with Members of both parties recognizing how vital the services it provides are. Since then, for those in rural communities, for low-income women and men, and for members of the LGBTQ community, title X-supported health centers have been a major source of preventive care and reproductive health services, including cancer screenings, birth control, HIV and STI tests, and counseling services.

Title X helps communities and people throughout my home State of New Hampshire. Title X-funded centers deliver care to nearly 18,000 Granite Staters annually, and title X-supported Planned Parenthood centers serve 60 percent of those Granite Staters. In some parts of my State, there are no options other than a title X center, and if other options exist, they don’t provide the same expertise and commitment to reproductive healthcare services that title X centers offer. Community health centers around my State do important work, but they have told me that they will not be able to replace the services lost if the administration is successful in its efforts to target Planned Parenthood.

The Trump administration’s gag rule is simply dangerous. It would force providers to violate their professional and ethical standards regarding their obligation to give patients full and accurate information about their healthcare and would discriminate against providers who refuse to curtail truthful communication with their patients. This rule would cut investments in family planning clinics, taking away services that so many people depend on, with a disproportionate effect on low-income families and those who already struggle to access care. This effort is part of the shameless and blatantly political attempts from this administration to restrict access to healthcare.

By attacking providers, such as Planned Parenthood, the Trump administration is once again threatening the health and economic well-being of millions. Women in New Hampshire and across the country deserve better. They should have the right to make their own choice about if or when to start a family, and they should be able to visit providers of their choice who understand their healthcare needs and will be truthful about their healthcare options and realities. This title X gag rule undermines all of that.

I am going to continue to stand up for a woman's constitutionally protected rights, and I will do everything I can to fight back against these partisan attempts from the Trump administration to undermine women's reproductive healthcare.

Thank you.

NOMINATION OF NEOMI J. RAO

Mr. President, I also want to take a moment to express my opposition to a nominee the Senate is considering today for the DC Circuit Court of Appeals—Neomi Rao.

Ms. Rao is up for a lifetime appointment on the DC Circuit, but her record and previous statements make it clear that she is unfit for this position.

Ms. Rao's writings as a college student are nothing short of outrageous. Ms. Rao once described race as a "hot money-making issue." She has called the fight for LGBTQ equality a "trendy political movement." She has criticized the "dangerous feminist idealism which teaches women that they are equal." Perhaps most disturbing are Ms. Rao's previous writings on campus sexual assault and rape. Ms. Rao once claimed that women shared the responsibility for being raped, saying: "If she drinks to the point where she can no longer choose, well, getting to that point was part of her choice." She also noted that "a good way to prevent potential date rape is to stay reasonably sober."

I know that Ms. Rao has said she regretted these comments now that she is up for this appointment, but that cannot make up for the type of damage that rhetoric like this has done. In 2019, survivors are still not listened to and taken seriously, and dangerous rhetoric and callous beliefs like these have prevented women from coming forward with their experiences of sexual assault in the first place.

I cannot support a nominee who made a decision to publish these types of outrageous sentiments.

If Ms. Rao's previous statements aren't already disqualifying, then her record as a member of the Trump administration certainly is.

As the head of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OIRA, Ms. Rao signed off on a policy that would allow the Environmental Protection Agency to not use the best available evidence when developing clean air and clean water protections—a policy with dangerous implications given the fact that the Trump administration has ig-

nored science and fought to undermine these protections. Ms. Rao signed off on this policy even after publicly pledging to meet in a Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs subcommittee hearing that she would do just the opposite.

Additionally, one of Ms. Rao's first efforts in the Trump administration was approving an effort to eliminate reporting requirements proposed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to identify wage discrimination with regard to race and gender.

Finally, Ms. Rao approved of the title X gag rule, which, as I just discussed, will harm the health and well-being of people across the country.

It is clear that Ms. Rao is a partisan nominee with a dangerous record.

By the way, she has never tried a case—not in Federal court and not in State court.

Given her past comments, her record in the Trump administration, and her complete lack of experience, it is clear that she does not meet the standard that a lifetime appointment to a vital court requires. I will oppose her nomination today, and I urge my colleagues to do the same thing.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I would like to start by talking about one of the best things we are known for in Montana, and that is our great outdoors, whether it be our national parks, our iconic wildlife, hunting, or fly fishing. Like all Montanans, I want the peace of mind that I can continue to enjoy these opportunities with my kids and grandkids, just as my dad and my grandpa did with me growing up in Montana.

In Montana, we know how to foster commonsense, locally driven conservation to protect our environment. I am here to tell you today that there is nothing common sense about the so-called Green New Deal. In fact, the Green New Deal is a representation of everything that is wrong with Washington, DC. It is a radical, top-down idea that disregards the impacts on hard-working Montanans and Americans across our country.

You see, in Montana, we rely on a diverse portfolio of energy and fuel sources to help grow our economy, to create good-paying jobs, and to preserve our Montana way of life. In order to live where you also like to play—that is what we call Montana—you need a good-paying job. Montana is still a State where a mom or a dad, a grandma or a grandpa, or an uncle or an aunt can take a child down to Walmart and buy an elk tag over the counter and be at a trailhead to start elk hunting within 30 minutes. We need our ag production. We need clean coal. We need sustainable timber production. These are all part of our Montana way of life. They are all important to the

great State heritage we have. This Green New Deal would uproot all of that.

This Green New Deal sounds more like a socialist wish list than it does some great, bold conservation plan. Calling for an end to air travel, getting rid of all of the cows, and ceasing all production of coal would literally destroy our State's economy. The Green New Deal flat out doesn't work. Montana's rural communities would be left without any power or electricity. In fact, just this month, we saw record cold temperatures in Montana. I was trying to fly back to Washington, DC, a week ago Monday. When I got to our airport there in Bozeman, it was minus-40 degrees. We had to hold the plane for nearly 3 hours because deicing fluid only works at minus-25 and warmer temperatures.

The data that we have now looked at from during that cold snap shows that it was coal-fired generation—in particular, our Colstrip powerplant—that picked up the slack during those low temperatures. It kept the heat on for families across Montana.

Our wind turbines have difficulty working in subzero temperatures, and that is regardless of whether the wind blows. One of the challenges in a State like Montana is that when a high-pressure system moves in, whether in the wintertime or in the summertime—let's take the winter for example. When high pressure moves in, oftentimes that is associated with low temperatures. That usually is when we have a spike in requirements of energy consumption needs on the grid. What happens when a high-pressure system moves in is that the wind stops blowing. There is a reason wind is referred to as intermittent energy.

I am not opposed to the renewables. I think it is wonderful that we have wind energy in Montana. We have solar. We have hydro. We have a great renewable energy portfolio in Montana. But the reality is that during the coldest days of the winter, the wind doesn't blow. In fact, at minus-23 degrees and colder, they have to shut off the wind turbines because of the stress it presents to the materials of the turbines.

In the summertime, when high-pressure systems move in, the temperatures spike on the high side, and the wind stops blowing. At the same time, we have peak load on the grid.

So the commonsense thing to do is to focus on accelerating development of clean coal technology and keeping a balanced portfolio to make sure we meet the spike demands, whether they are in the summertime or in the wintertime.

While we should focus on accelerating investments to help renewables like wind become more reliable, which makes a lot of sense, we should continue to think about how to make renewables better.

The Green New Deal seems to think we all live in a fantasyland. In fact, it states how the United States has a disproportionate contribution to global

greenhouse gas emissions. Reports show that it is Asia, China, India, and other Asian countries. They are the countries that will drive energy consumption 25 percent higher by 2040 and with it, global gas emissions.

The Green New Deal doesn't tell the positive story right here at home that the U.S.—and listen to this—is actually a world leader in technological energy innovation; that is we, the United States, leads the world in reducing energy-related carbon emissions. In fact, since 2007, our emissions have decreased about 14 percent. In fact, it is more innovation, not more regulation, that will further reduce global carbon emissions.

Our world is a safer, more secure place if we accelerate energy innovation here at home, not cut the rug out from under us and cede that leadership to Asian countries. To top it all off, under the Green New Deal, it is the American people and it is Montanans, the hard-working taxpayers, who are going to pick up the bill.

Some estimates have found this radical proposal would cost hard-working families over \$600,000 per household over the proposed timeframe of that deal. That is about \$65,000 every year.

After only 10 years of implementation, Montanans will be stuck with a \$93 trillion tab; roughly, \$10 trillion more than the combined GDP of every nation on the planet in 2017. You see, this Green New Deal has nothing to do with conservation and the environment.

The people of Montana believe in smart and efficient conservation. Listen, I am an avid backpacker. I am an avid fly fisherman. I spend more time in the wilderness than many. My wife and I love to put backpacks on and get back in the High Country and chase golden trout, the elk, and cattle. I love pristine environments. Montanans share a similar passion for the outdoors, but Montanans know we need smart and efficient conservation, and there is not one smart or efficient thing about this proposal.

The Green New Deal is not a bold step forward. It is tragically backward. This is taking us back to Lewis and Clark, but don't take it from me. Take it from the hard-working Montanans, like our mine workers, like our pipe fitters, like our labor unions, which say:

We will not accept proposals that could cause immediate harm to millions of our members and their families. We will not stand by and allow threats to our members' jobs and their families' standard of living go unanswered.

That is why I am here today. We will not let this Green New Deal proposal go unanswered.

WELFARE-TO-WORK PROGRAMS

Mr. President, our Nation's primary welfare-to-work program is broken. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program, also called TANF, was created with bipartisan support in 1996. It was recently reauthorized tem-

porarily, but I believe we need to take bold action to reform it for today's generation.

TANF recognizes that funding and maintaining a job is the most effective way for healthy, working-age parents to go from government dependency to self-sufficiency. It is not about hand-outs. It is about giving a hand to those who need help the most.

Now, the more liberal voices of the times argue that TANF Programs wouldn't work. In fact, it was our former colleague, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who predicted that TANF would result in "children sleeping on grates, picked up in the morning frozen."

The critics were wrong. They were very wrong. TANF was a huge success. After TANF became law, welfare case-loads plummeted, child poverty declined, and unemployment among low-income, never married parents went up.

Yet more than 20 years after the historic 1996 reforms, Congress has neglected to act on the loopholes that are undercutting its fundamental work requirements.

Today, very few States are meeting the work participation rate required by the law. In fact, my home State of Montana is one of many that is falling short. You see, the law calls for 50 percent of welfare enrollees to be engaged in work. In Montana, they are only reaching about one-third.

Many States are also using TANF dollars for purposes unrelated to work, and we need to hold those States accountable. That means more transparency and accountability metrics.

As we have seen in President Trump's recent budget proposal, the President agrees that stronger work requirements must be a priority of this Congress. We can take the next bold step forward in reforming the TANF system to close these loopholes and get the American people back to work.

We are fortunate our economy continues to grow, and there are more opportunities being created. Just last Congress, we passed tax relief for the American people so working-class families got to keep more of what they earned and small business owners could afford to invest and grow in their business, creating more jobs. Main Street in America is thriving again.

As employers are rapidly looking to hire, we need to close the gap and ensure those jobs are filled by Americans who need them most. A strong, revitalized TANF Program is urgently needed to close this jobs gap and empower more Americans to find work.

We have a problem in this economy now. In fact, there are too many jobs available and not enough people to fill the jobs. That is a wonderful challenge to face. We have seen that now for 10 consecutive months. That is a great problem to face now in our country, but it is still a problem we need to solve. That is why we will be joining the U.S. House Ways and Means Com-

mittee this week to introduce the JOBS Act to demand positive work outcomes, rather than simply meeting ineffective participation rules.

It engages with every work-eligible individual to develop a plan that can lead to a sustainable career. It holds States accountable for their work outcomes and bolsters transparency of every State's performance.

The JOBS Act doesn't just demand work. It enables work. It substantially increases funding for vital childcare services so parents can ensure their child is cared for when they are trying to provide for their families.

It provides struggling beneficiaries with additional time to get the mental health or substance abuse treatment they need before they can hold a job.

It adds apprenticeships as a permissible work activity, alongside job training, getting more education, and building job readiness skills. It targets funds to truly needy families by capping participation to families with incomes below 200 percent of the Federal poverty level.

The JOBS Act recognizes there is dignity in work. A job, to most Americans, is more than just a job. It is an opportunity for mobility. It is a step up toward realizing the American dream. It is a track toward earning higher wages and better benefits. It can be a springboard to a meaningful career, and more importantly, it is hope for those who know hard times all too well. The dignity work brings can provide this hope.

The JOBS Act equips and empowers low-income families toward a better future. I urge my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to join me in taking bold action by supporting this important legislation to make our largest welfare-to-work program actually work again.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the nomination of Neomi Rao to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit.

The DC Circuit is considered by many to be the most powerful appellate court in the country. This is true in large part because the DC Circuit hears challenges to many actions taken by the Federal Government, including challenges to the adoption or repeal of Federal regulations.

I believe it is particularly relevant that Ms. Rao has a record of working to dismantle key regulations that ensure the air we breathe is safe, that address climate change, and that protect American workers and consumers.

Ms. Rao has a troubling and aggressive record as the head of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. She has led efforts to weaken fuel economy, or CAFE standards, which I authored with Senator Olympia Snowe and which has been the law since 2007. Before the administration proposed freezing these standards, we were set to achieve a fuel economy standard of 54 miles per gallon—MPG—by 2025.

Ms. Rao has also led efforts to repeal the Clean Power Plan. This repeal has been estimated to result in up to 1,400 premature deaths annually by 2030, due to an increase in particulate matter from emissions that are linked to heart and lung disease. Further, the repeal of the Clean Power Plan is expected to cause up to 48,000 new cases of serious asthma and 15,000 new cases of upper respiratory problems every year.

Ms. Rao was also instrumental in reversing the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's actions to address pay discrimination. Specifically, Ms. Rao eliminated reporting requirements proposed by the EEOC that were designed to identify wage discrimination on the basis of gender or race. Just last week, a Federal judge ruled that Ms. Rao's action was "arbitrary and capricious," which is significant because the arbitrary and capricious standard is high and hard to prove. The judge concluded that Ms. Rao's rationale for her decision was "unsupported by any analysis."

Ms. Rao also approved the recently finalized title X "gag rule" on family planning. Under this rule, any organization that merely refers patients to an abortion provider is ineligible for title X funding. This will result in many women going without lifesaving cancer screenings, and it will reduce access to contraception.

I asked Ms. Rao about her work dismantling these key regulations. In response to me, she downplayed her responsibility, saying that her role was simply to "coordinate regulatory policy."

But when answering the questions of Republican Senators, Ms. Rao expressed pride in her work. Asked specifically about her "primary contribution to pushing forward with deregulation," Ms. Rao responded: "There are a lot of regulations on the books that don't have the effects that were intended And, you know, we're looking to pull back the things that are no longer working."

However, to take just one example, the CAFE standards have been working; they have already saved \$65 billion in fuel costs for American families and prevented the emission of 250 million metric tons of carbon dioxide. Unfortunately, her words don't match the actual actions under her leadership.

Moreover, I asked Ms. Rao if she would commit to recusing herself from any case involving regulations that she worked on while serving in her current position. She refused to make such a commitment.

This is of great concern as other nominees have understood the appearance of bias and unequivocally made such commitments.

For example, President Trump's first nominee to the DC Circuit, Greg Katsas, said, "Under the governing statute, I would have to recuse myself from any case in which, while in the Executive Branch, I had participated as a counsel or advisor or expressed an opinion on the merits."

In addition to her record of dismantling key regulations that protect the environment, consumers, and worker health and safety, Ms. Rao has taken a number of extremely controversial positions in articles she has written. At Ms. Rao's hearing before the Judiciary Committee, I noted that, while the writings that received the most attention are from when she was in college, several are relevant to the work she has led in the Trump administration and to cases she could hear if confirmed.

For instance, in addressing the issue of date rape, Ms. Rao wrote that if a woman "drinks to the point where she can no longer choose, well, getting to that point was part of her choice."

While she has since written a letter expressing that she "lacked the perspective of how [her articles] might be perceived by others," her record demonstrates that these views seem to persist to today. Specifically, Ms. Rao has been personally involved in repealing protections for survivors of campus sexual violence. Ms. Rao has acknowledged that her office approved controversial new rules on campus sexual assault under title IX. Those rules would discourage survivors from reporting their assaults, in part because survivors would be subjected to cross-examination by their attacker's chosen representative. It is safe to assume this change in the guidance will be challenged in the DC Circuit.

In her writings, Ms. Rao also questioned the validity of climate change, criticizing certain student groups for promoting "a dangerous orthodoxy that includes the unquestioning acceptance of controversial theories like the greenhouse effect," which she argued "have come under serious scientific attack."

Again, at the hearing, she tried to mitigate these writings saying, it was her "understanding . . . that human activity does contribute to climate change."

However, during her tenure in the Trump administration, she has led the effort to overturn the very regulations that combat human contributions to climate change. For example, and as I noted previously, she has overseen the administration's efforts to rescind the Clean Power Plan and weaken fuel economy standards.

I am also concerned about Ms. Rao's professional experience. She is not admitted to practice before the DC Circuit, the court to which she has been nominated. She has never served as a judge, and she has never even tried a case.

In response to a question on the Judiciary Committee's questionnaire about the 10 most significant litigated matters that she personally handled, Ms. Rao listed only three, and two of these were arbitration cases that she worked on while serving as an attorney in the United Kingdom.

Ms. Rao's lack of litigation experience therefore raises an important

question as to her qualifications for this seat and suggests that she was nominated not because of her appellate credentials, but because of her anti-regulatory record.

I also have questions about commitments Ms. Rao appears to have made on reproductive rights. I don't believe we should have litmus tests for judicial nominees, and I know many on the other side agree with me on that. Just in 2017, Senator MCCONNELL said, "I don't think there should be a litmus test on judges no matter who the president is."

Yet, on a recent radio program, Senator HAWLEY said that, before he could vote for Ms. Rao, he wanted to "make sure that Neomi Rao is pro-life. It's as simple as that."

Subsequently, Ms. Rao met with Senator HAWLEY in private and presumably assured him that she would be anti-choice. According to Senator HAWLEY, Ms. Rao went further and "emphasized that substantive due process finds no textual support in the Constitution."

Rejecting the entire concept of substantive due process means that Ms. Rao not only believes *Roe v. Wade* was incorrectly decided, but also other landmark cases, like *Griswold v. Connecticut*, which held that States cannot restrict the use of contraception.

I am also concerned about her written responses to our questions for the record. She gave several responses that were misleading at best.

Ms. Rao wrote that the center she founded at George Mason University "did not receive any money from the Koch Foundation." She added that the center "did not receive money from an anonymous donor."

However, according to public records, in 2016, George Mason University received \$10 million from the Koch Foundation and \$20 million from an anonymous donor. The grant agreements executing these donations clearly state that support for Ms. Rao's center was one of the conditions of these multimillion dollar gifts and "Ms. Rao's center benefited from those contributions."

Additionally, Senator WHITEHOUSE asked Ms. Rao if she had any contact with the Federalist Society when considering potential faculty. Ms. Rao responded "no," but clarified the Federalist Society occasionally made recommendations through its faculty division.

What Ms. Rao failed to mention is that she, herself, was a member of the faculty division of the Federalist Society for her entire time in academia. Given this role, I don't understand why she would claim that she had no contact with the Federalist Society when considering faculty candidates.

In closing, my concerns about Ms. Rao, from her writings to her work dismantling regulations to her lack of candor with the committee, are simply too great for me to support her nomination to the DC Circuit. I will vote

against her confirmation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the nomination of Neomi Rao to serve as a judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Ms. Rao is the latest in a string of ultra-conservative judicial nominees who will rubberstamp Donald Trump's far-right agenda. Her record portends a threat to the rights of women and minorities, to consumer protection statutes and regulations, and to the security of our financial institutions.

Moreover, Ms. Rao utterly lacks the experience to serve on the court that many view as second in importance only to the U.S. Supreme Court. She practiced for only 3 years as an associate at a large law firm. None of her practice was in Federal courts or State courts, before administrative agencies, or involved criminal proceedings.

These are disqualifying reasons on their own, but I rise to speak about Ms. Rao's record on the environment, and the contempt she has demonstrated for fair, reasonable, and commonsense regulations that protect the health of our communities and the safety of our air and drinking water.

Ms. Rao currently serves in the Office of Management and Budget as Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OIRA. She is commonly known as the Trump administration's "regulatory czar." This role has her in charge of implementing the Trump administration's anti-environment, climate-change-denying, and polluter-friendly agenda.

Ms. Rao has called climate change a "dangerous orthodoxy," led the Trump administration's efforts to gut fundamental environmental protections, and has misused the regulatory review process for partisan political purposes.

The attacks on the environment that Ms. Rao has launched from OIRA include rolling back national auto fuel efficiency standards, challenging California's Clean Air Act waiver that allowed it to set higher fuel efficiency standards, removing safety rules for fertilizer plants, and rolling back safety rules put in place for oil rigs after the Deepwater Horizon oil spill disaster in 2010.

During review of a proposed rollback of the Methane and Waste Prevention Rule, Ms. Rao's office repeatedly pressured the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, to adopt fossil fuel industry requests to significantly reduce natural gas leak inspections. This would have doubled the amount of methane released into the atmosphere and, according to the EPA's own determination, conflicted with its legal obligation to reduce emissions.

Ms. Rao's office censored language about the impact of climate change on child health when reviewing a proposed rollback of the Refrigerant Management Program, a program that limited the release of greenhouse gases thousands of times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

Ms. Rao's office approved a proposed EPA rule to roll back public health protections that reduce pollution from wood-burning stoves, despite the EPA's own admission that the new rule would cost nine times as much in harm to public health as it would benefit the industry.

Ms. Rao has overseen the Trump administration's repeal of regulations to address climate change, including a repeal of President Obama's historic Clean Power Plan that would have significantly reduced greenhouse gas emissions. By comparison, Ms. Rao has approved a proposal to replace the Clean Power Plan with a rule that would lead to increases in carbon dioxide emissions, asthma attacks, and even death from black carbon, mercury, and other dangerous air emissions from power plants.

It is bad enough that, with Donald Trump, we have a climate-change denier in the White House, and with Andrew Wheeler, we have a coal industry lobbyist running the EPA. We don't need a judge on the DC Circuit whose record demonstrates that she is a sympathetic ally to their anti-environment agenda. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the nomination of Neomi Rao to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

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

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 44 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Booker	Cardin
Bennet	Brown	Carper
Blumenthal	Cantwell	Casey

Coons	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Sinema
Duckworth	Manchin	Smith
Durbin	Markey	Stabenow
Feinstein	Menendez	Tester
Gillibrand	Merkley	Udall
Harris	Murphy	Van Hollen
Hassan	Peters	Warner
Heinrich	Reed	Warren
Hirono	Rosen	Whitehouse
Jones	Sanders	Wyden
Kaine	Schatz	
King	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—1

Murray

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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 bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, for a term of four years.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, John Hoeven, John Barrasso, Chuck Grassley, Roy Blunt, Johnny Isakson, Lamar Alexander, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roger F. Wicker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, for a term of four years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 45 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Cruz	Kennedy
Barrasso	Daines	Lankford
Blackburn	Enzi	Lee
Blunt	Ernst	Manchin
Boozman	Fischer	McConnell
Braun	Gardner	McSally
Burr	Graham	Moran
Capito	Grassley	Murkowski
Cassidy	Hawley	Paul
Collins	Hoeven	Perdue
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Portman
Cotton	Inhofe	Risch
Cramer	Isakson	Roberts
Crapo	Johnson	Romney

Rounds	Shelby	Toomey
Rubio	Sinema	Wicker
Sasse	Sullivan	Young
Scott (FL)	Thune	
Scott (SC)	Tillis	

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Jones	Shaheen
Brown	Kaine	Smith
Cantwell	King	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Udall
Casey	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Peters	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Reed	Wyden
Harris	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—2

Duckworth	Murray
-----------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, for a term of four years.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM BEACH

Mr. BLUNT. I want to talk a little about the Green New Deal, but I can't pass up the opportunity to point out that we are now starting 30 hours of debate on the Director of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

It is outrageous. Everybody knows it is outrageous. If you start the clock right now, there will not be an hour of debate—there might not be 10 minutes of debate—on the Director of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but what our friends on the other side have done is ensure that we can't do any other business during that 30 hours, and, at some point, once it is too late to do anything else this week, they may even waive some of that time back.

This has to change. I certainly would like to see Members on the other side of the aisle work with us to make that change. The bill I have reported out of the Rules Committee that we have reported out of our committee to change this is given more verification every single week, as we try to let the President put a government in place, as we try to do our job of confirming judges to judicial vacancies. That has to stop, and I believe it is about to stop. I would like to see some cooperation from our friends on the other side so we can move forward in the way the Senate should move forward.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. President, the Senate has also been talking about legislation called the Green New Deal. A dozen of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have put this legislation in place. When you sponsor a piece of legislation, it usually means you are for that piece of legislation and think it needs to be debated, and it sure does.

This is a huge piece of legislation. Anything called the green anything would mean you would think it would be mostly about climate change or environmental things, but actually most

of it is about other things. I want to talk for a few minutes about what it says about healthcare.

It is estimated that one part of the Green New Deal would cost \$36 trillion over the next 10 years. That is about the same amount of money we would spend for everything else over the next 10 years of the money we appropriate. It is such a big number; it is hard to imagine how you would even describe it, but \$36 billion would be 100 times what it would cost to rebuild the entire Interstate Highway System. If you can imagine the entire Interstate Highway System, and you wanted to build it all over again—build it again, go in and tear it up, and build it again—do that 100 times over the next 100 years or however many years it would take, that is \$36 trillion. I might have even said earlier \$36 billion, but it is \$36 trillion, 100 times what it would cost to build the entire Interstate Highway System all over again.

It is an absolutely enormous figure, but the government is accepting an absolutely enormous new obligation, an obligation that, just in terms of the healthcare part of this bill, would again be more than all the money we would expect to spend over the next 7 years.

That would take us through fiscal year 2025. Everything we would spend on Social Security, everything we would spend on Medicare, everything we would spend on Medicaid, everything we would spend on defense, on education, on homeland security, on interest on the debt, and everything else would be less money than we would spend in the first decade on Medicare for All.

If you look at this legislation, it is pretty obvious that Medicare for All would, for a lot of reasons, be Medicare for None. One is that big of a system probably wouldn't serve anybody very well, if at all. Two is that Medicare would be eliminated. It would just be part of a big healthcare system. If you are planning on benefiting from Medicare as we know it today, that will not be there if this bill passed because everybody would have something that would be theoretically like Medicare is now, but there wouldn't be Medicare; there wouldn't be Medicaid; there wouldn't be military TRICARE; there wouldn't be the Children's Health Insurance Program. None of the things we have now would exist. They would all become part of this big system of Medicare for All.

In fact, it actually would eliminate private health insurance. We are in this debate way beyond the debate of the days of when President Obama said over and over again, if you like your current healthcare insurance, you can keep your current healthcare insurance. Nobody even pretends with Medicare for All that would be the case. In fact, this legislation specifically says: "It is unlawful for a private health insurer to sell health insurance coverage that duplicates the benefits provided

under this Act." You will have no choice but to look at Medicare for All.

So when they say Medicare for All, they really mean Medicare for All. The other forms of healthcare coverage would be gone.

One of our colleagues who is also running for President said: "Let's eliminate all of that." "That" in the question was private health insurance. "Let's eliminate all of that. Let's move on."

Well, what moving on would look like would be everybody, again, thrown into one system. There would be a single-payer, the Federal Government. There would be a single system. You could call it Medicare for All or anything else you want to call it, but there would be one place to go.

We are now spending about \$6 trillion over the next 10 years on Federal healthcare systems. This would go from \$6 trillion to \$36 trillion.

I could spend a lot of time talking about, how could we afford that? What would the taxes look like? The point is, it is an outrageous proposal, particularly for the millions and millions of Americans who like the insurance they have, who get insurance at work. It has been a benefit in our country that workers first started getting right after World War II. It has been a benefit at work that workers have never paid taxes on. It has been a benefit at work that an awful lot of people have been well served by.

We need to fill in the gaps. We need to create more options. We need to do lots of things. This isn't one of them. When people lose their healthcare options, when people begin to have to stand in line for healthcare like people do in Canada, they are quickly persuaded that, whatever turn was made, it was made in the wrong direction.

This would be a turn in the wrong direction. It would be something the government can't afford and individuals and families will not want. It would be something that people who have actually depended on Medicare being there when they qualify for Medicare—and people pay into it all their working lives, just like they do into Social Security, except there is no cap, so many people pay a lot more into that fund than they do the Social Security fund—but it would be gone. Medicare for All would be Medicare for None.

I think there is a reason sponsors of this bill aren't eager to talk about a lot of it and don't even want to vote on it. If I had sponsored it, I might not want to vote on it either.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S.J. RES. 7

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am reading a book called "These Truths"

by Jill Lepore. It is a history of the United States. She is a really gifted historian and writes quite a few things. She has an article in the New Yorker magazine about Eugene V. Debs, an early Socialist in the 20th century who ran for President. She is a skillful historian, and she tells a story in "These Truths" about how this Nation came to be.

Of course, we emerged from a colony—a colony of England, Great Britain—and then fought for our independence. One of the reasons we fought for independence was to take the role of Kings out of the lives of the people who lived in what we call America and to say we aren't going to have Kings making decisions for us here. We will make our own decisions. Thank you. We will call it a democracy, and the people will rule.

At that point, we sat down and tried to put it in writing. The first time we put it in writing, it didn't work out too well. The Articles of Confederation really didn't unite our country and move it in the direction that most people wanted. So the constitutional convention followed. The constitutional convention in Philadelphia sat down and wrote this document, the Constitution of the United States, and here we are, over 200 years later, still living by those words that were written over 200 years ago.

There were efforts to change and amend it to reflect changes in America. The end of slavery, for example, was one of the most significant, but, by and large, the principles of this document have guided us for a long time.

Article I, section 8 gives the Congress—the Senate and the House—the power to declare war. You think to yourself: Well, it is certainly better for the Congress to make that decision than for a President to do it alone. Letting a President do it without the people being involved, or Congress, really would be much like a King deciding whether we would go forward as a nation to be involved in a war.

This week, on the floor of the Senate, we will test that provision in the Constitution and see if the current Members of the Senate believe that the Constitution was right and that the Congress should be declaring war.

My colleagues, BERNIE SANDERS, well-known to most across America, MIKE LEE, a conservative Republican from Utah, and CHRIS MURPHY, a Democrat from Connecticut, have decided that we should have a test vote as to the United States' involvement in Saudi Arabia's bloody war in Yemen. I am glad to be a cosponsor of that legislation.

Regardless of who has been in the White House during the time that I have served in the House and the Senate, I have tried to consistently argue that the American people, through their elected Congress, must play a constitutional role in declaring a war—whether it was President Bush on the Iraq war or President Obama on the

U.S. military intervention in Syria or Libya.

I think the Constitution is very clear and very wise in saying that the American people, before we ask their sons and daughters to give up their lives in a war, should have a say in these decisions through their elected Members of Congress.

What we are doing today is deeply important. It occurs in the 18th year of a war in Afghanistan that hardly anyone could have imagined would be the case. Did anyone here who voted, as I did, 18 years ago—18 years ago, voting in this Chamber—for the authorization of the use of force in Afghanistan to go after the perpetrators of 9/11 believe that we were authorizing the longest war in the history of the United States, in Afghanistan—I am sure not a one—or that this authorization would be stretched by Presidents of both political parties to approve U.S. military action in other countries around the world? It became a blanket authorization that has been used time and again.

This brings me to the question before us in the Senate today—the disastrous, bloody war, led by the Saudi Arabians in Yemen, which the United States is supporting.

Has there been a vote in the Senate for that? No. In the House? No. Does anyone here remember authorizing any U.S. military involvement in the war in Yemen? Well, they certainly couldn't find a recorded vote to prove it.

Did anyone who voted in 2001, as I did, to go after the terrorists responsible for 9/11, believe that this would somehow include a Saudi-led quagmire in Yemen?

This war in Yemen is being led by a reckless young Saudi Crown Prince, whom I believe had direct involvement in the brutal murder of a journalist and resident of the United States, Jamal Khashoggi. It is highly unlikely that anybody would have argued that we gave permission for the U.S. Military and taxpayers' dollars to be spent in support of this Saudi Arabian cause.

Not only was this war never authorized by elected representatives or the American people, but it is a humanitarian disaster. An estimated 85,000 children have already died of malnutrition. We have created a famine with this war in Yemen. In a country of 28 million people, nearly half face death through famine.

I have a photo here, which I have displayed once on the floor, but I can't bring myself to do it again. It is a photo of a 7-year-old Yemeni girl, Amal Hussain. It is a heartbreaking photo. It appeared in the New York Times last November. This little girl died shortly thereafter. She starved to death. I just can't bring myself to display this photo again.

Do you know what her mother said after she died? It is what any mother would say: "My heart is broken."

This is a reality of the war that the United States supports in Yemen. We

have not debated it. We have not approved it. Yet taxpayers' dollars make certain that it continues day after day, week after week, month after month, and year after year.

Now, let's take a look at Saudi Arabia, which has asked us to join in this effort in Yemen that is causing such a humanitarian disaster. This is the same Saudi Arabia—the nation that conducted the cold-blooded murder of Jamal Khashoggi, a nation that is detaining and torturing women's rights activists, including Loujain al-Hathoul and Samar Badawi. This is a nation that is detaining and torturing U.S. citizen Dr. Walid Fitaihi. It is jailing Saudi blogger Raif Badawi and his lawyer, Waleed Abu al-Khair, on charges that are ridiculous on their face.

Saudi Arabia is accused of recruiting and using Sudanese children as soldiers in the war in Yemen. Saudi Arabia continues to turn a blind eye to the export of extremist teachings that have shown up and caused great harm around the world, most recently in Bosnia and Kosovo.

There may be some who think this war is justified. I am not one of them. There may be some who think that because Iran is the enemy, we should be engaged in this war. But, ultimately, this war, this debate, and this vote are not about the merits of any of the things that I have raised. It is not about a vindication of the Houthis, whom the Iranians have sided with, and their troubling role in this horrific civil war. It is about whether we in the Senate, who took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, believe it. If we don't believe it, we will just ignore it, let our military wage the war, let the President look the other way, and let this administration come up with another excuse for Saudi Arabia killing that journalist, and we will keep sending our tax dollars in, which prolong this terrible war.

I think the Constitution requires more of us. If you truly believe in what the President is asking us to do in Yemen, if you truly want to stand with Saudi Arabia at this moment in history, show the courage by voting that way. That is all I am asking for.

Our Founding Fathers showed great wisdom. They knew that the decision to send someone's son or daughter into a war was not to be made by a King or a supreme executive but by the people—the people of the United States. So our Constitution wisely rests that responsibility with us—the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

Today, there will be a recorded vote—a historic vote—as to whether we go forward with this involvement in the war in Yemen. I will be voting against any more involvement by the United States in this war.

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

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 46 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sinema
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Perdue	

NAYS—44

Baldwin	Harris	Rosen
Bennet	Hassan	Sanders
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Schatz
Booker	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Jones	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kaine	Smith
Cardin	King	Stabenow
Carper	Klobuchar	Tester
Casey	Leahy	Udall
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	

NOT VOTING—1

Murray

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each and with 30 minutes controlled by the Senator from Iowa, Ms. ERNST, or her designee.

The Senator from Wyoming.

THE GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor to discuss the so-called Green New Deal.

America needs every form of energy in order to succeed, but the Democrats' extreme Green New Deal would send our strong, healthy, and growing economy over a liberal cliff. This radical plan would eliminate fossil fuels by requiring 100-percent renewable, carbon-free fuels in just 10 years.

Clearly, we realize that the climate is changing and that the global community has a collective duty to deal with this and to address it. Renewables like wind and solar are certainly a key part of the solution, but still, in the United States today, wind and solar provide only 8 percent of our power. Abundant, reliable, and affordable fossil fuels, like coal and natural gas, power about three out of five U.S. homes and businesses. Excluding them would harm our national security; it would make us dependent on foreign energy; it would destroy jobs; and it would reduce our quality of life.

In a letter sent to the Green New Deal's sponsors, the AFL-CIO—the Nation's federation of labor unions that represents about 12½ million employees and 55 different unions—called the plan a threat to U.S. workers. The letter reads: "We will not accept proposals that could cause immediate harm to millions of our members and their families."

Those at the AFL-CIO also say the plan is not achievable or realistic, and I agree with them. By themselves, renewables can't keep the lights on, and an all-renewable energy electric power grid would collapse. This isn't serious environmental policy—it is a pipe dream.

The Democrats have yet to provide a cost estimate for the Green New Deal. One analysis by the former Director of the Congressional Budget Office estimates it could cost up to \$93 trillion—with a "t." That is more than the U.S. Government has spent in our Nation's entire history—combined. We are \$22 trillion in debt right now. So how are we going to pay for it—by borrowing more money we don't have or by hiking taxes?

The crushing burden is going to fall the hardest on working families. To get to this number, it would drain every person's checkbook in America, starting with Warren Buffett and going all the way down. The Green New Deal would cost every American family as much as \$65,000 a year every year. That is more than the average family makes in America. In Wyoming, where the average family's income is way above average, it would cost the family \$61,000 a year.

Despite the heavy toll it would take, the Green New Deal would still fail to significantly lower the Earth's temperature. Already, America leads the world in reducing carbon emissions. In 2017, the U.S. produced just 13 percent of the global emissions, and China and India combined produced 33 percent.

Let's take a look at this from a global standpoint. To me, it doesn't make any sense at all to destroy our competitive economy and allow the biggest polluters to continue to prioritize growth at our expense. Backbreaking tax increases and heavyhanded mandates are not the answer. The solution is to promote free market innovation, and the Republicans continue to advance several innovative strategies for reducing emissions.

First, we are encouraging carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration technologies. That means actually capturing carbon and using it productively for medical products, for construction products.

There are things we can actually do. Last year, we passed a bipartisan bill in this body that was signed into law. It is called the FUTURE Act, and it expands tax credits for capturing carbon.

The Clean Air Task Force calls it one of the most important bills for reducing global warming pollution in the last two decades.

Our carbon capture work continues with the bipartisan USE IT Act, which is going to help turn captured emissions into valuable products.

The other thing we are promoting is advanced nuclear power technologies. Nuclear power has helped lower emissions by providing most of America's carbon-free energy.

In late December, we passed the bipartisan Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act. This law will help innovators develop new-age nuclear reactors that are cheaper, better, and more reliable.

We also have extended the nuclear tax credit to speed completion of two new nuclear reactors. We are going to speed that completion—the first in a generation. Together they will prevent 10 million tons of emissions every year.

Third, we are encouraging an increase in the use of renewables. Republicans have repeatedly passed tax incentives to promote clean energy.

These include tax credits for wind, for solar panels, as well as incentives for biodiesel and compressed natural gas. The clean energy strategies that Republicans have been working on in a bipartisan way are working because America leads the world in reducing energy-related emissions.

Since 2007, U.S. emissions have been down 14 percent. This progress is the result of innovation. So let's continue to promote proven solutions. Let's reject the Democrats' Green New Deal as unreasonable, unworkable, and unaffordable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, last week, I joined several of my colleagues to highlight the unrealistic and unreasonable and impractical ideas of the Green New Deal—the staggering cost, which is more than the Federal Government has spent in our history; the misguided assumptions about what it

would take to decarbonize the U.S. economy on such an aggressive timeline; and the sorts of social programs that fundamentally change the United States, and, I would add, not in a good way, in my opinion.

But the worst part that has been talked about is a point I made last week. This resolution, this green deal resolution, dismisses or ignores the realistic and pragmatic environmental solutions that this Congress and past Congresses have already been working on.

I serve on the Environment and Public Works Committee with Chairman BARRASSO, who just spoke, and we have been working together in many different areas to get the same sorts of ends.

The supporters of the Green New Deal actually claim Congress has done nothing. Unfortunately, some in the media and some others seem to be reiterating that same message.

As in so many policy arenas, the latest shiny object distracts from the great bipartisan work that is being done in these Halls—work that sometimes just doesn't get noticed—and that is exactly what is happening here.

Well, today I would like to highlight some of the practical, realistic, bipartisan efforts that will put us on the right path without killing jobs or overburdening Americans with government spending and higher costs.

Just yesterday, President Trump signed into law the bipartisan lands package we passed in the Senate last month, and it was an overwhelming vote. As part of that legislation, we permanently reauthorized the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is a critical resource for protecting and preserving some of our country's most beautiful public lands, including those in my State of West Virginia.

Another example of the legislative solutions that we have advanced is the FUTURE Act, which I led with my Democratic colleagues, former Senator Heidi Heitkamp from North Dakota and Senator WHITEHOUSE from Rhode Island, along with Chairman BARRASSO. That legislation had a bipartisan group of 25 cosponsors and the support of an incredibly diverse and broad coalition of supporters: environmental groups, oil and gas companies, Governors from around the country, and labor unions.

What cause could bring these diverse stakeholders together? Carbon capture utilization and storage—CCUS.

The FUTURE Act reauthorized and improved the section 45Q tax credit for CCUS, and it requires the certainty that the carbon stays captured for good and is used in real products for market potential.

It is not about research and development. There are other Federal programs that are reserved for that important endeavor. It is about establishing real incentives for the commercial deployment of CCUS technologies and establishing a national market for carbon.

Only a market-based solution like the FUTURE Act can lead to broad adoption of CCUS. And CCUS is something that the International Panel on Climate Change at the U.N. and several other climate and scientific organizations say must be a part of the international solution to this global challenge.

The FUTURE Act also includes support for direct-air capture projects, and that means not just from a power source or some other manufacturing source. It is actually capturing it in the free air in the environment, which can literally pull CO₂ out of the atmosphere for storage or use in marketable products. That can work to make new industries carbon-negative and carbon-neutral.

The United States can be a leader in this space because the environment is a global concern, and we can't control other countries' industrial and environmental policies, nor do we want them controlling ours.

With CCUS and direct-air capture, not only can we cut our emissions while maintaining high-paying coal, gas, oil, and manufacturing jobs, but we can also capture emissions emitted abroad and use them in value-added products.

The FUTURE Act was passed as part of the bipartisan Budget Act last Congress, and we are already seeing new projects being proposed to benefit from this policy. Even more will be coming forward as we build on this success, and that is where the USE IT Act comes in.

We introduced that legislation with the same group of cosponsors with Environment and Public Works Committee Ranking Member CARPER stepping in for Senator Heitkamp. We have a similar coalition of supporters across industry, environmental groups, State governments, and labor.

The USE IT Act will direct an inter-agency council to review the guidelines and create a playbook for permitting CCUS projects and associated carbon dioxide pipelines. This certainty from Federal Agencies is essential so that those seeking to utilize the 45Q tax credit that I talked about previously in the FUTURE Act can do so before it expires.

I look forward to advancing this legislation in Congress. We have already had a hearing on it—a very great bipartisan hearing on this—and I look forward to furthering our achievements in the CCUS space.

The FUTURE Act also includes seed money for breakthrough innovations in carbon capture. This expands on the good work that is already being done in CCUS research and development, primarily through the funding of the Fossil Energy Research and Development Office.

Congress has invested more than \$4 billion in CCUS through that program alone, in addition to several other programs to make more efficient and environmentally sound use of our fossil re-

sources. Some of these breakthroughs are being developed at the National Energy Technology Lab in Morgantown, WV, in conjunction with outside partners like West Virginia University.

I will continue to advocate for this kind of robust funding for these sorts of innovative energy programs, and I will support improving energy efficiency and ensuring that the United States remains a leader in carbon-free nuclear energy.

Doing the hard-nosed legislating and coalition building to achieve these goals is tough enough without all of the noise around a Green New Deal. Despite this distraction, I am confident we can continue to notch wins in this arena. We have to because there is simply too much riding on it for our economy and for our environment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, when it comes to bankrupting our country, the Green New Deal puts all other ideas to shame. It calls for rebuilding or retrofitting every building in America in the next 10 years, eliminating all fossil fuels in 10 years, eliminating nuclear power, and working toward ending air travel. This Green New Deal is not a serious policy idea; it is a unicorn.

Democrats failed to grasp something basic: Republicans and Independents care about the environment. We want clean air, we want clean water, and we want to take care of our environment and natural resources. At the same time, we also care about our economy, jobs for families in our States, and making sure that everyone in our country has the opportunity to succeed. We believe that taking care of the planet and working to create a better economy are objectives that can and must be pursued at the exact same time.

You can't afford to take care of the environment if you don't have a strong economy. The Green New Deal would destroy our economy. To embrace this Green New Deal plan is to be an enemy of the American economy and the American worker because when you stop and think about it, the Green New Deal is, in reality, the green job killer.

Some will say: Why bother picking on this plan? It is not like it has any chance of being enacted.

Here is the problem: A socialist from New York City with a massive Twitter following introduced this nonserious plan, and every single major Democrat running for President immediately embraced it. Let that sink in for a moment.

Climate change is real and requires real solutions, but the Democratic Party has accepted this economy-destroying new deal as a new commandment to go alongside single-payer healthcare and higher taxes on job creators.

For most Americans, this plan is a declaration of war on the economy, our

way of life, and the standard of living for working class families across our great country.

What does this mean for Florida? Well, it would mean the end of the tourism industry; that is, 1.4 million jobs, massive job loss, and unemployment.

As for me, I love and cherish the environment. It is what makes the great State of Florida so great. What I don't love are naive plans that would destroy Florida's economy.

During my time as Governor of Florida, we made record investments in our environment, and we were able to do that only because Florida's economy was booming and we had the resources to make these investments. The Green New Deal would reverse every ounce of progress we have made.

The most incredible part of the Green New Deal plan is the statement that they will provide "economic security for all people of the United States." No government can ever do that. To argue otherwise is a disservice to all hard-working Americans and nothing more than phony political posturing.

I look forward to a time when we don't have to argue about ridiculous proposals being amplified in the media and can actually focus on real solutions to protect our environment and build our economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the so-called Green New Deal and its impact on Indiana's agricultural community and our Hoosier farmers.

As I said last week, this misguided Green New Deal is unaffordable, unattainable, and unrealistic. In fact, over the next decade, this so-called deal would cost up to \$65,000 per American household per year.

This proposal is a job killer, and it is bad news for hard-working Hoosiers. This is especially true for Hoosiers who rely on our vital agriculture industry for their incomes.

Allow me to run through a few numbers. In Indiana, agriculture supports more than 107,000 Hoosier jobs. Agriculture also contributes an estimated \$30 billion to Indiana's economy. Indiana is the 10th largest farming state in the Nation, and we are the 8th largest ag export. Perhaps most importantly, 97 percent of Hoosier farms are family owned or operated.

Agriculture is a main driver of our State's economy. It is often said that Indiana feeds the world, and we take a lot of pride in that. We need our ag community to continue thriving. Yet the sponsors of this Green New Deal have spoken about cutting back on the farming practices that employ Hoosiers and put food on the table.

Imagine the crushing cost to Hoosier farmers of changing out all farm equipment for electric vehicles or the cost of upgrading every single building on every farm in Indiana. This is on top of

the sharp climb in energy prices that we would see under the Green New Deal. This bad deal would force the cost of doing business to skyrocket for Hoosier manufacturers and our farmers, which would mean higher prices for consumers and less money in the pockets of hard-working Hoosiers.

Jim, a small business owner from Muncie, wrote to my office recently. He said: "Please stop the Green New Deal in its tracks NOW."

I also heard from Patrick in Bloomington, who said: "As a man who has served my country in combat in Vietnam 50 years ago and someone who loves my country deeply—I am very concerned about the direction our nation is heading." Regarding the Green New Deal, he added: "I hope you won't give this idea a second thought."

Dennis from Greenwood wrote: "My wife and I are strongly against the 'Green New Deal'. . . . We would recommend that you not support this crazy idea."

Well, Dennis, I don't intend to.

Susan from Lafayette wrote: "Please hold strong and promote the values of Indiana and many Americans. . . ."

The bottom line is this: Hoosiers don't want this harmful Green New Deal. It sets unattainable goals that are bad for Hoosier farmers. It is bad for our economy, and it is bad for our families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

S.J. RES. 7

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me begin by thanking Senator MIKE LEE and Senator CHRIS MURPHY for their hard work on this important resolution—work which, in fact, has gone on now for several years.

Today is an extremely important day. Today we in the Senate have the opportunity to take a major step forward in ending the horrific war in Yemen and alleviating the terrible, terrible suffering being experienced by the people in one of the poorest countries on Earth.

Today, equally important, we can finally begin the process of reasserting Congress's responsibility over war-making. As every schoolchild should know, article I of the Constitution clearly states that it is Congress, not the President, that has the power to declare war. In their great wisdom, the Framers of our Constitution, the Founders of this country, gave that enormously important responsibility to Congress because the Members of the House and the Senate are closer and more accountable to the people of this country.

Tragically, however, over many years, Congress has abdicated that responsibility to Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents. Today we begin the process of reclaiming our constitutional authority by ending U.S. involvement in a war that has not been authorized by Congress and is clearly unconstitutional.

Last December, this body made history for the first time since the War Powers Resolution was passed in 1973. A majority of Senators—56 of us, in a bipartisan way—used those powers from the War Powers Act to end U.S. involvement in a war.

Today we consider that exact same resolution once again in the new Congress. This time, however, unlike last session, this resolution will be brought to the House floor, and I strongly believe will be passed.

Let me say a brief word about the war in Yemen.

In March of 2015, under the leadership of Muhammad bin Salman, then Saudi Defense Minister and now the Crown Prince, a Saudi-led coalition intervened in Yemen's ongoing civil war. As a result of that intervention, Yemen is now experiencing the worst humanitarian disaster on the planet.

According to the United Nations, Yemen is at risk of the most severe famine in 100 years, with some 14 million people facing the possibility of starvation. In one of the poorest countries on Earth, as a result of this war, according to the Save the Children organization, some 85,000 children in Yemen have already starved to death over the last several years—an unimaginable number, unimaginable suffering and destruction. If this war continues, what the experts tell us is that millions more will also face famine and starvation.

Further, Yemen is currently experiencing the worst cholera outbreak in the world, with as many as 10,000 new cases each week, according to the World Health Organization. This is a disease spread by infected water that causes severe diarrhea and dehydration and will only accelerate the death rate. The cholera outbreak has occurred because Saudi bombs have destroyed Yemen's water infrastructure and people are no longer able to access clean drinking water.

The fact is that the United States, with little media attention, has been Saudi Arabia's partner in this horrific war. We have been providing the bombs that the Saudi-led coalition is using. We have been refueling their planes before they drop those bombs, and we have been assisting with intelligence.

In too many cases, our weapons are being used to kill civilians. In August, it was an American-made bomb that obliterated a schoolbus full of young boys, killing dozens and wounding many more. A CNN report found evidence that American weapons have been used in a string of such deadly attacks on civilians since the war began.

This past weekend—this past weekend—at least 20 women and a child were killed in a Saudi-led airstrike on Yemen's northwestern Province of Hajjah, as they huddled in a house to avoid nearby clashes. As is so often the case in war, the innocent, the women and the children, pay the price.

Late last year, I met with several brave Yemeni human rights activists.

They had come to Congress to urge us to put a stop to this war. They told me clearly: When Yemenis see “Made in America” on the bombs that are killing them, it tells them that the United States is responsible for this war. That is the sad truth.

The bottom line is that the United States should not be supporting a catastrophic war led by a despotic regime with a dangerous and irresponsible foreign policy.

Some have suggested that Congress moving to withdraw support for this war would undermine the United Nations’ efforts to reach a peace agreement, but the opposite is true. It is the promise of unconditional U.S. support for the Saudis that undermines those efforts.

We have evidence of this. Last December, as we were preparing to vote on this same resolution, we received news that U.N. Special Envoy Martin Griffiths reached a breakthrough agreement for a ceasefire in the port city of Hodeidah. That ceasefire, which is being maintained today, is enabling food and increased humanitarian aid into the country.

I have spoken to people at the highest level of those negotiations, who have made it clear that our actions here in the Senate played a significant role in pushing Saudi Arabia toward an agreement. That pressure must continue, and the resolution I hope we pass today will do just that.

Our effort on this issue has clearly made a positive impact, and I thank all of the cosponsors of this resolution for their efforts and all of the civil society organizations—progressive and conservative organizations—that have worked so hard to raise awareness of this conflict and the constitutional implications.

Above and beyond the humanitarian crisis in Yemen, this war has been harmful to our national security and the security of the region. The administration defends our engagement in Yemen by overstating Iranian support for the Houthi rebels. Let me be clear. Iran’s support for the Houthis is of serious concern for all of us, but the truth is that support there is far less significant than the administration claims. The fact is that the relationship between Iran and the Houthis has only been strengthened by this war. The war is creating the very problem the administration claims to want to solve.

This war is also undermining the broader effort against violent extremists. A 2016 State Department report found that the conflict had helped al-Qaida and the Islamic State’s Yemen branch “deepen their inroads across much of the country.” The head of the International Rescue Committee, former British Foreign Minister David Miliband, said in a recent interview that “the winners are the extremist groups like Al Qaeda and ISIS.” Late last year, the Wall Street Journal reported that “nearly two years after

being driven from its stronghold in Yemen, one of al Qaeda’s most dangerous franchises has entrenched itself in the country’s hinterlands as a devastating war creates the conditions for its comeback.”

Here is something that should deeply concern us all. At a time when we are spending billions to fight terrorism all over the world, a February CNN report revealed that Saudi Arabia and its coalition partners have transferred American-made weapons to al-Qaida-linked fighters in Yemen. Does anyone here think it makes sense that U.S. weapons should be given to groups who have declared war against the United States?

This war is both a humanitarian and a strategic disaster.

Let us also not forget that this war is being led by a despotic, undemocratic regime in Saudi Arabia. The United States of America—the most powerful country on Earth—should not be led into a regional war by our client states that are trying to serve their own narrow and selfish interests.

It should not be Saudi Arabia that is developing and implementing American foreign and military policy. Saudi Arabia is a monarchy controlled by one of the wealthiest families in the world—the Saud family. In a 2017 report by the Cato Institute, Saudi Arabia was ranked 149th out of 159 countries for freedom and human rights. Is this really the kind of country whose foreign policy we should be supporting with U.S. taxpayer dollars?

For decades, the Saudis have funded schools, mosques, and preachers who promote an extreme form of Islam known as Wahhabism.

In Saudi Arabia today, women are treated as third-class citizens. Women still need the permission of a male guardian to go to school or to get a job. They have to follow a strict dress code and can be stoned to death for adultery or flogged for spending time in the company of a man who is not their relative.

Last year, Saudi activist Loujain al-Hathloul, a leader in the fight for women’s rights, was kidnapped from Abu Dhabi and forced to return to the country. She is currently imprisoned, along with many other human rights activists. Human Rights Watch reported that imprisoned women activists have been subjected to torture, including electric shocks, and other forms of physical and sexual assault.

The people of the entire world received a very clear understanding of the nature of the Saudi regime with the murder of Jamal Khashoggi in the Saudi consulate in Turkey. All of the evidence suggests that the Saudi Crown Prince was directly responsible for that murder. Is that really the kind of regime whose leads we in the United States should be following?

I believe the U.S. Congress has become far too comfortable with military interventions all over the world. We have now been in Afghanistan for nearly 18 years—the longest war in Amer-

ican history. We also have troops in many other countries around the world. The time is long overdue for Congress to reassert its constitutional role in determining when and where our country goes to war. This resolution provides that opportunity.

I hope this body will do exactly as it did in December and, in a bipartisan manner, pass this resolution. The humanitarian catastrophe has only gotten worse in Yemen, and our intervention there is every bit as unconstitutional as it was when we passed this resolution in December.

Let us bring this catastrophic war in Yemen to an end. Let us focus our efforts on a diplomatic resolution to end that war. Let us provide the humanitarian aid needed to protect the hungry and the sick in Yemen. In a historic vote 45 years after the passage of the War Powers Act, let us today reassert Congress’s constitutional responsibility in terms of war-making.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Once again, I am very pleased to join my friend the Senator from Vermont on the floor to press this body to take seriously its constitutional responsibility and its responsibility to ensure that the United States doesn’t enter into hostilities abroad other than in those situations that are vitally necessary to protect our national security interests.

I am so proud to have worked with Senator SANDERS, Senator LEE, and many others here to build a truly bipartisan coalition that is going to do something that, as Senator SANDERS said, is historic.

I have been coming down to the Senate floor for 4 years now raising concerns about U.S. participation in this civil war. When the United States first entered into an agreement with the Saudis to help them in their bombing campaign, very few people could probably locate Yemen on the map. Today, it is the subject of national conversation. With passage in the Senate and the House, regardless of what the President chooses to do, the world now knows that the United States is paying attention to the world’s worst humanitarian disaster—a nightmare inside Yemen that is taking the lives of tens of thousands of people.

Sometimes humanitarian disasters and famines are caused by natural events, those that we cannot control—droughts, for instance. This is a man-made humanitarian catastrophe that the United States has something to say about, and we are going to say something about it in a matter of hours.

Let me just say a few things about what will happen if we pass this resolution and it becomes law and what will not happen if we pass this resolution and it becomes law. I think Senator SANDERS covered this, and we have covered this enough.

The first thing that happens is that we uphold the Constitution.

I get it. Declaring war is a lot tougher today than it was 40 years ago or 100 years ago. It is not as if there are big armies that march against each other across open fields. Very rarely is there a nice peace treaty signed to wrap up hostilities. Now we have shadowy and more diffuse enemies who are harder to define. We have wars that seem to never end. But that doesn't obviate Congress's responsibility to set parameters around war. Just because it is harder to declare war today doesn't mean that we still don't have the responsibility to do it.

Over and over again, we have outsourced the decision on hostilities to the President, whether it be President Obama or President Trump. In large part, it is because we just don't want to be in this business any longer.

There is no doubt that when we are helping Saudi Arabia drop bombs on churches, on weddings, on cholera treatment facilities, and on some legitimate military targets, we are engaged in a war, and we should declare it here. That is the first thing that happens.

The second thing that happens if we pass this resolution and it becomes law is that we wash our hands of the blood associated with being a participant in the creation of one of the world's worst humanitarian catastrophes.

Never has the world seen a cholera epidemic as big as this one, at least in recorded history. There is no secret as to why there is a cholera epidemic; it is because the Saudis bombed the water treatment facilities, so the water isn't clean any longer.

Whether or not the United States knew about this or signed off on it, we don't know, but the fact is, we should not be associated with a bombing campaign that the U.N. tells us is likely a gross violation of human rights.

Third, if we pass this resolution and it becomes law, peace becomes more likely.

We have evidence of why that is because when we passed this resolution in the Senate at the end of last year, not coincidentally, within days, a partial ceasefire was announced in Hodeidah. Why is that? The reason is twofold. One, when the Saudis realize they don't have a blank check from the United States any longer, they get more serious about peace. Two, the Houthis, who are the other party to this conflict and who don't believe that the United States is an honest broker or that anyone will actually be serious about enforcing concessions they give, come to the table because they see that the United States and others that we support as part of the negotiations will actually be honest brokers and that we are only willing to go so far with our Saudi partners.

The fourth thing that happens, as Senator SANDERS has mentioned, is that we are able to send a message to Saudi Arabia and specifically to the

Crown Prince that they need to change their behavior if they want to maintain this relationship.

Some people are going to vote against this because they say it has nothing to do with Jamal Khashoggi. It does. Jamal Khashoggi's name isn't in here. The names of the other American residents who are currently being detained by Saudi Arabia aren't in here. But make no mistake—Muhammad bin Salman, who ordered this campaign of political repression—his No. 1 foreign policy priority is the perpetuation of the war inside Yemen.

Given the violation of trust that has occurred with the United States over the murder of Jamal Khashoggi and the coverup of it, it stands to reason that we would rethink our association with other priorities of the Crown Prince's if he blatantly lied to us about his participation in the human rights violation that has become the obsession of this country and the world. The two are connected. This will be seen as a message to the Saudis that they need to clean up their act.

What will not happen? Casualties will not get worse. The Trump administration says: Well, if we are not part of the coalition, it just means we can't stop civilians from being killed.

Well, forgive me, but it doesn't seem like we have been doing too good of a job thus far if 85,000 children under the age of 5 have died of starvation and disease and tens of thousands of civilians have been caught in the crossfire. We can't get into classified information here, but let's just say there is a limit to what the United States can do as part of this coalition.

There is no evidence to suggest that casualties will get worse. In fact, the cover being lifted of U.S. endorsements of this bombing campaign will make it harder for the Saudis to take chances because they know they don't have the United States to fall back on.

Second, the Saudis will not go somewhere else. This idea that if we just say we are not going to participate in this one single war with you, that the Saudis will all of a sudden break relationships with the United States and go buy their military equipment from Russia, is belied by how this alliance has worked for years. The complication of the Saudis turning around and choosing to go to another partner, if that is how this works, that the nature of our relationship is one in which the United States can never ever refuse a request from the Saudis to participate in one of their military endeavors overseas, then that is not an alliance. An alliance allows you to tell your partner when you think they are wrong and choose, unless you have a treaty obligation of some sort, whether you engage with them.

Lastly, as I mentioned, some people say we will lose our political leverage; that we will make it harder for negotiations to happen. It is exactly the opposite, as evidenced by the fact that when we were debating this resolution

last time, as people were telling us that if we passed it we wouldn't have as much leverage in the negotiations, successful negotiations were being concluded in Stockholm.

This is a historic moment for the Congress to step up and say that enough is enough. We are made weaker in the eyes of the world when we willingly participate in war crimes and when we allow for our partner to engage in activity that leads to the slaughter of innocents.

Never mind the conduct of a war in which our true enemies, al-Qaida and ISIS, are getting stronger and stronger by the day. I hope we have the same bipartisan stamp of approval on this resolution today as we did last year, and I hope it stands as a new day for the Senate when we are more willing, on a bipartisan basis, to do our concurrent responsibility, along with the executive branch, to set the foreign policy of this Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to again support efforts to stop U.S. direct military support for the Saudi-led coalition efforts in Yemen.

I do not need to remind my colleagues what is at stake. Each time we have considered this resolution, the situation for Yemenis is even more dire.

Now in its fourth year, this conflict has put nearly 16 million people on the brink of starvation, including 400,000 children who are severely malnourished, displaced more than 3 million people, and done nothing to increase stability or prosperity for the people of Yemen. In fact, the longer this conflict goes on, the larger Iran's foothold in Yemen grows and the more entrenched opposing political factions become.

In addition to the horrifying humanitarian crisis, we have also learned that U.S. coalition partners may be transferring U.S.-origin weapons to known—underline known—terrorist organizations. We have read alarming reports about torture and abuse in prisons throughout Yemen—both Houthi and coalition controlled.

I will simply repeat what I have said before. It is in the interest of the United States to put as much political pressure on the parties to end this conflict as we can. Yes, we have strategic partnerships with Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, but we must find a way forward to get those relationships on a path that truly serves U.S. interests.

To be clear, the Houthis bear significant responsibility in the deterioration of the state of affairs in Yemen, and that is without a doubt. We do not have diplomatic relations with the Houthis, and we certainly don't sell them arms or provide active military support. This resolution is a good first step, but what we really need is a comprehensive approach to address our interests in the gulf.

Along with Senators YOUNG, REED, GRAHAM, SHAHEEN, COLLINS, and MURPHY, I introduced the comprehensive Saudi Arabia Accountability and Yemen Act. The bill calls for a suspension of offensive weapons sales to Saudi Arabia, sanctions all persons responsible for blocking humanitarian access in Yemen or supporting the Houthis in Yemen, and urges accountability for all actors in Yemen guilty of war crimes.

Finally, it also addresses some of the most reckless Saudi actions by calling for true accountability for those responsible for the murder of American resident and journalist, Jamal Khashoggi, and a report on human rights in Saudi Arabia.

I support this resolution and encourage us to continue to debate. We must evaluate our relationship with these partners and find a path forward not just in Yemen but indeed in the entire gulf region that truly promotes American interests and American values.

Today is a day we can make a clear and unequivocal statement that we do not support this continuing conflict and humanitarian disaster. There is a consequence for acting in the way the coalition has—in many cases, clearly, irresponsibly, with the reckless loss of human life. I hope we can continue to work to go beyond that so we can deal with the entire region's challenges.

I look forward to whatever is the agreement on amendments that may be considered here. I personally would like to see us get an up-or-down vote as a resolution. I understand there may be some amendments.

Depending upon what amendments are made in order, I may seek a second-degree amendment at the end of the day. I am concerned that one of these amendments that are contemplated may be well-intentioned but also may very well be used in such a way to actually undermine the very essence of the underlying vote we are taking.

I will reserve my judgment until that time on that, but in the interim, I urge all of my colleagues to continue to support it, as they did in the last vote on this question of this resolution.

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. LEE. 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. LEE. Mr. President, I stand with Senator SANDERS and with Senator MURPHY as a cosponsor of the legislation before us, S.J. Res. 7, which would remove U.S. Armed Forces from Saudi Arabia's war in Yemen.

There were 56 Senators who voted in favor of this resolution just a few months ago, in December, or at the end of the last Congress. That vote was, of course, a victory for the Constitution

and for the separation of powers, to say nothing of prudence, of peace, and of justice. The House of Representatives passed its own version of this resolution earlier this year. Now it is back to us. Now it is our turn. Now it is our job to get this passed. We have the opportunity today to reassert Congress's constitutional role over declaring war and over putting American blood and treasure on the line.

In this particular case, the evidence is clear that we ought not be involved in this unconstitutional, unjustified, and, ultimately, immoral war. The Yemeni war has claimed the lives of tens of thousands of people, including those of countless innocent civilians. It has created countless refugees, orphans, widows, and it has also displaced countless families. The numbers are nothing short of staggering.

Since 2015, more than 6,000 civilians have died, and more than 10,000 have been wounded. The majority of these casualties—over 10,000 of them—has been as the result of airstrikes led by the Saudi-led coalition. In one attack last year, the Saudis dropped a U.S.-made bomb on a schoolbus that killed 40 young children on a school trip and wounded another 30 children in addition to that.

Yemen is now facing rampant disease and mass starvation. An estimated 15 million people do not have access to clean water and sanitation, and 17 million don't have access to food. Photographs from Yemen depict malnourished children who have every rib in their tiny bodies exposed and jetting out as manifestations of their starvation. Over 85,000 children have died of starvation since 2015.

In short, the situation in Yemen has become the worst humanitarian crisis in the world, and the United States has been abating the horrors of this war. Indeed, our country has actually made the crisis worse by helping one side bomb innocent civilians. I don't say that lightly. It is with great soberness that I raise this very real and very serious accusation.

So it begs the question: How did we get entangled in this crisis to begin with? How did we get involved? Why and how and under what circumstances did this become our war to fight?

In March of 2015, Saudi Arabia launched a war against the Houthi rebels. Shortly after the Houthis ousted the Saudi-backed government in the capital city of Sanaa, the Obama administration—without consulting Congress, of course—authorized U.S. military forces to provide logistical and intelligence support to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia-led coalition fighting that war. U.S. military support has continued ever since then, for the last 4 years, including with midair refueling, surveillance, reconnaissance information, and target selection assistance. In other words, we have been supporting and, in fact, have been actively participating in the activities of war. We are involved in this conflict as, no less, cobelligerents.

Some of my colleagues have argued to the contrary and have suggested that we are somehow not involved in this war in Yemen. Yet, if we are honest with ourselves, we know that isn't true. We know that this argument falls dead flat on its face. As Defense Secretary Jim Mattis himself acknowledged in December of 2017, just a little over a year ago, our military has been helping the Saudis with target selection assistance or with "making certain they hit the right thing."

In other words, we are helping a foreign power bomb its adversaries in what is, undoubtedly, indisputably, a war. Previously, we were helping them even with midair refueling assistance—that is, helping Saudi jets that were en route to bombing missions and other combat missions on the ground inside of Yemen. If that doesn't constitute direct involvement in a war, I don't know what does.

Other opponents of our resolution claim somehow that our involvement in Yemen is constitutional, that it is lawful under the War Powers Act of 1973. It is true that under the War Powers Act, the executive branch is authorized to use Armed Forces in cases of emergencies and in other certain, rigid, well-established time constraints. Yet, you see, the conflict in Yemen does not constitute a threat to the safety of American citizens, and our involvement has far surpassed any emergency time allotted under the War Powers Resolution.

The Houthis, while, perhaps, no friends of the American people, make up a regional rebel group that does not itself threaten American national security. In fact, the longer we fight against it, the more we give reason to it to hate America and to embrace the opportunists who are our true enemies in the region—those who make up the regime in power in Iran. The more we prolong the activities that destabilize this region, the longer we harm our own interests in terms of trade and broader regional security.

The War Powers Act also states that the assignment of U.S. Armed Forces to coordinate and to participate in the hostilities of a foreign power, of a foreign country, itself constitutes a conflict of war. Some have argued that we have not been engaging in hostilities and, therefore, somehow, have not violated the War Powers Act. This claim falls flat in several respects.

First, the claim itself is categorically untrue. As we heard before, we are literally telling the Saudis what to bomb, what to hit, and what and whom to take out.

Second, these opponents are relying on an old, 1976 memorandum that is internal to the executive branch and internal to the Department of Defense itself that was written by a lawyer within the Department of Defense. Talk about the fox guarding the henhouse. It defers to a Department of Defense lawyer's memorandum from 1976 that uses an unreasonably,

unsustainably, indefensibly slim definition of the word “hostilities.” This definition may or may not have been relevant then. I don’t know. I was only 5 years old at the time it was written. Yet we no longer live in a world in which “war” means exclusively two competing countries that are lined up on opposite ends of the battlefield, in two columns, and that are engaged in direct exchanges of fire across the same ground. That is not how war is waged anymore.

War activities, of course, have changed dramatically since 1976. Like bell-bottoms and so many fads of that era, this is a dynamic that has changed today. Our war in today’s America increasingly relies on high technology and on high-technology solutions. Our wars have involved cyber activity, reconnaissance, surveillance, and high-tech target selection. These, by the way, are the precise activities that we ourselves are undertaking in Yemen. It is not just that we are involved somehow on the sidelines. These activities themselves constitute war.

Even aside from this overly narrow, cramped, and indefensible definition of the word “hostilities” and separate and apart from the definition of the word “hostilities,” under the War Powers Act, we ourselves do not have to technically be involved in hostilities in order to trigger the responsibilities of the Congress under the War Powers Act in order to make sure that the legislative branch actually does its job to declare war or to authorize the use of military force under the War Powers Act and under the Constitution. The War Powers Act, in fact, is triggered so long as we are sufficiently involved with the armed forces of another nation when those armed forces of another nation are themselves involved in hostilities, which they indisputably are.

The Saudi-led coalition directing the activities in the civil war in Yemen against the Houthis is undeniably involved in hostilities. We are undeniably assisting the coalition in those movements, in those activities, in those acts of war. We, therefore, by definition under the plain language of the War Powers Act itself, are subjected to the terms of the War Powers Act. The Saudis are, without question, involved in those hostilities. We can’t doubt that. No one here can credibly claim to the contrary.

Finally, some argue that this resolution might somehow harm or undermine or hurt our efforts to combat terrorism in the region specifically with regard to al-Qaida and ISIS. Importantly, however, this resolution explicitly states that the resolution would not impede the military’s ability to fight these terror groups. In fact, U.S. involvement in Yemen has, arguably, undermined the effort against al-Qaida’s affiliates. The State Department’s Country Reports on Terrorism for 2016 found that the conflict between the Saudi-led forces and Houthi insur-

gents has actually helped al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, or AQAP, as it is often described, and ISIS’ Yemen branch to “deepen their inroads across much of the country.”

It appears that our involvement in Yemen accomplishes no good at all, only harm—and significant harm at that. Recent events are bringing that into an even clearer light. In October, there was the killing of Jamal Khashoggi. Then, just the week before last, news broke that the Saudis tortured a man while he was detained there in 2017. He had dual citizenship in the United States and Saudi Arabia. Shortly before that, a report also came out that suggested that Saudi Arabia had transferred American-made, American-manufactured weapons to al-Qaida-linked fighters and to other militant groups. In other words, the Saudis are likely using our own weapons in violation of our own end-user agreements with them, by the way, to commit these atrocities of war. That is not OK.

It is becoming clearer and clearer that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is not an ally that deserves our unwavering, unquestioning, unflinching support. It is not an ally that deserves our support or our military intervention, especially when our own security—the safety of the American people—is not on the line, and I haven’t heard anyone in this body maintain otherwise.

Indeed, perhaps we ought not be supporting this regime at all. At a bare minimum, we ought not be deferring unflinchingly to this regime, and we ought not be fighting an unjust war on its behalf half a world away, putting at risk not only U.S. treasure but also, potentially, U.S. blood and the blood of countless innocent civilians who are in the line of fire as a result of this. To the contrary, to continue supporting them in this war would be bad diplomacy and would undermine our very credibility on the world stage.

Look, regardless of where you stand on this war, these decisions matter, and we ought to take them seriously. In fact, each and every one of us has sworn an oath to take things like this seriously.

The Constitution puts the war-making power—the power to declare war—in the hands of Congress. There was a good reason for this. It has everything to do with the fact that Congress is the branch of the Federal Government most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals, and our Founding Fathers wisely understood that it was dangerous to allow the powers of government to accumulate in the hands of the few or in the hands of one person.

One of the reasons they put the war-making power in the hands of Congress is they wanted to make a strong break away from the system that had evolved in our old system of government, the one involved in our old capital based in London, where the chief executive himself had the power unilaterally to make war.

This was a decided break from that tradition. There were other traditions that we continued, that we adopted. Many of our rights, our liberties, our processes in government were patterned after the British model. This one was not. It was deliberately the choice of the Founding Fathers not to continue with that tradition, and that is why we and only we can declare war.

You see, it is not that we are flawless. It is not that we are any smarter than people in other branches. Quite to the contrary, it has only to do—and everything to do—with the fact that we are more accountable to the people at more routine intervals.

When you put the power to declare war or authorize the use of military force in Congress, you guarantee that this decision will be made carefully and deliberately in full view of the American people. Public debates have a way of bringing the American people into the discussion, into the deliberation.

You see, there is no such thing as a clean war. There is no such thing as a war that is detached from moral peril, from moral consequences, from grave and heartbreaking results in which innocent men, women, and children lose their lives or are subjected to the worst privations known to human beings.

It is for that very reason that we owe it to those affected by war—not just the brave men and women who fight for us and protect us but for people all over the world and for the good name of the United States to be protected—that as we publicly debate the moral consequences of war, the grave implications that war has for our country and others involved in the conflict are the business of all of the American people and should never be reserved for one person.

We need to carefully weigh the risks and merits of engaging in any conflict in an open and in an honest manner. So instead of placing this power in the hands of a King or even just in the executive branch generally where it can be used unilaterally to declare war, the Founders placed it here in Congress, knowing that we are more accountable to the people than the other branches, and the power would be less likely to be abused here.

There is a lot at stake. There is a lot at stake whenever the lives of American military personnel are placed on the line and whenever the lives of innocent men, women, and children are on the line, too—precious lives, each of immeasurable worth. These decisions result in the shedding of blood, the shedding of blood that will be on our hands if we fail both to exercise our constitutional prerogatives and to take that very responsibility very seriously.

Over the last 80 years, we have tragically seen what happens when the muscle of the legislative branch begins to atrophy as a result of the failure of those who occupy these very seats to exercise their legislative muscle. When we fail to exercise that power that the

Constitution entrusts to us, entrusted to us in that document to which each of us has taken an oath, we imperil the entire system and the safety of our country. We also cheapen the moral certainty with which our Armed Forces need to be able to proceed in order to make what they do right and legally and morally justifiable.

So today, I respectfully and with all the passion and energy I am capable of communicating urge my colleagues once again to vote to end our involvement in this unauthorized, unjustified, unconstitutional, and immoral war.

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 7 and that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S.J. Res. 7. I further ask that there be 2 hours of debate, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with 10 minutes of the Democratic time being reserved for Senator MENENDEZ; further, that the following amendments be called up and reported by number, Paul amendment No. 193, Inhofe amendment No. 194, and Rubio amendment No. 195; further, that no other first-degree amendments be in order and no second-degree amendments be in order prior to a vote in relation to these amendments; finally, that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed and that following the disposition of the amendments, the joint resolution, as amended, if amended, be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution as amended, if amended, with 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A 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.

Thereupon, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 193, 194, AND 195

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments by number.

The bill clerk read the amendments as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE], for others, proposes amendments numbered 193, 194, and 195.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 193

(Purpose: To provide that nothing in the joint resolution may be construed as authorizing the use of military force)

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 6. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING NO AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(a)(1)), nothing in this joint resolution may be construed as authorizing the use of military force.

AMENDMENT NO. 194

(Purpose: To provide an exception for supporting efforts to defend against ballistic missile, cruise missile, and unmanned aerial vehicle threats to civilian population centers in coalition countries, including locations where citizens and nationals of the United States reside)

On page 5, line 7, insert after "associated forces" the following: "or operations to support efforts to defend against ballistic missile, cruise missile, and unmanned aerial vehicle threats to civilian population centers in coalition countries, including locations where citizens and nationals of the United States reside".

AMENDMENT NO. 195

(Purpose: To provide a rule of construction regarding intelligence sharing)

Insert after section 3 the following new section:

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING INTELLIGENCE SHARING.

Nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to influence or disrupt any intelligence, counterintelligence, or investigative activities relating to threats in or emanating from Yemen conducted by, or in conjunction with, the United States Government involving—

- (1) the collection of intelligence;
- (2) the analysis of intelligence; or
- (3) the sharing of intelligence between the United States and any coalition partner if the President determines such sharing is appropriate and in the national security interests of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, just like last year, I remain deeply concerned about the humanitarian situation in Yemen, as well as the erratic behavior of Saudi Arabia's leadership. We have all suffered through that.

However, I oppose the resolution brought forth by Senators LEE, MURPHY, and SANDERS, which, if implemented, would end all security cooperation with our partners in Yemen against the Houthis.

First of all, we are not engaged in hostilities in Yemen against the Houthis, and here is what we are doing in Yemen: We are providing intelligence support that helps construct no-strike lists that enable humanitarian efforts and protect humanitarian aid workers.

Some of these workers are workers we are very close to—our allies. Our intelligence support is also vital to assisting our partners in defending themselves against the Iranian-supported ballistic missile attacks.

It is important to emphasize that our partners are the tip of the spear, not us. Beyond this, our security cooperation provides leverage that we have used with the Saudi-led coalition to advance peace negotiations.

If we pull that support, here is what we can expect: Israel loses, Iran wins, and the humanitarian situation will

get worse. I think we all understand that.

Our partners will be less capable to confront the lethal ballistic missile threat, and peace efforts will lose a vital line of support. Moreover, if a ballistic missile hits a population center and kills Americans because we, due to the resolution, withheld intelligence, it would be unforgivable. That is why I introduced an amendment to specifically protect our civilian population.

In closing, the vote is not about whether we approve of Saudi Arabia's behavior; I don't. It is about whether we will use our leverage with the Saudi-led coalition to ensure humanitarian access and promote peace, and, more fundamentally, it is about whether we take seriously our responsibility to keep Americans safe. That is really what this is all about. It merely includes that we would eliminate the threats to civilian population centers in coalition countries, including locations where citizens and nationals of the United States reside. I can't imagine anyone would be opposed to that.

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

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

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to support the joint resolution of disapproval and to urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Let's be clear, there is no national security emergency at the southwestern border. The President and his administration continue to mislead Americans about what really is happening at the border in order to fulfill a misguided campaign promise to build a wall. After weeks of threats and toying with the idea of declaring a national emergency to circumvent Congress, the President, in my view, wrongly issued such a proclamation on February 15 under the authority of the National Emergencies Act.

This proclamation redirects military construction funds provided by Congress to the Department of Defense for projects deemed important to the readiness, welfare, and missions of our Armed Forces. This action is an extreme overreach of Executive authority. No President has ever declared a national emergency to circumvent Congress for a construction project he failed to get approved through legislation.

In fact, this authority to use military construction funds in an emergency has only been used twice for projects in the United States—first by President George Herbert Walker Bush during Operation Desert Shield and then by President George W. Bush in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks—and those projects addressed

immediate and recognized needs of our warfighters. While the administration claims President Obama also used this authority, the distinction is, he used it for its true intent, to provide facilities quickly in overseas locations for our warfighters in combat zones. To say those needs are the same as President Trump's campaign pledge to build a wall is simply wrong and misleading.

The President tries to justify this emergency as responding to a humanitarian crisis at the border, but the wall is not an effective solution to that crisis. What he ignores is the fact that the House and Senate overwhelmingly approved \$22.54 billion in border security funding in the recent appropriations bill to enhance physical barriers at ports of entry, to hire additional law enforcement personnel, to address the humanitarian needs of migrants, and to increase counternarcotics and counterweapons detection technologies used at the border. Moreover, I would argue that to truly stop the influx of migrants at our southern border, there has to be a much more coordinated international effort led by the Department of State to address the conditions in Central America that cause migrants to leave their homes. Stopping mass migration at the source is the most effective and humane policy.

In its statement opposing the resolution before us today, the administration characterizes increasing numbers of "family units, unaccompanied minors, and persons claiming a fear of return" as a national security threat and a national emergency. Let us be clear. These groups of people present no military threat to our Nation. General O'Shaughnessy, Commander of U.S. Northern Command, confirmed this in a hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 26, when he said: "The threats to our nation from our southern border are not military in nature." So I have a hard time understanding why the administration thinks it is acceptable to use Department of Defense dollars for a wall that would provide little to no value to the Department of Defense in countering the very real military threats our Nation does confront across the globe.

Some have argued that the wall is a necessary response to the opioid crisis we are experiencing. There is no doubt we have a serious substance abuse crisis in this country. According to the Centers for Disease Control, over 70,000 people died in 2017 of drug overdoses. That means more people died that year because of drug overdoses than due to car crashes or gun violence. These numbers are staggering, and no community is immune. Congress has worked in a bipartisan manner to combat this crisis, passing landmark legislation and historic increases in funding, but the administration has failed to live up to its commitments. A wall will not fix this problem.

Indeed, while the administration would have the American people be-

lieve these drugs are coming across the southwestern border between ports of entry—where they want to build this wall—the facts from the Drug Enforcement Agency's 2018 National Drug Threat Assessment reveal otherwise.

In the case of heroin, in their words, "The majority of flow is through [privately owned vehicles] entering the United States at legal ports of entry." This will not be stopped by building a wall.

When it comes to fentanyl, according to the National Drug Threat Assessment, smaller quantities but of higher purity are "transported into the United States in parcel packages directly from China or from China through Canada." A wall on the southwest border will not stop packages of fentanyl coming through the mail from China. Again, according to the DEA, the fentanyl that is smuggled in from Mexico is most commonly, in their words, "concealed in [vehicles] . . . through [southwest border ports of entry]"—not through the terrain where the President wants to build a wall.

To underscore this point, just 2 days ago, Customs and Border Patrol announced the seizure of the biggest shipment of cocaine recovered at the ports of New York and New Jersey in 25 years. About 1.6 tons of cocaine were seized from a shipping container that arrived at the port in Newark, NJ. President Trump's wall would not have stopped this shipment.

Instead of addressing, for example, the high-purity fentanyl and fentanyl precursors coming from China or improving law enforcement's ability to detect and seize drugs at the ports of entry, this emergency declaration for a wall will divert billions of dollars from our troops and other national defense priorities and will not make our country any safer. Canceling or delaying military construction projects will have damaging impacts to the military services. These projects are intended to improve deteriorating airfields and piers, provide modern training and maintenance facilities, rehabilitate antiquated and hazardous hospitals and schools, remediate environmental contamination at former bases, and contribute to alliance and partnership responsibilities around the globe.

Bypassing congressional intent that these funds be used on vetted military construction projects in order to build a border wall Congress has rejected time and again is an affront to our Nation's system of checks and balances. It is also an abuse of the power of Congress granted to the President to use in times of true security emergencies or in times of war to address the immediate needs of our Armed Forces.

Furthermore, the administration wants to use another authority, title 10 United States Code, section 284, which allows the Department of Defense, without requiring an emergency declaration, to "provide support for the counterdrug activities or activities to counter transnational organized crime

of any other department or agency of the Federal Government," to include the "[c]onstruction of roads and fences and installation of lighting to block drug smuggling corridors across international boundaries of the United States."

This seems to be within the realm of the President's contemplation, but because there is only about \$238 million remaining in this counterdrug account, the administration plans to reprogram roughly \$2.5 billion appropriated in other DOD accounts into this counterdrug account to use for the wall. We know much of the funds being transferred would not be used for their original intent.

For example, the Army will have excess funding in military pay because it will not meet anticipated end strength, and fewer personnel opted into the new blended retirement system than anticipated, which created savings. However, instead of transferring these dollars to higher priority defense needs, DOD will have to use these amounts for the wall.

Ironically, the \$238 million now remaining in the counterdrug accounts will not be used for its original purpose of providing critical intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, and other detection capabilities for drug interdiction in the Caribbean, Central and South America, and Asia. It will be used to build a wall that will not solve the Nation's drug problems. We are literally taking money that is now being used to help interdict the flow of drugs through the Caribbean, in the Pacific, et cetera, and will put it into the ground in Mexico, where the drugs are not passing through.

We also know DOD has immediate and compelling needs of its own that we should be addressing. The Air Force and the Marines need billions of dollars to clean up and rebuild Tyndall Air Force Base and Camp Lejeune after hurricanes devastated both installations last year. According to the Marines, it is about \$3.5 billion to Camp Lejeune, and—according to some numbers I have seen for Tyndall—it is about \$5 billion for Tyndall. Instead of fixing Camp Lejeune and Tyndall Air Force Base, the President is going to take that \$8 billion and put it into a wall through the deserts of the Southwest.

What is more important to the national security of the United States than rebuilding our major Marine Corps facility on the Atlantic Coast and rebuilding our major Air Force facility in the Florida Panhandle? I think, clearly, we should invest in our troops in the Marines and Air Force. We know all of the services continue to have readiness gaps in aircraft maintenance, depot maintenance, and ship overhauls. We know there continues to be a shortage of childcare facilities in certain locations, but these very real needs in our military are put in jeopardy because of the President's obsession with building a wall on the border.

As I indicated, the President intends to fill the 284 account by reprogramming funds. Congress authorizes this reprogramming process to allow the Department of Defense to conduct a certain amount of transfers of funds between accounts for unforeseen problems. By tradition and custom, reprogramming is done with the specific approval of the defense oversight committees, but this time, when DOD transfers dollars to pay for the President's wall, Congress will have no say. The administration will only notify Congress it is happening. Again, this is another example of complete disregard for the legislative branch's role, as directed by the Constitution, in approving and appropriating funds for the activities of the executive branch.

Furthermore, the amount of funds that can be reprogrammed in a year has a \$4 billion limit, and DOD will use a significant portion of that \$4 billion to transfer money for the wall. This means that billions of dollars of other high-priority defense needs will not be met this year, needs like ship maintenance, unexpected fuel costs, vehicle upgrades, and other equipment shortfalls we will see at the end of this year. The Department of Defense is in a situation where they have ships that have to be refueled, they have ships that have to be overhauled, they have equipment that must be prepared for the readiness of the troops that they will not have the money for because it has been spent already, and they have exhausted their reprogramming not serving the needs of the military but building a wall in the middle of the deserts of the Southwest.

We need to address the real issues at our southwest border. To do so, I will continue to support effective border security measures, such as those in the recently passed Homeland Security Appropriations Act to invest in new technology and equipment, increase the number of Customs and Border Protection agents, and make smart physical improvements at ports of entry.

This law also included funding to increase the number of immigration judges to help reduce the backlog in our immigration system, provide humanitarian aid for Central American countries, and address humanitarian concerns at the border.

These efforts are important and appropriate for the true nature of the situation, but I cannot support diverting billions of dollars of money from the needs of our men and women in uniform to fulfill a campaign promise. Therefore, I will vote in support of the resolution to terminate the President's inappropriate declaration.

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

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

S.J. RES. 7

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wanted to come down here and participate in this debate. It is the second one we have had in a couple of months on the floor of the U.S. Senate regarding this resolution with regard to U.S. policies and participation in helping Saudi Arabia—a difficult ally but nevertheless a longstanding ally of the United States—in its conflict with regard to Yemen. There have been a number of speeches, as there were last time we debated this issue a few months ago on the Senate floor.

I do want to call out my Senate colleague from the great State of Utah, Senator LEE, who has been down here passionately arguing the issue of constitutional authority that the President may or may not have with regard to our U.S. military activities with regard to the conflict in Yemen. Senator LEE is a great constitutional scholar. He is someone who cares deeply about this issue, as do I. He is one of the leaders in the Senate on this issue. That is where he has been focused. That is why I believe he is part of this resolution that we are going to be voting on here in a few minutes on the Senate floor.

I happen to disagree with him that under the War Powers Act, the United States of America doing air refueling of Saudi aircraft—not above Yemen, not above our conflict zone, but above Saudi Arabia—would constitute hostilities. I think that is too limiting a view of that statutory prohibition in the War Powers Act. I know Senator LEE comes at this very honestly; I just happen to respectfully disagree with him.

I say to the Presiding Officer, as you have been watching this debate, the vast majority of my colleagues, all of whom I have deep respect for—Senator DURBIN, Senator SANDERS, Senator MURPHY, and Senator MENENDEZ—have all been on the floor the last hour or so making the case that if we, the United States, limit our involvement in this war in Yemen, somehow it is going to get better.

We all want the humanitarian crisis in Yemen to end. We all want that. I think all 100 U.S. Senators want that. The arguments that have been made—and by the way, they were made a couple of months ago. We debated this for a week. Nearly every U.S. Senator came down here on the floor. They have just done it again. They said: The Saudis are involved in this war in Yemen, a civil war—they are—and the involvement of the United States is actually increasing the humanitarian crisis.

These are the arguments. I have been listening. By the way, they were the arguments a couple of months ago. Senator after Senator after Senator made that argument. Well, I just wanted to provide a counter-argument. I am hoping my colleagues are listening because we should not pass this resolu-

tion. We should not pass this resolution.

One thing that all of these debates—and I listened and I watched. Certainly, we debated this a couple of months ago for almost a whole week. Do you know what word never came up from my colleagues in these debates—almost never? The word “Iran.” Why is that important? As the Presiding Officer probably knows, the Houthis are actually backed by the Iranians. The Iranians are the biggest state sponsor of terrorism in the world. Right now, we are having this debate all about the humanitarian crisis in Yemen, which we want to stop—we want to stop—but this resolution would say: OK, one of the best ways to stop it is we, the U.S. Senate, are going to tell the U.S. military that in terms of military assistance regarding Yemen, they can't work at all anymore. We are not going to allow that.

Somehow our lack of involvement is going to, A, help end the war, and B, help end the humanitarian crisis. That is the argument. That is what we are voting on right now. I happen to think that argument is wrong. I think that, but I am going to talk about some people who have testified on this very issue in the last couple of weeks who have a lot of knowledge on this issue. I am going to replay a little bit of what they said because I think it is important for other Senators to hear this. Yes, we have a lot of experts, but I am going to talk about some of the people who have talked about this recently, who I think have a little more expertise on this issue than the vast majority—I would say actually every Member of this body, with all due respect.

Let me go back to this point. Right now, as the Ayatollahs in Tehran watch this debate, they are very pleased. They are very pleased. Why? Because nobody is talking about them. Nobody is talking about them. Well, I am going to talk about them.

First of all, with regard to what started as a humanitarian crisis—which has been going on for a long time, but this war really kicked in when Iranian-backed Houthi rebels seized power in 2015. There is not a lot of discussion about how this began, but that is how it began. Tehran has been trying to establish a Hezbollah-like entity on the Arabian Peninsula in Yemen, increasing capabilities to target cities in Saudi Arabia with ballistic missiles supplied by Iran. This is all part of Iran's broader strategy in the region to encircle our traditional allies—Saudi Arabia, the Gulf Arab States, and, of course, Israel—with proxy fighters in Syria, Lebanon, and Yemen. Yet nobody is talking about Iran.

Let's talk about the humanitarian crisis in Yemen. U.S. humanitarian aid has totaled almost \$697 million in the last 14 months. Yes, the Saudis could do a much better job, but they have invested over \$1 billion in trying to end the suffering.

Iran—the country that started this war, the country that nobody on the Senate floor is even talking about—has not spent a dime to relieve the suffering. Now, of course, they have supplied weapons and ballistic missiles in the tens of millions of dollars but nothing to relieve the suffering.

(Mrs. BLACKBURN assumed the Chair.)

There is something else here that I wanted to reemphasize on the floor of the Senate. The horrible death of Mr. Khashoggi is something we have all condemned. It is very important that we do that. It is very important that we get to the bottom of it. Again, there has been a lot of discussion on that death, and any death is a problem, but let's talk about some other deaths, again, caused by the Iranians—a country we are not even talking about in this debate.

In 2005, 2006, and 2007, they started supplying Iraqi Shia militias with very sophisticated, improvised explosive devices that killed and wounded over 2,000 American soldiers—2,000 American soldiers.

Where is the outrage on that? How come no one is talking about that issue? Where are the editorials about that issue—killing our servicemembers?

The whole concept in which we have to view this issue is through the lens of the Iranian efforts to spread terrorism and to push their malign interests, including in Yemen. Yet, once again, it is all about the Saudis, and no one is talking about Iran. No one is talking about Iran.

What has happened in the last couple of days since we debated this issue 2 months ago? Well, we had an Armed Services Committee hearing. It was classified, but I am going to talk about things that I asked some of the witnesses—all of the witnesses with regard to operations in Yemen and Saudi Arabia—and the answers are clearly not classified.

I asked: Will stopping U.S. support to help the Saudis end the conflict in Yemen? No. Would it prevent more civilian casualties? No. Would it give leverage to our negotiators and speed up the peace process? No. Would it support Israel's interests in the region? No. Would it support the U.S. interests in the region? No. Would it help embolden Iran with its regional malign goals? Yes.

These are the experts in the U.S. intelligence community and the Pentagon giving these answers. This is about 3 or 4 weeks ago. They are questions that I was asking.

Let me give you another group of experts. Just last week, we had a hearing. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee had a hearing for the nominations of our new Ambassador to Saudi Arabia, General John Abizaid, and our new Ambassador to Iraq, a career Ambassador, Ambassador Tueller, a career Foreign Service officer. That Ambassador had just spent the last several years as Ambassador to Yemen.

I had the honor of introducing General Abizaid at his confirmation hearing just last week. He was the U.S. Central Command commander. By the way, he was the U.S. CENTCOM commander when this spread of these IEDs killing American soldiers started and began. I happen to have been a Marine Corps major, a staff officer to General Abizaid for 1½ years during this time. I had the honor of introducing him.

This is an individual who is a great American, by the way, who spent his life in the Middle East. He retired as a four-star general, speaks Arabic, has a master's degree from Harvard on Middle East studies, and was an Olmsted scholar at the University of Amman in Jordan. He knows a lot about this issue that we are debating, as does Ambassador Tueller, who had just spent the last several years as the U.S. Ambassador in Yemen. He is a career Foreign Service officer who is getting ready to go to Iraq as our Ambassador.

We have a lot of expertise here, but, with all due respect to my Senate colleagues, these gentlemen have spent their lives in the region. I am just going to quote from a couple of the questions and answers that came from General Abizaid and Ambassador Tueller on what is going on in the region.

Here is an important one. Ambassador Tueller was asked about the humanitarian crisis in Yemen. Remember, this is the current Ambassador to Yemen—a very, very knowledgeable career political officer, a career Foreign Service officer. He said: But almost 100 percent of the humanitarian catastrophe in Yemen has been caused by the Iranian-backed Houthis that overthrew the Yemeni Government, destroyed the institutions of state, and caused approximately a 40-percent decline in the GDP of the country.

Let me say that again. This is the current Ambassador to Yemen, who is getting ready to be Ambassador to Iraq. He was asked who was responsible. Right now, if you listen to the Members of the Senate, it is all the Saudis, and the Iranians have nothing to do with it.

Here is a guy who knows more than anybody, with all due respect to the people in this body, on Yemen: One of the things I often feel badly about is because we have a relationship with Saudi Arabia, and understandably, hold them to a higher account. We do focus on the consequences of Saudi actions. That is what is going on in this debate right now. But almost 100 percent of the humanitarian catastrophe in Yemen has been caused by the Iranian-backed Houthis that overthrew the government in 2015, destroyed the institutions of state, and caused approximately a 40-percent decline in the GDP of the country.

He continued: I see very, very little reporting, for example, of the millions and millions of mines that the Houthis have planted around the country, that in fact have caused more civilian cas-

ualties and continue to cause civilian casualties going into the future. That is a great concern, and I think the American people need to be concerned about the humanitarian issues caused by the Iranian-backed Houthis.

This is last week in the Senate Foreign Relations committee. Now, you wouldn't know it in this debate because everybody is saying the whole problem is Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia is a problem. They are an ally. They are a difficult ally. They are a complicated ally. But one of the experts in our country on this issue says that almost 100 percent of this is the Iranian-backed Houthis who caused the humanitarian crisis.

Let me just make a couple of more points. This is General Abizaid. I see the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is on the floor, and I hope he will talk to this because this was in front of his committee. Iran and its proxies want us out of the region.

By the way, that is what this resolution would help us do. This is General Abizaid last week: They see that their agenda is served by having the United States disengaged and out to not counter their malign influence. I think it is very important that we work to ensure that the relationship with Saudi Arabia allows us to continue our influence in the region. I think, as we continue to apply pressure to them, what I hope is that we can create conditions with some of the elements to begin to abandon sort of the Houthi ideological project, a project that because it is an Iranian project really in Yemen will never bring stability to Yemen.

Again, what is going on here is that the Iranian-backed Houthis in Yemen are causing the humanitarian crisis. The Iranian regime wants us out of the region, including in Yemen, and the U.S. Senate is getting ready to vote on a resolution that does just that.

Again, the Ayatollahs are watching this debate, and they are very pleased. They are very pleased with what is happening.

Let's hear one more final thing that General Abizaid said, again, in this hearing just last week—a man who understands so much more about what is going on in the region than my colleagues here on the Senate floor: One thing we can't afford in Yemen, we can't afford to withdraw U.S. expertise to the coalition about how to fight.

He is talking about the Saudis.

He continued: Does anyone think that if we leave and take our assistance with regard to the Saudis, that is going to help the humanitarian situation in Yemen?

The question almost answers itself, and here is General Abizaid, the former CENTCOM commander, at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee just last week, saying that is not a good idea: If we want them, the Saudis, to fight right, we need to continue to give them that expertise.

That is exactly the opposite of what this Senate resolution is getting ready to do.

He continued: As far as competence in military operations conducted by the Saudi coalition, I think they have much work to do. We all agree with that. It is very important for us to continue to talk to them about the targeting system—we all agree with that—and about the way that they go about hitting the various targets, and about the professionalization of their forces, and when mistakes are made, that they do like what we do, which is to convene a board of officers, talk about the mistakes, and then take corrective action necessary to gain better and better expertise.

This is still General Abizaid, just last week: I am hopeful that there is a way to move forward with regard to easing humanitarian problems in Yemen, and that it will continue. And if I am confirmed—which we all hope he will be very soon—will tell the Saudi Government they need to do that.

But the former commander of U.S. Central Command—and I spent 1½ years with him in the region, seeing him in action every day—emphatically stated that if we don't work with the Saudis in terms of military assistance, it is going to get worse.

The current Ambassador to Yemen testified last week that almost 100 percent of the humanitarian crisis in Yemen is caused by the Houthi rebels backed by the Iranians. Yet, if you listen to the debate today and if you listen to the debate 3 months ago on the floor of the Senate, almost nobody even talks about Iran.

So given that the experts believe this strongly, given that they have more knowledge—and they are not political; one is a career four-star general, and one is a career Foreign Service officer—and given that they think this is a really bad idea to vote for this resolution, I am not sure how it advances American interests. I am not sure how it advances humanitarian interests in Yemen, which we all want to advance. It certainly will not advance the peace process, which we all want to move forward.

The only entity in the Middle East that will be cheering a resolution in support of American withdrawal with regard to the Saudis is the biggest state sponsor of terrorism in the region, and that is Iran. That is not just me saying it. That is literally some of the most prominent experts in the country who have spent their lives focused on these issues.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this resolution that we are going to take up here very soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, first of all, I want to associate myself with those clear, concise comments of my friend and colleague from the great State of Alaska. He is absolutely right from not only a military standpoint but also from the standpoint of getting this resolved through a political resolution.

We are going to consider the Senate joint resolution today, and it is a joint resolution that directs removal of U.S. Armed Forces from hostility in the Yemen conflict unless authorized by Congress. The premise of this resolution is fundamentally flawed.

Let's start here, though. Every single one of us—all 100 of us—can agree what a horrible situation this is and what a horrible catastrophe this is in Yemen. But this resolution sets a bad precedent for using the War Powers Act to express political disagreements with a President under expedited Senate rules.

I want to start by making it absolutely clear what is and what is not happening with respect to our current U.S. engagement in Yemen.

First of all, this is what isn't happening. What is not happening is the injection of U.S. troops into active hostilities in Yemen. We are not doing that.

What we are doing, however, is most important. We provide limited, non-combat support, including intelligence sharing, and the practices that minimize civilian casualties to the Saudi-led coalition. This support is advisory in nature and helps defend the territorial integrity of the region, which faces a very real threat from the Iranians and the Iranian-backed Houthis.

This point can't be understated. The United States conducts war operations entirely differently from any other country on the face of the Earth, and it is done with a direct and involved method of minimizing civilian casualties. Our presence here assists the parties in conducting operations to minimize those civilian casualties, and it is badly needed there because there are tremendous civilian casualties.

Iran's support for the Houthis, notably the transfer of missiles and other weaponry, threatens to undermine our partners' territorial integrity. It imperils key shipping routes and puts U.S. interests at risk, including the thousands of U.S. personnel and citizens currently within the range of Iranian-made missile systems under the control of the Houthis. That said, there can be no argument that after 4 long years of conflict, Yemen, a country with a long history of socioeconomic challenges is now in the grip of the world's worst humanitarian crisis at this moment. An estimated 24 million—80 percent of the Yemeni population—are in need of some kind of assistance and 15.9 million people—more than half of the country's population—remain severely food insecure.

A resolution to this conflict must be found, and make no mistake, many of us on a bipartisan basis are working regularly every day to do everything within our power to restore peace in a country that has been ravaged by years of proxy war and fractious infighting. But we all recognize that lasting peace can be achieved only through a political settlement brokered by the U.N. The U.N.-led peace talks are our best

bet for achieving peace in Yemen, and they appear to be at a critical juncture at this moment.

In the past, we have helped advance the negotiations by using the support we provide to the coalition as leverage over the parties to advance the negotiating process. In the past, parties have been reluctant to take on the negotiating process, but in the place we are in, we have the ability to leverage them to get there.

As this body considers ways to drive effective U.S. policy that helps end the war and relieves humanitarian suffering in Yemen, I urge Members to bear in mind that the U.N. negotiations are our best hope for achieving peace. We must do everything in our power to advance this cause, and advancing this cause does not mean turning our backs on the negotiations and on what is going on there at this time. We need to stay engaged with the limited engagement that we have had.

The peace envoys have come to this body and have testified over and over again, and they are telling us they want deeper U.S. engagement. Voting for this resolution sends a terrible message of U.S. division and lack of resolve. We need to send a signal and resolve that we are committed to playing an important role in pushing for a sustainable political settlement. As I stated, turning our backs at this critical moment is only going to empower them, and it is going to send a message to people that they don't need to negotiate right now and that they are actually making gains.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this at this time and give peace a chance through the negotiations.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I want to be very clear about a couple of things. No. 1, the fact that the word "hostilities"—

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LEE. Yes, sir.

Mr. INHOFE. It was my understanding that before the vote on my amendment, I would be recognized prior to the vote for 1 minute or so. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first vote is on the Paul amendment, but there are 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to this vote.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I need to make a few points, and I say these with great respect for my distinguished colleagues on the other side of this issue, with great respect for my colleagues, the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Idaho, from whom we just heard.

I must nonetheless insist on a couple of points being made. No. 1, this tortured definition of the word "hostilities" that we have heard over and over and over again is itself, No. 1, ridiculous and, No. 2, utterly at odds

with and irrelevant under the War Powers Act.

The War Powers Act itself, in title 50 of the United States Code, section 1547(c), states in pertinent part that “For purposes of this chapter, the term ‘introduction of United States Armed Forces’ includes the assignment of members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will be engaged, in hostilities.”

There is absolutely no question here that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia-led coalition is involved in hostilities. No one doubts that. No one tries to dress it up in ridiculous language amounting to anything other than what it is, which is a war. It is also beyond dispute that our U.S. Armed Forces are, in fact, involved in the commanding, the coordinating, the participating in the movement of and the accompanying of those forces, as they themselves are engaged in hostilities. Therefore, the War Powers Act is itself implicated, and that matters.

Why? Well, because in the absence of an act of Congress authorizing this, it is unconstitutional for us to send our brave young men and women into harm’s way. It is unconstitutional and unlawful for us to be involved in a war, and, make no mistake, we are involved in a war.

Next, we hear a lot about Iran—Iran this and Iran that. I get that. I get that some people in this Chamber really like war or at least really like this war. I get that some people in this Chamber really distrust the regime in Iran, and of that latter group, I count myself among them. The regime in charge of Iran is not a friend of the United States and is, in fact, an enemy.

I do not understand—for the life of me, I cannot comprehend how the fact that the Iranian regime is an enemy to the United States in any way, shape, or form authorizes an unconstitutional war effort, an undeclared war by the United States in a civil war half a world away in Yemen. It makes no sense. It is a complete non sequitur. So, look, if somebody wants to bring a resolution declaring war on Iran, let’s have that conversation. If somebody wants to use military force in Iran or anywhere else in the world—in Yemen—let’s have that conversation too.

Remember a few years ago, when President Obama decided he wanted us to go to war in Syria. At the time he made that point, Congress reconvened. I believe it was during a summer recess. Congress came back. We had a lot of discussions. A lot of us received classified briefings in the SCIF, and, ultimately, Congress concluded: Let’s not do that. We didn’t authorize that, but that is, in fact, for Congress to decide. That is, in fact, Congress’s decision.

The fact that Iran or the regime of Iran may be an enemy of the United States does not justify our going to war in a civil war against the Houthi rebels in Yemen. To suggest otherwise makes no sense and shouldn’t carry the day here.

Third, experts—we hear a lot of talk about “experts.” I don’t care whether general this, that, or the other or civilian this, that, or the other in the Pentagon or elsewhere in the executive branch of the government thinks that our going to war in somebody else’s civil war half a world away makes sense. I really don’t care. They don’t hold this office.

I care in the sense that I will listen to them; I care in the sense that their opinion might be informative to us as we exercise our constitutional authority to decide whether we should go to war. But it is a complete non sequitur to suggest that general this, that, or the other or somebody or other at the Pentagon who is an “expert” thinks that we should be in that war or that we should somehow be able to circumvent the Constitution and the law in order to go to war.

Finally, with respect to the suggestion that this would somehow hinder our involvement in international humanitarian aid, that is completely incorrect. That is not at all what this resolution does. This resolution wouldn’t do that.

What this resolution does is very simple. It says that short of the U.S. Congress’s declaring war or authorizing the use of military force in the civil war in Yemen, half a world away, we shouldn’t be there, and we should get out. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Thank you.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to discuss the situation in Yemen and express my continued support for the resolution that is currently before us.

The conflict in Yemen is approaching its 4th year and has resulted in the most severe humanitarian crisis in the world. The human cost of this war is truly hard to fathom. According to the United Nations, approximately 20 million people—or more than two-thirds of Yemen’s population—have no reliable source of food or access to medical care; roughly 10 million Yemenis are on the brink of famine; more than 3.3 million Yemenis have been displaced from their homes; and credible reports indicate that approximately 80,000 children have died of starvation and another 360,000 children suffer from severe acute malnutrition.

The international community must come together to demand an end to the violence in Yemen and a sustainable political agreement. I strongly support the efforts of the U.N. Special Envoy for Yemen Martin Griffiths, in partnership with the United States and other engaged nations, to expeditiously negotiate an end to the conflict and bring relief to the Yemeni people. The De-

ember 2018 Stockholm Agreement and resulting ceasefire around the port of Hudaydah was a critical confidence building measure that will hopefully provide a foundation for continued negotiations.

I commend my colleagues Senators SANDERS, MURPHY, and LEE for their steadfast efforts to keep focus on the suffering of the Yemeni people. As the events of the last 4 years have made clear, there is no military solution to this civil war.

I remain deeply concerned about the significant number of civilian casualties that have resulted from airstrikes by the Saudi-led coalition. I strongly supported the decision last fall to cease U.S. aerial refueling support to the coalition, an outcome I long advocated for. It is appropriate for the U.S. to help the coalition avoid civilian casualties, but those efforts have not yet yielded sufficient results. Secretary Pompeo acknowledged this fact when he told Congress in September that “Recent civilian casualty incidents indicate insufficient implementation of reforms and targeting processes” and “Investigations have not yielded accountability measures” into the behavior of coalition pilots flying missions into Yemen. It is clear that the coalition has not sufficiently minimized the impact of the war on Yemeni civilians, and more must be done. The U.S. should use all available leverage to affect better outcomes.

The resolution before us would make clear that Congress does not support the introduction of U.S. forces into hostilities in Yemen absent an affirmative authorization for the use of military force. I believe that any U.S. assistance to members of the Saudi-led coalition should be explicitly limited to the following objectives: enabling counterterrorism operations against al Qaeda and ISIS; defending the territorial integrity of Saudi Arabia and UAE, including against specific, imminent ballistic missile and UAV threats; preserving freedom of navigation in the maritime environment around Yemen; and enhancing the training and professionalism of their armed forces with a primary focus on the adherence to the Law of Armed Conflict and the prevention of civilian casualties. With particular regard to defense against ballistic missile and UAV threats, the United States cannot be in the position of providing targeting information in Yemen that would be misused by the Saudi-led coalition either deliberately or through carelessness.

Continued U.S. engagement is critical to helping to resolve the conflict in Yemen, but any assistance to the Saudi-led coalition should be provided in accordance with the principles outlined above, activities which I do not believe conflict with the War Powers Resolution. From a policy perspective, the provision of U.S. support that could be used to enable offensive operations against the Houthis runs counter to our objective of ending the

civil war and risks exacerbating the suffering of the Yemeni people. Beyond the humanitarian crisis, the conflict continues to negatively impact the strategic security interests of the United States, Saudi Arabia, and UAE, including by emboldening Iran and relieving pressure on al Qaeda and ISIS. It is time for this war to end, and Congress should take every opportunity to make its voice clear on this point.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MENENDEZ's time be reserved; that all other remaining time be yielded back; and that the Senate begin voting on the amendments, as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 193

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to the vote in relation to the Paul amendment no. 193.

Who yields time?

Mr. LEE. I yield back time.

Mr. SANDERS. We yield back time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 194

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to the vote in relation to the Inhofe amendment.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we have heard a lot of controversy about this. I think the main thing for me at this late hour in relation to use of force—ours is not that type of activity there. We are on the outside. We are providing intelligence. We are not the tip of the spear. We are not the inductee in that type of action.

I would just say that if they are successful in their efforts, then the loser would be Israel. Iran would be the winner, and the humanitarian situation would be worse. I think most of us understand that.

The amendment we are talking about right now is merely an amendment that would put us in a position where, if a ballistic missile or cruise missile or UAV hits a population center and kills Americans, because we, due to the resolution, withheld intelligence, it would be unforgiveable. I think we all understand that. American lives could be lost.

That is why I introduced an amendment to specifically protect civilian populations. I am talking about not just other countries but our civilian population. We all know the exposure is there, and this would take that exposure away.

MOTION TO TABLE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I strongly oppose this amendment.

This amendment provides an exception to this resolution in support of efforts to defend against threats to civilian population centers in coalition countries, including locations where citizens and nationals of the United States reside. But the President already has authority to support the defense of U.S. partners and U.S. citizens residing in those countries, so it simply duplicates the authorities the President already has.

In the best interpretation, this amendment is unnecessary, but this amendment could also very easily be used by the administration as a loophole that will allow the Department of Defense to continue the unauthorized activities that the sponsors of this resolution are attempting to halt.

This resolution is intended to end U.S. support for the Saudi war against the Houthis in Yemen, support that has not been authorized by Congress as the Constitution requires. Under the language of this amendment, the administration could continue to wage that war under different pretenses.

The goal of this resolution is to get the United States out of a war. Senator INHOFE's amendment creates a pretext to keep the United States in that war.

I urge my colleagues to vote against it, and I move to table the Inhofe amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 47 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Blumenthal	Jones	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cardin	Leahy	Smith
Carper	Lee	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Paul	Young
Harris	Peters	
Hassan	Reed	

NAYS—48

Alexander	Ernst	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blackburn	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Graham	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Romney
Braun	Hawley	Rounds
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Collins	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cramer	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker

The motion to table the amendment (No. 194) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 195

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote in relation to amendment No. 195.

Mr. CORNYN. We yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 195.

The amendment (No. 195) was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 48 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Jones	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Sinema
Casey	Lee	Smith
Collins	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Harris	Paul	Young

NAYS—46

Alexander	Fischer	Risch
Barrasso	Gardner	Roberts
Blackburn	Graham	Romney
Blunt	Grassley	Rounds
Boozman	Hawley	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Kennedy	Thune
Cramer	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Toomey
Cruz	McSally	Wicker
Enzi	Perdue	
Ernst	Portman	

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 7

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:
(1) Congress has the sole power to declare war under article I, section 8, clause 11 of the United States Constitution.

(2) Congress has not declared war with respect to, or provided a specific statutory authorization for, the conflict between military forces led by Saudi Arabia, including forces from the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Kuwait, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Senegal, and Sudan (the Saudi-led coalition), against the Houthis, also known as Ansar Allah, in the Republic of Yemen.

(3) Since March 2015, members of the United States Armed Forces have been introduced into hostilities between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis, including providing to the Saudi-led coalition aerial targeting assistance, intelligence sharing, and mid-flight aerial refueling.

(4) The United States has established a Joint Combined Planning Cell with Saudi Arabia, in which members of the United States Armed Forces assist in aerial targeting and help to coordinate military and intelligence activities.

(5) In December 2017, Secretary of Defense James N. Mattis stated, "We have gone in to be very—to be helpful where we can in identifying how you do target analysis and how you make certain you hit the right thing."

(6) The conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis constitutes, within the meaning of section 4(a) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543(a)), either hostilities or a situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances into which United States Armed Forces have been introduced.

(7) Section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)) states that "at any time that United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States, its possessions and territories without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs".

(8) Section 8(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(c)) defines the introduction of United States Armed Forces to include "the assignment of members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged, in hostilities," and activities that the United States is conducting in support of the Saudi-led coalition, including aerial refueling and targeting assistance, fall within this definition.

(9) Section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a) provides that any joint resolution or bill to require the removal of United States Armed Forces engaged in hostilities without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization shall be considered in accordance with the expedited procedures of section 601(b) of the International Security and Arms Export Control Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-329; 90 Stat. 765).

(10) No specific statutory authorization for the use of United States Armed Forces with respect to the conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis in Yemen has been enacted, and no provision of law explicitly authorizes the provision of targeting assistance or of midair refueling services to warplanes of Saudi Arabia or the United Arab Emirates that are engaged in such conflict.

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS.

Pursuant to section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a) and in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-329; 90 Stat. 765), Congress hereby directs the President to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities in or affecting the Republic of Yemen, except United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at al Qaeda or associated forces, by not later than the date that is 30 days after the date

of the enactment of this joint resolution (unless the President requests and Congress authorizes a later date), and unless and until a declaration of war or specific authorization for such use of United States Armed Forces has been enacted. For purposes of this resolution, in this section, the term "hostilities" includes in-flight refueling of non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING CONTINUED MILITARY OPERATIONS AND COOPERATION WITH ISRAEL.

Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to influence or disrupt any military operations and cooperation with Israel.

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING INTELLIGENCE SHARING.

Nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to influence or disrupt any intelligence, counterintelligence, or investigative activities relating to threats in or emanating from Yemen conducted by, or in conjunction with, the United States Government involving—

- (1) the collection of intelligence;
- (2) the analysis of intelligence; or
- (3) the sharing of intelligence between the United States and any coalition partner if the President determines such sharing is appropriate and in the national security interests of the United States.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON RISKS POSED BY CEASING SAUDI ARABIA SUPPORT OPERATIONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the risks posed to United States citizens and the civilian population of Saudi Arabia and the risk of regional humanitarian crises if the United States were to cease support operations with respect to the conflict between the Saudi-led coalition and the Houthis in Yemen.

SEC. 6. REPORT ON INCREASED RISK OF TERRORIST ATTACKS TO UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES ABROAD, ALLIES, AND THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES IF SAUDI ARABIA CEASES YEMEN-RELATED INTELLIGENCE SHARING WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the increased risk of terrorist attacks on United States Armed Forces abroad, allies, and to the continental United States if the Government of Saudi Arabia were to cease Yemen-related intelligence sharing with the United States.

SEC. 7. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING NO AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(a)(1)), nothing in this joint resolution may be construed as authorizing the use of military force.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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.

MOBILE MAMMA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of my constituent, Christy Teslow, I ask unanimous consent to

have printed in the RECORD information about a program she founded to help educate children of all ages about the importance of being a good digital citizen.

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

Mobile Mamma is a non-profit organization which was founded in 2017 in Cresco, Iowa. We are 6 moms who are working professionals that use a common-sense approach to educate about the impact of technology. We personally have children ranging in age from kindergarten to college and wanted to be better educated about using devices of daily use, with the common goal to keep our children safe and secure while being online. From our own research, we felt compelled to design a curriculum to share with students and adults of all ages.

Statement of the Problem. Children today are so self-reliant on their mobile devices which in turn has caused a social disconnect with society. Children are more concerned with their "e-reputation" and not as much of what their real-life reputation is. Parents have an ethical and moral role to provide children with online safety. The problem is, children are not safe online and parents are unaware of the detrimental dangers, harms, and effects of social media.

Conceptual Framework. Clear and concise communication about parents' expectations are especially important. Research has demonstrated that teens, whose parents use effective monitoring practices, are less likely to make poor decisions such as having sex at a young age, smoking, using illegal drugs, drinking alcohol, being physically aggressive, or skipping school (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2012). Teens who believe their parents disapprove of risky behaviors are less likely to participate in these behaviors. Teens rely on their parents and other adults in their daily lives for information about online safety. In 2013, a study by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention titled "Adolescents, Technology, and Reducing Risk for HIV, STDs, and Pregnancy", a participant stated "I multitask every second I am online. At this very moment, I am watching TV, checking my email every two minutes, reading a newsgroup about who shot JFK, burning some music to a CD, and writing this message" (a 17-year-old male). According to Farrukh, Sadwick, and Villaseñor (2014), parents seek information on how to best protect children online through various channels. Parents utilize general news media 38% of the time, other parents 37%, and school teachers 29%.

Statement of the Purpose. The purpose of the Be a B.E.A.R. program is to educate children of all ages about the importance of being a good digital citizen. The Be a B.E.A.R. curriculum is designed to teach children from kindergarten through high school about what is acceptable to portray on social media and what is not acceptable. The intention of the Be a B.E.A.R. program is not only designed for children but can be applied to adults as well. The purpose of the program is to gain a positive structured approach to handling online situations.

Significance of the Program. There is an ethical and moral responsibility of schools and adults that give these devices to children, to properly educate themselves and their children. With the rising mental health crisis, not only in Iowa but across the Nation, the devices of daily living (also known as Smartphones, tablets, etc) are causing these issues. Some of these issues include: low self-esteem, anxiety, depression, sadness, sleeplessness, and paranoia. Due to the mental health concerns, if we can get this program in schools it will help give a positive

use to technology by determining what a good digital footprint and digital citizen are. This program continues to educate both parents and children about cybersecurity/safety, the potential harms and dangers associated with the evolving virtual environment, and discusses in detail about the responsibility needed by all ages when it comes to the constant influx of technology in our children's lives. With the increasing suicide rates, there is a direct correlation between human trafficking, cyberbullying, and sexting that are negatively impacting society.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Good digital citizen: While online portraying yourself as a positive person and using appropriate etiquette

Good digital footprint: Leaving positive markers when using the internet and social media sites

B.E.A.R.:

B = breathe, stop and take a breath before reacting to a situation that may cause you negative feelings

E = explain to the other person or parties how the negative behaviors that are being portrayed are impacting you personally

A = affirm actions, your choice is to walk away, block the other party on social media, and ignore

R = report the unwanted behavior to a trusted adult such as parents, teachers, or counselors.

Timeline. Currently, we are involved with two Northeast Iowa School Districts. We are using a 7-week program to educate the students in the following grades kindergarten, third, sixth, eighth, and eleventh about the Be a B.E.A.R. program. Each student has completed a pre-test about the different objectives that are covered in the core curriculum. After completion of the program there will be a post-test administered to determine the learning curve of the students.

Currently, we do not have substantial results because of the initiation phase we are in. After the completion of our 7-week program we will have results to support our statement of intent.

Conclusion. By implementing these steps of the Be a B.E.A.R. program with children and adults, we can bring positivity and education while being safe online.

GUATEMALA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, for the past dozen years, the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala, with financial support from the United States and other countries, has worked in collaboration with Guatemala's Public Ministry. That partnership has enabled courageous Guatemalan prosecutors to investigate and bring to trial cases they never could have pursued without the international "shield" and assistance provided by CICIG. It has also enabled courageous constitutional court magistrates to defend Guatemala's weak judicial institutions. In a country where throughout its history high-ranking public officials, including senior military officers, and corporate elites have enjoyed near total impunity for corrupt acts and violent crimes, the Guatemalan people finally saw that justice is possible.

Not surprisingly, that collaboration encountered fierce opposition from its inception. The same high-ranking officials and elites who feared becoming

the targets of corruption investigations sought to curtail CICIG's role. Last year, that opposition culminated in President Morales expelling the CICIG commissioner and subsequently announcing that the agreement establishing CICIG would be terminated, effective immediately. That announcement was made, without warning, after months of negotiations between Guatemala, UN, and U.S. officials on reforms requested by the Morales government, which would have established the position of Deputy Commissioner as well as certain reporting and oversight requirements.

In response to that announcement, as well as other worrisome trends in Guatemala, last week Senator CARDIN and I, along with Representatives TORRES and MCGOVERN, introduced legislation in the Senate and House entitled the "Guatemala Rule of Law Accountability Act." Its purpose is to respond to the flagrant actions by the Morales government to subvert the rule of law, including its campaign against CICIG.

In fact, the Morales government lacks authority to unilaterally curtail an agreement with the United Nations, a point that was made clear by the UN Secretary General. CICIG's mandate continues in effect until September 2019, at which point it may or may not be renewed. However, I am concerned that there are some, including at the UN, who believe CICIG should significantly reduce its activities and, for all intents and purposes, fade into the sunset. This would mean that, for the remaining 6 months of its current mandate, CICIG personnel would no longer attend trials or engage in further investigations. Essentially, CICIG would discontinue its public activities and its personnel would be limited to preparing for the shutdown that would presumably occur in September.

This is extremely worrisome for several reasons. First, donors would be paying to simply keep the lights on. Second, CICIG would cease to function half a year before the end of its mandate. This would be an enormous waste of time and resources that could be used to continue pursuing important cases and to ensure their proper hand-off to the public ministry. Third, it would send a terrible message to the Guatemalan people, especially to the families of the victims.

CICIG's work under Commissioner Ivan Velazquez has been important not only for Guatemala, but for all of Central America. There are still many cases under investigation. Abandoning these cases would be a grave mistake. It would signal that the Morales government's tactics of intimidation and obstruction of justice paid off. It would undermine future anticorruption efforts in Guatemala, as well as send a terrible message to anticorruption efforts in Honduras and fledgling efforts in El Salvador. The United Nations and the international community have a responsibility to do everything possible to prevent this result.

On a related topic, the Guatemalan Congress is about to debate, for the third and final time, legislation to grant amnesty to former military personnel who are charged with or convicted of war crimes and crimes against humanity. If the amnesty legislation is approved, those serving prison sentences will reportedly be released within 24 hours. The Guatemalan Congress has long had a reputation for being corrupt, and absolving military officers who engaged in heinous crimes is clearly a payoff to obstruct justice and undermine the rule of law.

We remember that Guatemala was ravaged by three decades of an internal armed conflict that included crimes of genocide. An estimated 200,000 people, mostly rural Mayan villagers, were killed, and, according to the United Nations, more than 90 percent of those killings were committed by the army. The peace accords that ended that disaster were never implemented, and for decades, the victims of those crimes were denied justice. Now the Guatemalan Congress, with the support of President Morales, is on the verge of adding insult to injury by freeing the few army officers who were sent to prison. If that happens, the Guatemalan Government will join other pariah governments that fail to uphold their most sacred obligation to provide security and justice for their citizens.

SAUDI ARABIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it has been more than 5 months since journalist and American resident Jamal Khashoggi was tortured and murdered inside the Saudi consulate in Istanbul. More than 5 months since the Saudi Government initially denied it had anything to do with Mr. Khashoggi's disappearance and told the world, in a calculated and quickly disproven lie, that he left the consulate unharmed.

As the Saudi Government's complicity became clear, its explanations became even more convoluted. We were told to accept that the operation that resulted in Mr. Khashoggi's death was an interrogation gone wrong, carried out by rogue agents who somehow flew to Istanbul, executed Mr. Khashoggi, and worked with a local collaborator to cover up the crime, all, despite their ties to the highest levels of government, without the knowledge of the Crown Prince. Although Senators—Republicans and Democrats—who have been briefed on the matter found that possibility preposterous, President Trump and Secretary Pompeo seemed ready to accept the Saudi Government's lies.

The truth is that, while there is a mountain of information circulating in the press that suggests the Crown Prince was involved in the planning and approval of the assassination of Mr. Khashoggi, there are still many unanswered questions.

We know the Saudi Government identified certain Saudi officials who allegedly carried out this murder, but we do not know how they were identified, what these officials were asked, by whom, and what they have said about the crime, or why some of them were brought to trial and others were not.

We know that the Trump administration sanctioned 17 Saudi officials, but we have not been told to what extent or why these individuals were targeted for sanctions and others were not. We know that there was a local collaborator, but we have not been told his nationality or identity, nor the whereabouts of Mr. Khashoggi's body, which has not been returned to his family.

What do we know? We know that the Saudi Government—the royal family—is sticking to the latest version of its story, absolving itself of any culpability. The Trump administration maintains, despite many mixed signals, that it is doing everything in its power to ensure Mr. Khashoggi's murderers are held accountable for their actions.

If that is true, we would expect the administration to be transparent and to cooperate with the Congress.

But while I would like to be persuaded of their commitment to pursuing justice in this case, their efforts to date have been anything but convincing. On October 10, 2018, Senators Corker, MENENDEZ, GRAHAM, and I, along with a majority of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, sent a letter to the President to trigger a 120-day review and determination on the imposition of sanctions pursuant to the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act with respect to any foreign person involved in the murder of Mr. Khashoggi. The response of the administration has been to ignore the legal requirement to make that determination. This is only the latest attempt by the administration to obstruct the Congress's access to information about this crime.

Rather than ignoring its legal obligations and keeping Congress in the dark, the administration should be working with Congress and the international community, to expose the truth about who gave the orders to kill Mr. Khashoggi. If the administration has nothing to hide, then they have nothing to lose and everything to gain by being part of the effort to see justice done.

One way for the administration to prove it is serious about accountability is to fully cooperate with the UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, who is reviewing the evidence in the Khashoggi case. The White House, the State Department, and our intelligence agencies should promptly provide her with any relevant information in their possession.

As I stated on February 3, 2019, if the President continues to take actions such as ignoring the clear mandate of the Magnitsky Act or otherwise refuses to cooperate with the investigations of

this murder, the White House will share the blame for attempting to cover up the crime and for helping those responsible to evade justice.

The administration should also urge the Saudi Government to guarantee a fair and public trial for the men accused of being involved in the killing of Mr. Khashoggi, that meets international standards of due process. A trial that fails to disclose all of the facts—a trial that is rushed and secretive—will be seen as simply further obstruction of justice. Real accountability must occur in this case.

We know all too well that Mr. Khashoggi's murder is only one example of the brutal way in which the Saudi Government, led by the Crown Prince, treats anyone it perceives as a threat, which means anyone who dares criticize the government or who advocates for human rights.

Since May 2018, prominent women's rights advocates have been imprisoned and tortured by the Saudi Government or banned from traveling, without any criminal charges being brought—women like 25-year-old Loujain al-Hathloul, who had a driver's license from the United Arab Emirates and advocated for the right of Saudi women to drive, but was arrested in a sweeping crackdown on women's activists just before the Saudi Government lifted the ban on female drivers. Dr. Hatoon al-Fassi, another women's rights advocate and a history professor, was arrested in June 2018 and remains confined to this day. While these women have not been charged, their so-called crime is obvious: engaging in independent activism. The royal family will do whatever it takes to make clear that they alone can create change in Saudi Arabia.

That is why, like these women, anyone of influence, including average citizens who advocate for reforms, is at risk in Saudi Arabia. It is not only opposition that the Crown Prince fears, it is the appearance of capitulation to ordinary citizens that he seeks to avoid by cracking down on those who are merely advocating for reforms he himself claims to support. His repression has touched every segment of society, from journalists to women's rights advocates to economists like Dr. Essam al-Zamil, who was detained in September 2017, presumably due to his opposition to the Crown Prince's economic plan, and Mohammad Fahad al-Qahtani, an economics professor and human rights activist who was sentenced in 2013 to 10 years in prison for breaking allegiance with the royal family and defaming the judiciary.

Sometimes the motivation behind the Crown Prince's actions is a complete mystery. One egregious case is that of Dr. Walid Fitaihi, a U.S. citizen who earned his medical degree from George Washington University and a master's degree in public health from Harvard University. Dr. Fitaihi was seized by Saudi authorities for unknown reasons in November 2017. He has reportedly been severely tortured,

and he remains in prison. In fact, before Mr. Khashoggi was murdered, he wrote about Dr. Fitaihi's detention on social media to decry the arbitrary and repressive trends developing under the Crown Prince's rule. Like Jamal Khashoggi, there is not a shred of evidence that Dr. Fitaihi is guilty of anything. He should be released immediately. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the March 4, 2019, editorial in the Washington Post, entitled, "Saudi Arabia is torturing a U.S. citizen. When will Trump Act?" which highlights Mr. Fitaihi's case, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

These cases are only a fraction of the known examples of the Crown Prince's repression. There are countless others that don't escape the royal family's tight control of information in the country. This is the so-called reformer we are told to put our trust in to help lead Saudi Arabia into the future. As others in this body have said, he is no reformer; he is an impulsive, ruthless gangster. It would be naive not to think that the Crown Prince's actions will lead to greater public resentment and instability in Saudi Arabia and jeopardize our long-term interests in the region. Contrary to the thinking of the White House, no amount of arms sales and no amount of oil can change that reality.

I urge all Senators to join me in urging the White House and in supporting legislative action as appropriate to protect our national interests by ensuring that United States relations with Saudi Arabia are guided, first and foremost, by our principles and, most importantly, by our commitment to the rule of law.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 2019]
SAUDI ARABIA IS TORTURING A U.S. CITIZEN.
WHEN WILL TRUMP ACT?
(By Editorial Board)

Before he was murdered inside a Saudi Consulate in October, our colleague Jamal Khashoggi questioned why Saudi Arabia had detained a prominent doctor, Walid Fitaihi, a dual Saudi-U.S. citizen seized in a November 2017 roundup of businessmen. The detainees, in what was described as an anti-corruption drive, were held at the Ritz-Carlton hotel in Riyadh. "What happened to us?" Khashoggi, himself a Saudi, asked on Twitter. "How can a person like @Walidfitaihi get arrested, and for what reason?" He added, "With no interceding channels to pursue & no Attorney General to answer questions & verify charges, of course everyone is struck with awe and helplessness."

Today, Khashoggi is no longer able to ask such impertinent questions. He was assassinated in Istanbul by a hit squad that intelligence reports say was dispatched by the Saudi crown prince, Mohammed bin Salman. But Khashoggi's question remains relevant. Mr. Fitaihi, founder of a medical center in Jeddah, is still a captive. It is not known precisely why, and he has never been charged, although the New York Times quoted a friend saying he was being pressured to give evidence against a relative.

He has been tortured during his captivity. He was reportedly grabbed from his room at

the Ritz, slapped, blindfolded, stripped to his underwear, bound to a chair, shocked with electricity and whipped so severely that he could not sleep on his back for days. The Times said his lawyer has written to the State Department that the doctor “is in fear for his life, that he cannot take his situation any longer, and that he desires all possible help.” The Associated Press quoted the lawyer as saying Mr. Fitaïhi is now in a prison hospital after suffering “an emotional breakdown.” Mr. Fitaïhi earned his medical degree from George Washington University and holds a master’s degree in public health from Harvard University.

On another front in Mohammed bin Salman’s drive to crush critical voices, Saudi Arabia’s public prosecutor announced charges Friday against a group of female activists who campaigned to give women the right to drive—a right that Mohammed bin Salman conferred after they sought it. The activists have been jailed for nearly a year, during which Amnesty International says they have been tortured and sexually abused. They did nothing wrong and should be released unconditionally and immediately.

In the New York Times Magazine on Sunday, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, asked about the crown prince’s role in the Khashoggi murder, declared that the United States would “hold everyone that we determine is responsible for this accountable in an appropriate way, a way that reflects the best of the United States of America.”

A doctor with U.S. citizenship was tortured and held without charge. Women who stood for human dignity and equality were jailed and tortured. A journalist was killed. Yet President Trump and his administration—including his son-in-law, Jared Kushner, who last week met with the crown prince—are loath to act. That does not reflect the best of the United States of America.

AMENDMENT NO. 193 TO S.J. RES. 7

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I oppose amendment No. 193 to S.J. Res. 7, as I believe it is an unnecessary measure that too broadly narrows the President’s role in international affairs. I would have voted no if the amendment had been called for a roll-call vote.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN’S DAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate International Women’s Day, which occurred this past Friday, March 8, 2019. On this day each year, we recognize and celebrate women’s incredible achievements and double down on our commitment to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment, both at home and abroad.

The theme of International Women’s Day this year is “Think equal, build smart, innovate for change,” which highlights the importance of finding new ways to advance gender equality, especially by utilizing technology. In January of this year, President Trump signed a bill Senator BOOZMAN and I sponsored, the Women’s Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act, WEEE Act, into law. This important, bipartisan legislation allows women around the world, including those living in poverty, to access critical tools to start and grow their businesses. It

requires that 50 percent of U.S. Agency for International Development’s micro, small, and medium-sized enterprise resources are targeted to activities that reach the very poor, as well as enterprises women own, manage, and control. The WEEE Act empowers women to invest in themselves, their families, and their communities.

A McKinsey Global Institute report estimates that achieving global gender parity in economic activity could add as much as \$28 trillion to annual global gross domestic product by 2025. The WEEE Act will help women overcome the critical barriers they face when seeking economic opportunity and the legislation will open doors for children, families, and communities to benefit, too.

This year’s theme of “Think equal, build smart, innovate for change” also provides the opportunity to celebrate some of the incredible and life-changing innovations being launched around the world. In Cambodia, for example, CARE has developed a gamified mobile app called “Chat!” to provide cost-effective and high-impact reproductive health education to its young, female population working in the garment industry. Cambodia has the largest youth and adolescent population in Southeast Asia; two-thirds of the population are under the age of 29. Increasing numbers of Cambodians, especially young women, are migrating to urban areas to support its garment industry.

According to CARE, 85 percent of Cambodia’s garment factory workers are women, who are vulnerable to abuse and exploitation. According to the United Nations’ research on women, one in three women are likely to face violence in her lifetime. Therefore, applications like Chat! are critical to reach this population and provide reproductive health information and services, helping these women make informed and healthy choices and prevent unplanned pregnancies.

While International Women’s Day provides the opportunity to celebrate such successes, it is also critically important to recognize the work that lies ahead in the fight for gender equality, and especially the challenges that female human rights defenders face in this fight. A recent United Nations report on human rights defenders describes increased resistance to the work of female human rights defenders at multiple levels, linked to the rise of populism, fundamentalism, and violent extremism around the world.

The report highlights the increasing number of countries that are actively restricting fundamental human rights, including the freedoms of expression, association, and assembly, and specifically notes the enforced disappearances of female defenders in Saudi Arabia. Samar Badawi and Nassima al-Sadah, for example, were arrested last summer for advocating to lift the ban on female drivers and end the guardianship system that prevents women from legal and social independence. Amal al-Harbi

was also arrested last summer for advocating for the release of her husband, Fowzan al-Harbi, a human rights defender. These female human rights defenders remain detained to this day, and several of these activists are due to appear in Saudi court this week. With no access to legal representation, I and many of my colleagues fear that these activists will be charged and tried for crimes they did not commit, as a result of engaging in peaceful activities to advance human rights in Saudi Arabia, which are protected under international law.

The reduction in funding for women’s rights in recent years is also an immense challenge to future progress, a challenge exasperated by the Trump administration’s actions, particularly in the realm of women’s health. The Trump administration’s reinstatement and expansion of the Mexico City policy, often referred to as the Global Gag Rule, for example, has closed the door on some of the most effective, life-saving family planning programs by disqualifying international organizations from receiving U.S. family planning assistance if any non-U.S. funds are used to provide abortion services or counseling. The implementation of this expanded policy, as the aforementioned UN report notes, has “threatened the integration of health services and created division in civil society around the world.” As underscored by the example of Chat!, we know that family planning tools are critical to providing the education, information, and services that help prevent unplanned pregnancies and abortions.

As I have stated in the past, America’s global leadership begins with our progress here in the United States. This also extends into the realm of gender equality. A critical challenge to progress here at home is the fact that our own Constitution does not already guarantee women the same rights and protections as men. The Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution guarantees “equal protection of the laws,” and the Supreme Court, so far, has held that most sex or gender classifications are subject to only “intermediate scrutiny” when analyzing laws that may have a discriminatory impact. Ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment, ERA, by State legislatures would provide the courts with clearer guidance in holding gender or sex classifications to the “strict scrutiny” standard. That is why on January 25, 2019, Senator MURKOWSKI and I introduced a resolution to immediately remove the ratification deadline and reopen consideration of the ERA for ratification by the States and finally guarantee full and equal protections to women in the Constitution.

While we have much to celebrate on this day, I want to take this opportunity to remind my colleagues in the U.S. Senate that we must continue to use our leadership positions to shine a spotlight on human rights violations, wherever they occur, and push for the

immediate release of human rights defenders around the world, imprisoned for exercising fundamental human rights. We must also end the Global Gag Rule once and for all, and we must finally grant women equality under the law. By doing so, we will truly recommit ourselves to breaking down the barriers that remain for women's empowerment, so that we can pave the path towards prosperity for generations to come.

CENTENNIAL OF THE
THERMOPOLIS CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the centennial of the Thermopolis, WY, Chamber of Commerce.

On March 23, the Thermopolis Chamber of Commerce celebrates their 100th anniversary at an annual banquet. What was once called the old Thermopolis Commercial Club incorporated in Hot Springs County as the Thermopolis Chamber of Commerce on February 4, 1919.

The future of the chamber was entrusted to elected directors: President Guy J. Gay, Vice President C.C. Beaver, and Directors Peter Sill, I.W. Wright, Harris Woods, A.W. Harrigan, and C.E. Stewart. Their guidance laid the foundation for a chamber that continues to foster the growth of business and sense of community in Thermopolis.

In an article dated February 7, 1919, the Thermopolis Independent Record wrote of the intended mission of the new chamber of commerce. "We wish to create better business, better homes, better government, a better community and, in general, create a better brotherhood of man. We ask only what is fair. All who live here are the owners of our community and our community is our biggest asset."

This spirit has driven Wyoming's people, businesses, and communities since its inception and will continue for generations to come. To further expand the chamber's embrace of community, on November 13, 1987, the Thermopolis Chamber of Commerce passed a resolution to change its name to the Thermopolis Hot Springs Chamber of Commerce. This combined all of Hot Springs County's corner of the Big Horn Basin into the chamber's mission.

The citizens of Thermopolis and Hot Springs County are blessed to live in a beautiful environment. Located in northern Wyoming and nestled on the world's largest mineral hot spring, Thermopolis is bordered by the Hot Springs State Park and the Wind River Canyon. The Owl Creek Mountains lie to the South while the Absaroka Range is to the West. The hot springs have been free to the public since purchase of the land from Native Americans in 1896.

The construction of the railroad had a major impact on the development of Hot Springs County. In 1910, the Bur-

lington Railroad reached Thermopolis from the north. In 1911, the Burlington completed its line through Wind River Canyon to the south. This gave the entire Bighorn Basin much better connections with the rest of Wyoming. On February 9, 1911, the legislature approved establishment of Hot Springs County with Thermopolis as county seat. County government was organized in January 1913. The Thermopolis Chamber of Commerce was organized just a few years later in an office on South 5th Street.

For 100 years, the hard-working people at the chamber welcomed visitors to the area. One of today's main attractions is the rich prehistoric areas of Hot Springs County. The Wyoming Dinosaur Center offers a professional paleontological experience for the whole family. The center is an impressive 16,000-square-foot complex. It includes a world-class museum, working dig sites, and a modern preparation laboratory. Interpretive dig site tours allow visitors to walk the same ground as ancient dinosaurs and watch as scientists recover fossils from burial sites.

Hot Springs County as we know it today is vastly different from 100 years ago. It is this shared history between today's residents and those of the past that creates a special bond. Under direction and guidance from the chamber board of directors, executive director Meri Ann Rush and two office assistants, Kailey Dvorak and Kymberlee Oliver, continue the traditions of promoting Wyoming's people, businesses, and communities, started by the chamber 100 years ago. Chamber board members are president Deb Tudor, vice president Pastor Sam Needham, treasurer Vivian Butchart, secretary Susan Linko, past president Greg Willson, Phillip Scheel, Barb Heinze, Robin Griffin, Kerri Manig, Amanda Kraushaar, Lana Nicodemus, Shelly Burrows, and middle school representative Jackson Reed.

In honor of the centennial of the Thermopolis Hot Springs County Chamber of Commerce, I invite my colleagues to see this wonderful place in person. Thermopolis is the hometown of my wife Bobbi and her brother Mike. Her parents, Bob and Jerry Brown, continue to live there today. Bob served Thermopolis as the longtime postmaster, as well as in World War 2 and the Korean war. Jerry owned a store downtown.

It is a great privilege to recognize this remarkable organization advancing Wyoming business and tourism. Bobbi joins me in extending our congratulations and gratitude to the Thermopolis Hot Springs Chamber of Commerce on their centennial celebration.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO GERALD KOTKOWSKI

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, when Gerald Kotkowski of Hampton, NH,

was preparing for retirement, he knew he would have more time on his hands and wanted to find a way to give back to his community. Inspired by his own life experiences, Gerald chose to serve as a volunteer driver to help people undergoing cancer treatment, as well as those who experience visual impairments. Since he started working with both Future in Sight and the American Cancer Society, Gerald has provided more than 400 rides to his fellow Granite Staters in need. For his incredible volunteerism, I am proud to recognize him as March 2019's Granite Stater of the Month.

Gerald began driving people undergoing cancer treatment after he heard about the program from a coworker. The cause, he said, touched him because of his own experiences; he and his wife both have had cancer scares, and their daughter was diagnosed with leukemia as a child. While his daughter has thankfully been cancer-free for over two decades, he still remembers the impact that the diagnosis had on his family. Gerald also provides rides to Granite Staters who experience visual impairments through Future in Sight, inspired by a friend with low vision. Many of the people Gerald drives are from rural parts of our State or don't have the support networks they need while undergoing treatment and are profoundly grateful for the simple act.

In addition to providing rides, Gerald is also active in supporting adult Granite Staters who experience disabilities. Inspired in part by raising his own daughter who experiences Down syndrome, every Monday, Gerald plays basketball with adults who experience disabilities through Friends in Action NH, an organization dedicated to providing social and recreational activities to those who experience disabilities. Gerald also serves on the board of the organization.

For his selfless work to support those who need care in his community and to ensure that those who experience disabilities are fully included, I am proud to recognize Gerald as the March 2019 Granite Stater of the Month. •

TRIBUTE TO FRANK MORONEY

• Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, today I recognize Frank Moroney, executive director of AFSCME Council 93 and the AFSCME International vice president for the northern New England region. For his entire life, Frank has been a committed and fearless advocate for working people. Now, after four decades of service, he is entering a well-deserved retirement.

Frank began his career with AFSCME in 1967, when he joined Local 1358 as a worker in the Brookline Water Department. He quickly rose through the union ranks, and in 1971, he was elected president of the local. Frank scored two huge victories for his members early in his career. In 1973, he successfully took his local on strike

and received important longevity benefits for its members. He then fought for survivor health insurance benefits for all Brookline's municipal employees, taking the fight to the voters and winning on a ballot initiative.

Frank would build on these achievements as his career progressed, improving the lives of thousands of public employees throughout New England. He secured numerous wage increases, obtained more paid sick leave time, and successfully negotiated the Agency Fee in Maine. In 2012, Frank was appointed as the executive director of Council 93 and as vice president to the AFSCME International Executive Board, where he has served since. It is a leadership position befitting his service and dedication.

On April 1, 2019, Frank will retire as AFSCME Council 93 executive director. Throughout my and Frank's years of service, I have had the privilege of working closely with him and am lucky enough to call him my friend. Frank is irreplaceable, but his successes have left the council strong and one of the most effective AFSCME affiliates in the Nation.●

TRIBUTE TO BRANDY BUNKLEY

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Brandy Bunkley, the Union County Teacher of the Year from Union County High School in Lake Butler, FL.

Brandy has taught for 21 years and is the career specialist at Union County High School. Her dedication and support for students has been credited for the increasing graduation rate at the school.

Brandy believes that every voice has value and that every student matters. As a teacher, she works to ensure her students are developing clear and positive career paths for themselves and provides a caring and enthusiastic support system.

Throughout her time at Union County High School, she has put a high importance on the value of students' voices and as individuals by forming strong teaching relationships with her students. She has continuously proven that being an educator is deeply rooted in her core.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Brandy for her dedication to her students and look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KAMILLE CHAPMAN

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to honor Kamille Chapman, the Lake County Teacher of the Year from Mount Dora Middle School in Mount Dora, FL.

After receiving this award, Kamille credited the relationships she builds with her students as one of the reasons for her success. She works with her students to improve their lives and considers improved academic results a

byproduct. When some students have behavioral issues, she invites them to have lunch with her instead of writing a referral, believing this to be an investment in their well-being.

Kamille's eighth grade geometry students score 21 percent higher than any other school in her district and they outperform their ninth and 10th grade peers. Ninety-three percent of her algebra students pass their end of course exam, an increase from the previous 50 percent passage rate 2 years ago. She originally returned to Mount Dora Middle School with the intention to retire in 2016 after first leaving in 1996. Instead, her students inspired her to continue teaching after being surrounded by positive influences that reminded her why she became a teacher.

Kamille earned her bachelor's degree in health education from the State University of New York Cortland and her master's degree in education from Florida State University. She has taught over a 32-year span in Houston, TX, and several schools throughout Lake County. She also worked as a curriculum specialist for math and science for middle and high schools in the county.

I express my sincere thanks and appreciation to Kamille for all the fine work she has done throughout her career for her students and offer my best wishes on her future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO JUSTEN EARLY

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Justen Early, the Hernando County Teacher of the Year from Nature Coast Technical High School in Brooksville, FL.

Justen's desire to become a teacher began when he first volunteered as a football coach at Central High School. He became invested in the success of his players, both on the football field and in the classroom. From this experience, he decided his next step would be to enter the classroom.

As a teacher, Justen seeks to build a camaraderie to make students feel they are a part of a community. He focuses on his students learning differences and encourages them to make teaching suggestions.

Justen attended Florida A&M University and currently teaches technology support classes. He serves as the co-offensive coordinator of the high school's football team. He has been with the school since 2014 and is grateful for his school's administration for providing him the opportunity to teach. Justen credits his success to his mother, grandmother, aunt, Mrs. Rosemarie Poluchowicz of the language arts department, and Coach Rudolph Story for their mentorship.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Justen for his dedication in helping his students succeed in life and offer my best wishes for his continued success in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO DONELLE EVENSEN

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Donelle Evensen, the Flagler County Teacher of the Year from Rymfire Elementary School in Palm Coast, FL.

After receiving this award, Donelle said, "It makes me feel like I may have accomplished what I've set out to do and that's increase student achievement and increase support for our teachers and make them feel like they're valued and are appreciated for what they do every day." She tries each day to plan different ways to inspire and excite students and teachers at her school.

Donelle previously spent 10 weeks backpacking through nine European countries with her husband. This experience served as a reminder of life back home and how we treat those around us and the true value of all lives. She has brought this reflection to her classroom to share with her students.

Donelle has been an educator for 13 years and currently is the literacy coach for kindergarten through sixth grade at her school. She earned her master's degree in elementary reading and literacy from Walden University in 2008 and her master's certification in educational leadership from Stetson University in 2017.

I express my sincere thanks and appreciation to Donelle for her devotion to her students and look forward to hearing of her continued success in her future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO ELISA HALL

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Elisa Hall, the Suwannee County Teacher of the Year from Suwannee County High School in Live Oak, FL.

Elisa is a Florida High Impact Teacher and was honored to receive this important recognition. In her classroom, she implemented the House System, which encourages friendly competitions, school spirit, and a comradery built by students who strive to help each other succeed. She collaborated with her fellow teachers, Emily Blackmon and Vanessa Menhennett, to create this system.

The House System consists of four houses named Diligence, Optimism, Generosity, and Sincerity, to spell out DOGS, in honor of the school's mascot, the Suwannee Bulldogs. The houses are mixed with students from ninth through twelfth grade and compete with one another to win the House Championship. Elisa's work with the House System is credited with increasing students' motivation to earn prizes through improved attendance, completion of assignments, positive behaviors, and teamwork.

A ninth grade English teacher at Suwannee County High School, Elisa has taught at the school since 2015. Through her positive experiences within the school district, she is dedicated

to giving back to others and working hard for her students.

I extend my best wishes to Elisa on receiving this award and look forward to hearing of her continued success in her future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO HEATHER RAWLINS

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am honored to recognize Heather Rawlins, the Levy County Teacher of the Year from Chiefland Elementary School in Chiefland, FL.

Heather works closely with her colleagues in order to solve problems and coach them in the best teaching practices for students. She strives to continue her professional growth through instructional and educational leadership and earned several recognitions for her teaching abilities throughout her career.

Heather has taught for 10 years at various elementary schools throughout Florida and currently is a reading coach at Chiefland Elementary School, focusing on the iReady curriculum for her students. She also coaches teachers on the best practices for professional development in English Language Arts blocks.

Heather graduated summa-cum laude from Flagler College with two bachelor of arts degrees, elementary education—K-6—with ESOL endorsement and deaf education—K-12—in 2009. She also graduated summa-cum laude from Saint Leo University with her master of education degree, educational leadership in 2015.

I am thankful for the commitment Heather has given to her students and teachers throughout her career. I convey my best wishes to her on receiving this award and wish her continued success in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO JULIE WADE

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Julie Wade, the Columbia County Teacher of the Year from Eastside Elementary School in Lake City, FL.

Julie dedicates her time as a teacher to building relationships and trust with all of her students, even those considered the most difficult. She uses chess as an opportunity to reward and motivate her students and involves herself in various events throughout her school.

Julie's work with her students is credited to their scoring the second highest Florida Standards Assessments English Language Arts scores in the school district and the highest Florida Standards Assessments for fourth grade math scores in the county last school year.

Julie has been a teacher for 8 years and currently teaches fourth grade at Eastside Elementary School. She has taught at the school for 3 years and sponsors the math bee. She is currently enrolled in a masters of education program.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Julie for her dedication to her students and look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JESSICA WATKINS

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jessica Watkins, the Nassau County Teacher of the Year from Yulee Elementary School in Yulee, FL.

Jessica builds relationships with her students and enjoys seeing them thrive in the classroom and after graduation. She cares for her students and believes they can rise to any challenge set before them.

Outside of her classroom, Jessica has dedicated her time to mentoring new teachers and interns. She also has served on her school district's reading curriculum building team, the writing professional development team, and the language arts/grammar building team, all in efforts to improve student outcomes in classrooms beyond her own.

Jessica is a fourth grade teacher at Yulee Elementary School, where she serves as the fourth grade chairperson, is on the school leadership team, and on the positive behavioral interventions and support team. She has spent 4 years teaching in Nassau County and 8 years overall in education.

I extend my best wishes and gratitude to Jessica for her dedication to her students and colleagues. I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 596. An act to prohibit United States Government recognition of the Russian Federation's claim of sovereignty over Crimea, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1404. An act to strengthen the United States response to Russian interference by providing transparency on the corruption of Russian President Vladimir Putin.

H.R. 1582. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to require preservation of certain electronic records by Federal agencies, to require a certification and reports relating to Presidential records, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1608. An act to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1617. An act to direct the Director of National Intelligence to submit intelligence assessments of the intentions of the political leadership of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1654. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to modernize the Federal Register, 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. 596. An act to prohibit United States Government recognition of the Russian Federation's claim of sovereignty over Crimea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1404. An act to strengthen the United States response to Russian interference by providing transparency on the corruption of Russian President Vladimir Putin; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

H.R. 1582. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to require preservation of certain electronic records by Federal agencies, to require a certification and reports relating to Presidential records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1608. An act to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1654. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to modernize the Federal Register, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-552. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's proposed fiscal year 2020 Budget and Performance Plan; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-553. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hiring Flexibility Under Professional Standards" (RIN0584-AE60) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-554. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Dixon R. Smith, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-555. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual National Defense Stockpile Operations and Planning Report"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-556. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 on April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-557. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Community Reinvestment Act Regulations" (RIN3064-AE97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-558. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Depository Institution Management Interlocks

Act” (RIN3064-AE92) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-559. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Limited Exception for a Capped Amount of Reciprocal Deposits From Treatment as Brokered Deposits” (RIN3064-AE89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-560. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Selenomethionine Hydroxy Analogue” (21 CFR Part 573) (Docket No. FDA-2015-F-2712) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-561. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s Annual Sunshine Act Report for 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-562. A communication from the Director of the Office of Business Transformation, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department’s fiscal year 2017 inventory of commercial and inherently governmental activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-563. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-7, “Sports Wagering Procurement Practices Reform Exemption Act of 2019”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-564. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-8, “Rental Housing Registration Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2019”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-565. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-9, “Federal Worker Housing Relief Temporary Act of 2019”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-566. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-19, “Sports Wagering Lottery Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2019”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-567. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-20, “Bryant Street Tax Increment Financing Temporary Amendment Act of 2019”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-568. A communication from the Regulation Policy Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Update: Enrollment - Provision of Hospital and Outpatient Care to Medal of Honor Veterans” (RIN2900-AQ34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-569. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls” ((CG Docket No. 17-59) (FCC 18-177)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-570. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Misuse of Internet Protocol (IP) Captioned Telephone Service; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities” ((CG Docket Nos. 13-24 and 3-123) (FCC 19-11)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-571. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Office of Economics and Analytics, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Connect America Fund; Universal Service Reform - Mobility Fund” ((WT Docket Nos. 10-90 and 10-208) (FCC 18-183)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-572. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Hazardous Materials: Enhanced Safety Provisions for Lithium Batteries Transported by Aircraft (FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018)” (RIN2137-AF20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-573. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; 2018 Commercial Quota Harvested for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts” (RIN0648-XG392) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-574. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fishery; 2018 Illex Squid Quota Harvested” (RIN0648-XG349) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-575. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “International Fisheries: Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Closure of Purse Seine Fishery on the High Seas in 2018” (RIN0648-XG458) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-576. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries in the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-

XG402) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-577. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XG115) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-578. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XG400) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-579. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; 2018 Commercial Quota Harvested for the State of Rhode Island” (RIN0648-XG692) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-580. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries” (RIN0648-XG695) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-581. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; 2018 Management Area 1B Directed Fishery Closure” (RIN0648-XG512) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-582. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XG675) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-583. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XF948) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-584. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant

to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XG502) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-585. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Closure of the Penaeid Shrimp Fishery Off South Carolina” (RIN0648-XF955) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-586. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2018 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Blueline Tilefish” (RIN0648-XG424) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-587. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Real Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2018 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Grey Triggerfish” (RIN0648-XG421) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-588. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; 2019 Specifications” (RIN0648-BI48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 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-12. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, urging the United States Congress to enact legislation that would eliminate the addition of a question regarding citizenship to the decennial United States Census questionnaire; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

POM-13. A resolution adopted by the Republican Party of Sarpy County, Nebraska memorializing its support for the President of the United States’ proposal to construct a secure border wall, and urging the United States Congress to immediately take action to fund the construction; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

POM-14. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of

Miami Beach, Florida, urging the United States Congress to recognize and support states’ rights relative to the legalization of medical marijuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 46. A bill to repeal the Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act (Rept. No. 116-6).

S. 50. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-7).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. ISAKSON for the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

*John Lowry III, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans’ Employment and Training.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 765. A bill to promote neutrality, simplicity, and fairness in the taxation of digital goods and digital services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 766. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to promote the investigation of fraudulent claims against certain trusts, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties against fraudulent claims against certain trusts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. KING):

S. 767. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to qualify homeless youth and veterans who are full-time students for purposes of the low income housing tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr.

UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 768. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 769. A bill to require the disclosure of certain visitor access records; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 770. A bill to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 771. A bill to amend section 21 of the Small Business Act to require cyber certification for small business development center counselors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 772. A bill to require an annual report on the cybersecurity of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 773. A bill to require the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation to test the effect of including telehealth services in Medicare health care delivery reform models; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 774. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to include the Rim of the Valley Corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 775. A bill to amend the America COMPETES Act to require certain agencies to develop scientific integrity policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 776. A bill to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act for purposes of making claims under such Act based on exposure to atmospheric nuclear testing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 777. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to enter into contracts with industry intermediaries for purposes of promoting the development of and access to apprenticeships in the technology sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 778. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to conduct coastal community vulnerability assessments related to ocean acidification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 779. A bill to end offshore corporate tax avoidance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for current year inclusion of net CFC tested income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 781. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the proper tax treatment of personal service income earned in pass-thru entities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 782. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to mental health services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 783. A bill to amend the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 to give Americans the option to delete personal information collected by internet operators as a result of the person's internet activity prior to age 13; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 784. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to expand the military student identifier program to cover students with a parent who serves in the reserve component of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SINEA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 785. A bill to improve mental health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a new tax credit and grant program to stimulate investment and healthy nutrition options in food deserts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 787. A bill to make housing more affordable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. JONES, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. SMITH, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CARPER, Mr.

UDALL, Mr. TESTER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KING, Mr. WARNER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHUMER, and Ms. SINEA):

S. 788. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 789. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the financial aid process for homeless and foster care youth; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. BURR, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 790. A bill to clarify certain provisions of Public Law 103-116, the Catawba Indian Tribe of South Carolina Land Claims Settlement Act of 1993, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. UDALL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 791. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for clarification regarding the children to whom entitlement to educational assistance may be transferred under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. PAUL):

S. Res. 108. A resolution honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Representative Walter Beamon Jones, Jr.; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 25

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 25, a bill to reserve any amounts forfeited to the United States Government as a result of the criminal prosecution of Joaquin Archivaldo Guzman Loera (commonly known as "El Chapo"), or of other felony convictions involving the transportation of controlled substances into the United States, for security measures along the Southern border, including the completion of a border wall.

S. 62

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 62, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate fair prescription drug prices under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 106

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Rhode

Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 106, a bill to reauthorize and extend funding for community health centers and the National Health Service Corps.

S. 107

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 107, a bill to provide any State with a child welfare demonstration project that is scheduled to terminate at the end of fiscal year 2019 the option to extend the project for up to 2 additional years.

S. 133

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 201

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 201, a bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to make clear that each decennial census, as required for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States, shall tabulate the total number of persons in each State, and to provide that no information regarding United States citizenship or immigration status may be elicited in any such census.

S. 215

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 215, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes.

S. 323

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 323, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognition Inspiring School Employees (RISE) Program recognizing excellence exhibited by classified school employees providing services to students in pre-kindergarten through high school.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the Senator

from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 450

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 450, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to expedite the onboarding process for new medical providers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to reduce the duration of the hiring process for such medical providers, and for other purposes.

S. 504

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 504, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The American Legion, and for other purposes.

S. 518

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 518, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 521

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) 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. 537

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 537, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the work opportunity tax credit with respect to hiring veterans who are receiving educational assistance under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or Defense.

S. 546

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

S. 589

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 589, a bill to provide for a period of continuing appropriations in the event of a

lapse in appropriations under the normal appropriations process, and establish procedures and consequences in the event of a failure to complete regular appropriations.

S. 592

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 592, a bill to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to promote transparency in the oversight of cybersecurity risks at publicly traded companies.

S. 598

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 598, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase certain funeral benefits for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 611

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 611, a bill to provide adequate funding for water and sewer infrastructure, and for other purposes.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. JONES, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 622, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 625

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 625, a bill to direct the Election Assistance Commission to carry out a pilot program under which the Commission shall provide funds to local educational agencies for initiatives to provide voter registration information to secondary school students in the 12th grade.

S. 630

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 630, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 with respect to arbitration.

S. 632

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 632, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion of certain fringe benefit expenses for which a deduction is disallowed in unrelated business taxable income.

S. 657

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 657, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to establish requirements with respect to prescription drug benefits.

S. 717

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 717, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to prohibit the manufacture, processing, and distribution in commerce of asbestos and asbestos-containing mixtures and articles, and for other purposes.

S. 731

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 731, a bill to amend the Anti-Border Corruption Act of 2010 to authorize certain polygraph waiver authority, and for other purposes.

S. 739

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 739, a bill to protect the voting rights of Native American and Alaska Native voters.

S. 752

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 752, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for teacher and school leader quality enhancement and to enhance institutional aid.

S. 764

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 764, a bill to provide for congressional approval of national emergency declarations, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 7, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. CON. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 5, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 100

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 100, a resolution recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women in the United States.

S. RES. 102

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 102, a resolution designating April 2019 as “Second Chance Month”.

S. RES. 104

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 104, a resolution calling on the Government of Iran to fulfill repeated promises of assistance in the case of Robert Levinson, the longest held United States civilian in our Nation’s history.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 765. A bill to promote neutrality, simplicity, and fairness in the taxation of digital goods and digital services; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 765

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Digital Goods and Services Tax Fairness Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. MULTIPLE AND DISCRIMINATORY TAXES PROHIBITED.

(a) MULTIPLE TAXES.—No State or local jurisdiction shall impose multiple taxes on the sale or use of a covered electronic good or service.

(b) DISCRIMINATORY TAXES.—No State or local jurisdiction shall impose discriminatory taxes on the sale or use of a digital good or a digital service.

SEC. 3. SOURCING LIMITATION.

Subject to section 6(a), taxes on the sale of a covered electronic good or service may only be imposed by a State or local jurisdiction whose territorial limits encompass the customer tax address.

SEC. 4. CUSTOMER TAX ADDRESS.

(a) SELLER OBLIGATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (e)(2), a seller shall be responsible for obtaining and maintaining in the ordinary course of business the customer tax address with respect to the sale of a covered electronic good or service, and shall be responsible for collecting and remitting the correct amount of tax for the State and local jurisdictions whose territorial limits encompass the customer tax address if the State or local jurisdiction has the authority to require such collection and remittance by the seller.

(2) CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.—When a customer tax address is not a business location of the seller under clause (i) of section 7(4)(A)—

(A) if the sale is a separate and discrete transaction, then a seller shall use reasonable efforts to obtain a customer tax address, as such efforts are described in clauses (iii), (iv), and (v) of section 7(4)(A), before resorting to using a customer tax address as deter-

mined by clause (vi) of such section 7(4)(A); and

(B) if the sale is not a separate and discrete transaction, then a seller shall use reasonable efforts to obtain a customer tax address, as such efforts are described in clauses (ii), (iii), (iv), and (v) of section 7(4)(A), before resorting to using a customer tax address as determined by clause (vi) of such section 7(4)(A).

(b) RELIANCE ON CUSTOMER-PROVIDED INFORMATION.—A seller that relies in good faith on information provided by a customer to determine a customer tax address shall not be held liable for any additional tax based on a different determination of that customer tax address by a State or local jurisdiction or court of competent jurisdiction, unless and until binding notice is given as provided in subsection (c).

(c) ADDRESS CORRECTION.—If a State or local jurisdiction is authorized under State law to administer a tax, and the jurisdiction determines that the customer tax address determined by a seller is not the customer tax address that would have been determined under section 7(4)(A) if the seller had the additional information provided by the State or local jurisdiction, then the jurisdiction may give binding notice to the seller to correct the customer tax address on a prospective basis, effective not less than 45 days after the date of such notice, if—

(1) when the determination is made by a local jurisdiction, such local jurisdiction obtains the consent of all affected local jurisdictions within the State before giving such notice of determination; and

(2) before the State or local jurisdiction gives such notice of determination, the customer is given an opportunity to demonstrate in accordance with applicable State or local tax administrative procedures that the address used is the customer tax address.

(d) COORDINATION WITH SOURCING OF MOBILE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If—

(A) a covered electronic good or service is sold to a customer by a home service provider of mobile telecommunications service that is subject to being sourced under section 117 of title 4, United States Code, or the charges for a covered electronic good or service are billed to the customer by such a home service provider; and

(B) the covered electronic good or service is delivered, transferred, or provided electronically by means of mobile telecommunications service that is deemed to be provided by such home service provider under section 117 of such title,

then the home service provider and, if different, the seller of the covered electronic good or service, may presume that the customer’s place of primary use for such mobile telecommunications service is the customer tax address described in section 7(4)(A)(ii) with respect to the sale of such covered electronic good or service.

(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “home service provider”, “mobile telecommunications service”, and “place of primary use” have the same meanings as in section 124 of title 4, United States Code.

(e) MULTIPLE LOCATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a digital service, audio or video programming service, or VoIP service is sold to a customer and available for use by the customer in multiple locations simultaneously, the seller may determine the customer tax addresses using a reasonable and consistent method based on the addresses of use as provided by the customer and determined in agreement with the customer at the time of sale or at a later time.

(2) DIRECT CUSTOMER PAYMENT.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT OF DIRECT PAYMENT PROCEDURES.—Each State and local jurisdiction shall provide reasonable procedures that permit the direct payment by a qualified customer, as determined under procedures established by the State or local jurisdiction, of taxes that are on the sale of covered electronic goods or services to multiple locations of the customer and that would, absent such procedures, be required or permitted by law to be collected from the customer by the seller.

(B) EFFECT OF CUSTOMER COMPLIANCE WITH DIRECT PAYMENT PROCEDURES.—When a qualified customer elects to pay tax directly under the procedures established under subparagraph (A), the seller shall—

(i) have no obligation to obtain the multiple customer tax addresses under subsection (a); and

(ii) not be liable for such tax, provided the seller follows the State and local procedures and maintains appropriate documentation in its books and records.

SEC. 5. TREATMENT OF BUNDLED TRANSACTIONS, DIGITAL CODES, AND OTHER RULES.

(a) BUNDLED TRANSACTION.—If a charge for a distinct and identifiable covered electronic good or service is aggregated with and not separately stated from one or more charges for other distinct and identifiable goods or services, which may include other covered electronic goods or services, and any part of the aggregation is subject to taxation, then the entire aggregation may be subject to taxation, except to the extent that the seller can identify, by reasonable and verifiable standards, one or more charges for the nontaxable goods or services from its books and records kept in the ordinary course of business.

(b) DIGITAL CODE.—The tax treatment of the sale of a digital code shall be the same as the tax treatment of the sale of the covered electronic good or service to which the digital code relates.

(c) APPLICATION OF FIXED CHARGES TO VOIP SERVICE.—With respect to VoIP service, if any tax is based on a fixed charge, such fixed charge shall be based on the number of simultaneous outbound calls the customer has purchased the right to place, regardless of actual usage or the number of the customer’s phone numbers.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The sale of a digital code shall be considered the sale transaction for purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. NO INFERENCE.

(a) CUSTOMER LIABILITY.—Subject to the prohibition provided in section 2, nothing in this Act modifies, impairs, supersedes, or authorizes the modification, impairment, or supersession of any law allowing a State or local jurisdiction to impose tax on and collect tax directly from a customer based upon use of a covered electronic good or service in such State.

(b) NON-TAX MATTERS.—This Act shall not be construed to apply in, or to affect, any non-tax regulatory matter or other context.

(c) STATE TAX MATTERS.—The definitions contained in this Act are intended to be used with respect to interpreting this Act. Nothing in this Act shall prohibit a State or local jurisdiction from adopting different nomenclature to enforce the provisions set forth in this Act.

(d) INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT.—Nothing in this Act modifies, impairs, supersedes, or authorizes the modification, impairment, or supersession of the Internet Tax Freedom Act (47 U.S.C. 151 note).

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) AUDIO OR VIDEO PROGRAMMING SERVICE.—The term “audio or video programming service” means programming provided by, or

generally considered comparable to programming provided by, a radio or television broadcast station, regardless of the facilities used to deliver or provide such service.

(2) COVERED ELECTRONIC GOOD OR SERVICE.—The term “covered electronic good or service” means a digital good, digital service, audio or video programming service, or VoIP service.

(3) CUSTOMER.—The term “customer” means a person that purchases a covered electronic good or service or digital code.

(4) CUSTOMER TAX ADDRESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “customer tax address” means—

(i) with respect to the sale of a covered electronic good or service that is received by the customer at a business location of the seller, such business location;

(ii) if clause (i) does not apply and the primary use location of the covered electronic good or service is known by the seller, such location;

(iii) if neither clause (i) nor clause (ii) applies, and if the location where the covered electronic good or service is received by the customer, or by a donee of the customer that is identified by such customer, is known to the seller and maintained in the ordinary course of the seller’s business, such location;

(iv) if none of clauses (i) through (iii) applies, the location indicated by an address for the customer that is available from the business records of the seller that are maintained in the ordinary course of the seller’s business, when use of the address does not constitute bad faith;

(v) if none of clauses (i) through (iv) applies, the location indicated by an address for the customer obtained during the consummation of the sale, including the address of a customer’s payment instrument, when use of this address does not constitute bad faith; or

(vi) if none of clauses (i) through (v) applies, including the circumstance in which the seller is without sufficient information to apply such paragraphs, one of the following locations, as selected by the seller, provided that such location is consistently used by the seller for all such sales to which this clause applies:

(I) The location in the United States of the headquarters of the seller’s business.

(II) The location in the United States where the seller has the greatest number of employees.

(III) The location in the United States—

(aa) from which the seller makes digital goods available for electronic delivery; or

(bb) from which digital services, VoIP services, or audio or video programming services are provided electronically.

(B) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term “location” does not include the location of a server, machine, or device, including an intermediary server, that is used simply for routing or storage.

(5) DELIVERED OR TRANSFERRED ELECTRONICALLY; PROVIDED ELECTRONICALLY.—The term “delivered or transferred electronically” means the delivery or transfer of a digital good by means other than tangible storage media, and the term “provided electronically” means the provision of a digital service, audio or video programming service, or VoIP service remotely via electronic means.

(6) DIGITAL CODE.—The term “digital code” means a code that conveys only the right to obtain a covered electronic good or service without making further payment.

(7) DIGITAL GOOD.—The term “digital good” means any software or other good that is delivered or transferred electronically, including sounds, images, data, facts, or combinations thereof, maintained in digital format, where such software or other good is the true object of the transaction, rather than the ac-

tivity or service performed to create such software or other good, that results in the delivery to the customer of a complete copy of such software or other good, with the right to use permanently or for a specified period, and includes, as an incidental component, charges for the delivery or transfer of such software or other good.

(8) DIGITAL SERVICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “digital service” means any service that is provided electronically, including the provision of remote access to or use of a digital good, and includes, as an incidental component, charges for the electronic provision of the digital service to the customer.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term “digital service” does not include a service that is predominantly attributable to the direct, contemporaneous expenditure of live human effort, skill, or expertise, a telecommunications service, an ancillary service, Internet access, audio or video programming service, or a hotel intermediary service.

(C) CLARIFYING DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)—

(i) the term “ancillary service” means a service that is associated with or incidental to the provision of telecommunications services, including, but not limited to, detailed telecommunications billing, directory assistance, vertical service, and voice mail services;

(ii) the term “hotel intermediary service”—

(I) means a service provided by a person that facilitates the sale, use, or possession of a hotel room or other transient accommodation to the general public; and

(II) does not include the purchase of a digital service by a person who provides a hotel intermediary service or by a person who owns, operates, or manages hotel rooms or other transient accommodations;

(iii) the term “Internet access” means any service included within the definition of the term “internet access” under section 1105(5) of the Internet Tax Freedom Act (47 U.S.C. 151 note); and

(iv) the term “telecommunications service”—

(I) means the electronic transmission, conveyance, or routing of voice, data, audio, video, or any other information or signals to a point, or between or among points;

(II) includes such transmission, conveyance, or routing in which computer processing applications are used to act on the form, code, or protocol of the content for purposes of transmission, conveyance, or routing, without regard to whether such service is referred to as VoIP service; and

(III) does not include data processing and information services that allow data to be generated, acquired, stored, processed, or retrieved and delivered by an electronic transmission to a purchaser where such purchaser’s primary purpose for the underlying transaction is the processed data or information.

(9) DISCRIMINATORY TAX.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “discriminatory tax” means any tax imposed by a State or local jurisdiction on digital goods or digital services that—

(i) is not generally imposed and legally collectible by such State or local jurisdiction on transactions involving similar property, goods, or services accomplished through other means;

(ii) is not generally imposed and legally collectible at the same or higher rate by such State or local jurisdiction on transactions involving similar property, goods, or services accomplished through other means;

(iii) imposes an obligation to collect or pay the tax on a person, other than the seller, that the State or local jurisdiction would

not impose in the case of transactions involving similar property, goods, or services accomplished through other means;

(iv) establishes a classification of digital services or digital goods providers for purposes of establishing a higher tax rate to be imposed on such providers than the tax rate generally imposed on providers of similar property, goods, or services accomplished through other means; or

(v) does not provide a resale and component part exemption for the purchase of digital goods or digital services in a manner consistent with the State’s resale and component part exemption applicable to the purchase of similar property, goods, or services accomplished through other means.

(B) CLARIFICATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, any tax that is limited in its application to only certain services, providers, or industries shall not be considered to be generally imposed, with the exception of any State tax which is imposed—

(i) in lieu of a generally imposed tax; and

(ii) at a rate which is not greater than the rate of such tax.

(10) LOCAL JURISDICTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “local jurisdiction” means—

(i) any municipality, city, county, township, parish, transportation district, or assessment jurisdiction;

(ii) any other local jurisdiction in the territorial jurisdiction of the United States with the authority to impose a tax; and

(iii) any governmental entity or person acting on behalf of an entity described in clause (i) or (ii) and with the authority to assess, impose, levy, or collect taxes.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The term “local jurisdiction” shall not include a State.

(11) MULTIPLE TAX.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “multiple tax” means any tax that is imposed by one State, one or more of that State’s local jurisdictions, or both on the same or essentially the same covered electronic good or service that is also subject to tax imposed by another State, one or more local jurisdictions in such other State (whether or not at the same rate or on the same basis), or both, without a credit for taxes paid in other jurisdictions.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The term “multiple tax” shall not include a tax imposed by a State and one or more political subdivisions thereof on the same covered electronic good or service or a tax on persons engaged in selling covered electronic goods or services which also may have been subject to a sales or use tax thereon.

(12) PRIMARY USE LOCATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “primary use location” means a street address representative of where the customer’s use of a covered electronic good or service will primarily occur, which shall be the residential street address or a business street address of the actual end user of the covered electronic good or service, including, if applicable, the address of a donee of the customer that is designated by the customer.

(B) CUSTOMERS THAT ARE NOT INDIVIDUALS.—For the purpose of subparagraph (A), if the customer is not an individual, the primary use location is determined by the location of the customer’s employees or equipment (machine or device) that make use of the covered electronic good or service, but does not include the location of a person who uses the covered electronic good or service as the purchaser of a separate good or service from the customer.

(13) SALE AND PURCHASE.—The terms “sale” and “purchase”, and all variations thereof, shall include the provision, lease, rent, license, and corresponding variations thereof.

(14) SELLER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “seller” means a person making sales of covered electronic goods or services.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—A person that provides billing service or electronic delivery or transport service on behalf of another unrelated or unaffiliated person, with respect to the other person’s sale of a covered electronic good or service, shall not be treated as a seller of that covered electronic good or service.

(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall preclude the person providing the billing service or electronic delivery or transport service from entering into a contract with the seller to assume the tax collection and remittance responsibilities of the seller.

(15) SEPARATE AND DISCRETE TRANSACTION.—The term “separate and discrete transaction” means a sale of a covered electronic good or service or digital code sold in a single transaction that does not involve any additional charges or continued payment in order to maintain possession of the digital good or access to or usage of the digital service, audio or video programming service, or VoIP service.

(16) STATE.—The term “State” means—

(A) any of the several States, the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession of the United States; and

(B) any governmental entity or person acting on behalf of an entity described in subparagraph (A) and with the authority to assess, impose, levy, or collect taxes.

(17) TAX.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “tax” means any charge imposed by any State or local jurisdiction for the purpose of generating revenues for governmental purposes, including any tax, charge, or fee levied as a fixed charge or measured by gross amounts charged, regardless of whether such tax, charge, or fee is imposed on the seller or the customer and regardless of the terminology used to describe the tax, charge, or fee.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “tax” does not include an ad valorem tax, a tax on or measured by capital, a tax on or measured by net income, apportioned gross income, apportioned revenue, apportioned taxable margin, or apportioned gross receipts, or a State or local jurisdiction business and occupation tax imposed on a broad range of business activity in a State that enacted a State tax on gross receipts after January 1, 1932, and before January 1, 1936.

(18) VOIP SERVICE.—The term “VoIP service” means any interconnected VoIP service, as defined in section 9.3 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor technology.

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—This Act shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—A State or local jurisdiction shall have 2 years from the date of enactment of this Act to modify any State or local tax statute enacted prior to the date of enactment of this Act to conform to the provisions set forth in sections 4 and 5 of this Act.

(c) APPLICATION TO LIABILITIES AND PENDING CASES.—Nothing in this Act shall affect liability for taxes accrued and enforced before the effective date of this Act or affect ongoing litigation relating to such taxes.

SEC. 9. SAVINGS PROVISION.

If any provision or part of this Act is held to be invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction for any reason, such holding shall not affect the validity or enforceability of any other provision or part of this Act unless such holding substantially limits or impairs the essential elements of

this Act, in which case this Act shall be deemed invalid and of no legal effect as of the date that the judgment on such holding is final and no longer subject to appeal.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 774. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area to include the Rim of the Valley Corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the “Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act.” This legislation would expand the boundaries of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area by 191,000 acres.

This legislation would provide surrounding communities with much-needed access to nature and open space, while maintaining private property rights and existing local land-use authorities.

The proposed expansion is based upon findings of the National Park Service after a six-year special resource study of the area.

This study was directed by Congress in the Rim of the Valley Corridor Study Act, passed in 2008.

The National Park Service’s recommendation takes into account over 2,000 comments received from the public, elected officials, local organizations, and other stakeholders.

This bill would add an additional 191,000 acres, known as the Rim of the Valley Unit, to the existing Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation area to provide members of the local community with improved recreational and educational opportunities.

The proposed expansion would also better protect natural resources and habitats, including valuable habitat for endangered wildlife, such as the California red-legged frog, mountain lions, bobcats, foxes, badgers, coyotes, and deer.

Notably, the “Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act” would only allow the Department of the Interior to acquire non-Federal land within the new boundaries through exchange, donation, or purchase from willing sellers.

I want to highlight that this legislation will not create any additional liability or restrictions for private property owners.

This legislation will significantly expand outdoor recreational opportunities for residents of Los Angeles County, one of the most densely populated and park-poor areas in California.

In fact, 47% of Californians—that’s six percent of the total U.S. population—live within two hours of the proposed expansion area. Enlarging the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, at no cost to U.S. taxpayers, will provide these communities with increased access to public lands and boost the local economy.

This bill enjoys the support of more than 50 local municipalities, commu-

nity groups, and elected officials. It is the product of significant public engagement in the legislative process.

I would like to thank my colleague, Representative ADAM SCHIFF, for re-introducing this legislation in the House.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the “Rim of the Valley Corridor Preservation Act” as quickly as possible.

Thank you, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 783. A bill to amend the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 to give Americans the option to delete personal information collected by internet operators as a result of the person’s internet activity prior to age 13; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 783

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Clean Slate for Kids Online Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. ENHANCING THE CHILDREN’S ONLINE PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT OF 1998.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1302 of the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 (15 U.S.C. 6501) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(13) DELETE.—The term ‘delete’ means to remove personal information such that the information is not maintained in retrievable form and cannot be retrieved in the normal course of business.”.

(b) REGULATION OF UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE ACTS AND PRACTICES IN CONNECTION WITH THE COLLECTION AND USE OF PERSONAL INFORMATION FROM AND ABOUT CHILDREN ON THE INTERNET.—Section 1303 of the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 (15 U.S.C. 6502) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) FAILURE TO DELETE.—It is unlawful for an operator of a website or online service directed to children, or any operator that has actual knowledge that it is collecting personal information from a child, to fail to delete personal information collected from or about a child if a request for deletion is made pursuant to regulations prescribed under subsection (e).”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) RIGHT OF AN INDIVIDUAL TO DELETE PERSONAL INFORMATION COLLECTED WHEN THE PERSON WAS A CHILD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Commission shall promulgate under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, regulations that require the operator of any website or online service directed to children, or any operator that has actual knowledge that it has collected personal information from a child or maintains such personal information—

“(A) to provide notice in a prominent place on the website of how an individual over the

age of 13, or a legal guardian of an individual over the age of 13 acting with the knowledge and consent of the individual, can request that the operator delete all personal information in the possession of the operator that was collected from or about the individual when the individual was a child notwithstanding any parental consent that may have been provided when the individual was a child;

“(B) to promptly delete all personal information in the possession of the operator that was collected from or about an individual when the individual was a child when such deletion is requested by an individual over the age of 13 or by the legal guardian of such individual acting with the knowledge and consent of the individual, notwithstanding any parental consent that may have been provided when the individual was a child;

“(C) to provide written confirmation of deletion, after the deletion has occurred, to an individual or legal guardian of such individual who has requested such deletion pursuant to this subsection; and

“(D) to except from deletion personal information collected from or about a child—

“(i) only to the extent that the personal information is necessary—

“(I) to respond to judicial process; or

“(II) to the extent permitted under any other provision of law, to provide information to law enforcement agencies or for an investigation on a matter related to public safety; and

“(ii) if the operator retain such excepted personal information for only as long as reasonably necessary to fulfill the purpose for which the information has been excepted and that the excepted information not be used, disseminated or maintained in a form retrievable to anyone except for the purposes specified in this subparagraph.”

(c) SAFE HARBORS.—Section 1304 of the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 (15 U.S.C. 6503) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “section 1303(b)” and inserting “subsections (b) and (e) of section 1303”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “subsection (b)” and inserting “subsections (b) and (e)”.

(d) ACTIONS BY STATES.—Section 1305(a)(1) of the Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 (15 U.S.C. 6504(a)(1)) is amended by striking “1303(b)” and inserting “subsection (b) or (e) of section 1303”.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. JONES, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. UDALL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 791. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for clarification regarding the children to whom entitlement to educational assistance may be transferred under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 791

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “GI Educational Benefits Fairness Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION REGARDING THE CHILDREN TO WHOM ENTITLEMENT TO EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE MAY BE TRANSFERRED UNDER THE POST 9/11 EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3319(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(c) ELIGIBLE DEPENDENTS.—

“(1) TRANSFER.—An individual approved to transfer an entitlement to educational assistance under this section may transfer the individual’s entitlement as follows:

“(A) To the individual’s spouse.

“(B) To one or more of the individual’s children.

“(C) To a combination of the individuals referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

“(2) DEFINITION OF CHILDREN.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘children’ includes dependents described in section 1072(2)(I) of title 10.”

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to educational assistance payable under chapter 33 of such title before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 108—HONORING THE LIFE, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND LEGACY OF REPRESENTATIVE WALTER BEAMON JONES, JR

Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. PAUL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 108

Whereas the passing of Walter Beamon Jones, Jr. (in this preamble referred to as “Walter B. Jones”), on February 10, 2019, was a monumental loss to his wife, JoeAnne, and their daughter, Ashley, as well as a deep loss for the Third Congressional District of North Carolina and the entire Congress;

Whereas Walter B. Jones was born on February 10, 1943, in Farmville, North Carolina, to Walter B. Jones, Sr., and Doris Long;

Whereas Walter B. Jones attended Hargrave Military Academy in Chatham, Virginia, and went on to Atlantic Christian College, where he received his degree in history in 1966;

Whereas, also in 1966, Walter B. Jones married his wife of more than 50 years, JoeAnne Whitehurst, and they later welcomed their only child, Ashley Elizabeth;

Whereas Walter B. Jones went on to serve for 4 years in the North Carolina National Guard, beginning his long career of serving the people of North Carolina;

Whereas, in 1982, following in his father’s footsteps, Walter B. Jones was elected to serve the Ninth District in the House of Representatives of North Carolina, ultimately serving 5 consecutive terms;

Whereas, in 1994, Walter B. Jones was elected to represent the Third Congressional District of North Carolina in the House of Representatives of the United States, where he served for 12 full terms;

Whereas, although Walter B. Jones began his political career as a Democrat and later switched to the Republican Party, he always voted with his constituents of Eastern North Carolina in mind, regardless of party position;

Whereas Walter B. Jones worked tirelessly on the Committee on Armed Services of the

House of Representatives to advocate for members of the Armed Forces and their families;

Whereas Walter B. Jones was a staunch advocate for peace and began a letter-writing campaign to the loved ones of the fallen soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan, personally sending more than 11,200 letters;

Whereas Walter B. Jones worked for 14 years to finally restore honor to and clear the names of 2 deceased Marine pilots who had been wrongly blamed for a military accident that took the lives of 17 other Marines;

Whereas the heritage of Eastern North Carolina held an important place in the heart of Walter B. Jones, moving him to protect the Shackleford Banks Wild Horses and to work to extend protections to the Corolla Wild Horses that have freely roamed the beaches of North Carolina for centuries;

Whereas Walter B. Jones worked closely with Government agencies in his district, particularly the National Park Service, to ensure his constituents and guests in the district were able to enjoy the natural beauty of the coastline of North Carolina;

Whereas Walter B. Jones had an outstanding working relationship with the fishermen and beach communities in the Third Congressional District of North Carolina, always advocating on behalf of the marine industry and maintaining continuous engagement on coastal issues;

Whereas, in 2004, Walter B. Jones was voted by congressional staffers as the nicest Member of Congress, a testament to his ever-gracious and humble demeanor;

Whereas Walter B. Jones, always a man of the people, built an outstanding record in constituent services, ensuring every person in his district would have access to him and his office; and

Whereas Walter B. Jones is survived by his wife of 53 years, JoeAnne, and daughter, Ashley Elizabeth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Congressman Walter B. Jones, Jr.; and

(2) extends its warmest sympathies to the family, friends, and loved ones of Congressman Walter B. Jones, Jr.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 193. Mr. LEE (for Mr. PAUL) proposed an amendment to 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.

SA 194. Mr. LEE (for Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CORNYN)) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 7, supra.

SA 195. Mr. LEE (for Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. CORNYN)) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 7, supra.

SA 196. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 7, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 197. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 7, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 198. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 7, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 199. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 7, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 193. Mr. LEE (for Mr. PAUL) proposed an amendment to 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; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 6. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING NO AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(a)(1)), nothing in this joint resolution may be construed as authorizing the use of military force.

SA 194. Mr. LEE (for Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. CORNYN)) proposed an amendment to 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; as follows:

On page 5, line 7, insert after “associated forces” the following: “or operations to support efforts to defend against ballistic missile, cruise missile, and unmanned aerial vehicle threats to civilian population centers in coalition countries, including locations where citizens and nationals of the United States reside”.

SA 195. Mr. LEE (for Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. CORNYN)) proposed an amendment to 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; as follows:

Insert after section 3 the following new section:

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING INTELLIGENCE SHARING.

Nothing in this joint resolution may be construed to influence or disrupt any intelligence, counterintelligence, or investigative activities relating to threats in or emanating from Yemen conducted by, or in conjunction with, the United States Government involving—

- (1) the collection of intelligence;
- (2) the analysis of intelligence; or
- (3) the sharing of intelligence between the United States and any coalition partner if the President determines such sharing is appropriate and in the national security interests of the United States.

SA 196. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, line 5, insert after “Yemen” the following: “, including by blocking any arms sales to Saudi Arabia for any item designated as a Category III, IV, VII, or VIII item on the United States Munitions List (USML) pursuant to section 38(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(1)) as long as Saudi Arabia continues to use such weapons in the civil war in the Republic of Yemen”.

SA 197. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed

by him to 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 6. REQUIREMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL AS CONDITION OF ENTERING INTO CIVILIAN NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED STATES PURSUANT TO SECTION 123 OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In 1971, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) established the Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement (CSA), which non-nuclear weapons states party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, signed at Washington July 1, 1968 (commonly known as the “NPT”), are obligated to bring into force to verify compliance with their nonproliferation obligations under the treaty.

(2) In 1997, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) established the model Additional Protocol to CSAs, which grants the IAEA expanded rights of access to information and sites related to a state’s peaceful nuclear program.

(3) The IAEA and international nonproliferation community established the Additional Protocol as a response to major shocks to the nonproliferation regime, most notably revelations that the IAEA’s existing safeguards system had failed to detect the Government of Iraq’s covert, undeclared nuclear program for non-peaceful purposes prior to the 1991 Persian Gulf War.

(4) The Additional Protocol strengthens the IAEA’s ability not only to verify the non-diversion of declared nuclear material but also to provide assurances as to the absence of undeclared nuclear material activities in a state by—

(A) applying IAEA safeguards to a state’s entire nuclear program, including uranium mining and milling sites, fuel fabrication, enrichment, and nuclear waste sites, as well as to any other location where nuclear is or may be present;

(B) expanding the amount and type of information a state is obligated to report to the IAEA regarding its nuclear program and related activities;

(C) expanding the IAEA’s inspection access at declared—and undeclared—locations to verify the absence of undeclared material or to resolve questions or inconsistencies in the information a state has provided about its nuclear activities; and

(D) specifying the IAEA’s right to use additional safeguards methods and equipment, including environmental sampling at both declared and undeclared sites.

(5) Universalizing the Additional Protocol and establishing it as the international standard for IAEA safeguards has been a bipartisan objective of United States nonproliferation policy since the Additional Protocol’s adoption.

(6) During the 2000 NPT Review Conference at the United Nations, Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright endorsed the “IAEA’s new strengthened safeguards to deter and detect cheating” and urged “all states to adopt them”.

(7) During the 2005 NPT Review Conference at the United Nations, Assistant Secretary of State for Arms Control Stephen G. Rademaker stated that President George W. Bush’s nonproliferation policy included “universalizing adherence to the Additional

Protocol and making it a condition of nuclear supply”.

(8) During the 2015 NPT Review Conference, Secretary of State John Kerry emphasized that the “United States is working to bring the Additional Protocol into force globally and to make it the global standard for safeguards compliance”.

(9) During the 2018 IAEA General Conference, Secretary of Energy Rick Perry delivered a letter on behalf of President Donald J. Trump, announcing that the United States “will continue promoting high standards of safety, security, safeguards, and nonproliferation, including an Additional Protocol as the international standard, and call on other nations to do the same”.

(10) At the same conference, Assistant Secretary of State for International Security and Nonproliferation Christopher Ashley Ford stressed that the Additional Protocol “should be universalized, and all supplier states should make adherence to the AP by recipient states a condition for nuclear supply”.

(11) As of December 2018, 134 states have brought into force the Additional Protocol with the IAEA while another 16 states have signed the Additional Protocol but have yet to bring it into force.

(12) The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has not brought into force an Additional Protocol. It currently has a Small Quantities Protocol (SQP) with the IAEA, a safeguards agreement that suspends the application of many provisions of a CSA for countries with minimal nuclear material and activities on its territory or under its jurisdiction.

(13) The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has expressed its intent to build an extensive civilian nuclear program, including two large-scale nuclear power reactors and multiple small modular reactors.

(14) The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia will no longer be eligible for a SQP and will be obligated to implement a CSA with the IAEA without exemptions if it either has nuclear material in quantities exceeding minimal limits or constructs nuclear facilities on its territory or under its jurisdiction, including a nuclear reactor.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Additional Protocol represents the international safeguards standard;

(2) Saudi Arabia should, at a minimum, bring into force an Additional Protocol with the IAEA as a requirement under any nuclear cooperation agreement with the United States made pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153); and

(3) any future civilian nuclear cooperation agreement with other nations pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153) should require that the proposed recipient has in force an Additional Protocol to its safeguards agreement with the IAEA.

(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR CIVIL NUCLEAR COOPERATION AGREEMENTS WITH OTHER NATIONS.—Section 123a. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

“(10) the cooperating party has in force an Additional Protocol to its safeguards agreement with the IAEA.”.

SA 198. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 6. VISA RESTRICTIONS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall impose the visa restrictions described in subsection (c) on any alien who the Secretary determines is responsible for, or complicit in, ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing the unlawful detention of a United States citizen in Saudi Arabia.

(b) REMOVAL FROM VISA RESTRICTION LIST.—The Secretary may issue a visa to an alien described in subsection (a) if the Secretary—

(1) determines that such alien has afforded due process to the applicable United States citizen; and

(2) submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that contains a justification for such determination.

(c) VISA RESTRICTIONS DESCRIBED.—Subject to subsection (b)—

(1) an alien described in subsection (a)—

(A) is inadmissible to the United States; and

(B) is ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation authorizing entry into the United States; and

(2) in the case of an alien described in subsection (a) who is in possession of a valid visa or other documentation authorizing entry into the United States, the Secretary shall revoke such visa or other documentation under section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)).

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding section 222(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202(f)), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register—

(1) the name of any alien to whom a visa restriction under subsection (a) applies; and

(2) any report submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress under subsection (b)(2).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ALIEN.—The term “alien” has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)).

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of State.

(4) UNLAWFUL DETENTION.—The term “unlawful detention” means arbitrary arrest or imprisonment without a public charge or trial.

SA 199. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 6. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR KILLING OF JAMAL KHASHOGGI.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any foreign person the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency assesses, with high confidence, before, on, or after such date of enactment, is responsible for, or complicit in ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the extrajudicial killing of Jamal Khashoggi.

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions to be imposed under subsection (a) with respect to a foreign person are the following:

(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The blocking, in accordance with the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), of all transactions in all property and interests in property of the foreign person if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(B) INAPPLICABILITY OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—The requirements of section 202 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701) shall not apply for purposes of this subsection.

(2) INADMISSIBILITY TO UNITED STATES.—In the case of a foreign person who is an individual—

(A) ineligibility to receive a visa to enter the United States or to be admitted to the United States; or

(B) if the individual has been issued a visa or other documentation, revocation, in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of the visa or other documentation.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—The requirement to impose sanctions under subsection (b)(1) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions with respect to the importation of goods.

(2) COMPLIANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS.—Subsection (b)(2) shall not apply with respect to the admission of an alien to the United States if such admission is necessary to comply with United States obligations under the Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, under the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or under other international agreements.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.—

(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of subsection (b)(1) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out that subsection shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms “admitted” and “alien” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means a person that is not a United States person.

(3) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I have 9 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 AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 13, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Heath P. Tarbert, of Maryland, to be Chairman, and to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 13, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The New Space Race: Ensuring U.S. global leadership on the final frontier.”

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 13, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 13, 2019, at 10.15 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “A new approach for an era of United States-China competition.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 13, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Daniel P. Collins, and Kenneth Kiyul Lee, both of California, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 13, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Cyber Crime: An existential threat to small business.”

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 13, 2019, at a time to be determined, to conduct a hearing on John Lowry III, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 13, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATION, TECHNOLOGY, INNOVATION, AND THE INTERNET

The Subcommittee on Communication, Technology, Innovation, and The Internet of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 13, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Oversight of the United States Patent and Trademark office."

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mike Lawliss from my office be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day on S.J. Res. 7.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Brandon Jacobsen, a fellow from the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, be granted floor privileges while he serves on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations through August 15, 2019.

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

HONORING THE LIFE, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND LEGACY OF REPRESENTATIVE WALTER BEAMON JONES, JR.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 108, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 108) honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Representative Walter Beamon Jones, Jr.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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. 108) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME EN BLOC—H.R. 1 and H.R. 1617

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I understand that there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the titles of the bills for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1) to expand Americans' access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, and strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 1617) to direct the Director of National Intelligence to submit intelligence assessments of the intentions of the political leadership of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I now ask for their second reading, and in order to place the bills on the calendar, I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard.

The bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2019

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, March 14; 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; that the Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.J. Res. 46, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that no amendments be in order to the joint resolution.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SULLIVAN. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:07 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 14, 2019, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 13, 2019:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

WILLIAM BEACH, OF KANSAS, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF LABOR STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

THE JUDICIARY

NEOMI J. RAO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING STEPHAN KAMINSKY

HON. BRADLEY SCOTT SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life Mr. Stephan Kaminsky, an esteemed veteran, Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) Post Commander and community volunteer who passed away in January at the age of 73.

Mr. Kaminsky served four years in the Navy during the Vietnam War, where he was stationed on the USS *Epperson* DD719, a destroyer.

After his service, Mr. Kaminsky remained active with community veteran organizations as a member of the Mundelein American Legion No. 867 and Commander of the Libertyville VFW Post 8741. He also served as President of the USS *Epperson* DD-719 Association, participating in reunions of former shipmates around the United States every two years.

Within VFW, Mr. Kaminsky was particularly active in the Buddy Poppy Donation Drive. The poppy is the official flower of the VFW, and represents the blood shed by American service members. Mr. Kaminsky's work to ensure the drive's success benefitted local veterans' welfare in the Lake County area. He was also a vital leader in the VFW "Patriots' Pen" essay contest. He was also a member of the Color Guard and Honor Guard and could frequently be seen marching in community parades for events ranging from the high school homecoming dance to the Fourth of July.

A graduate of the University of Illinois Chicago, Mr. Kaminsky was Vice President of the First American Bank of Elk Grove Village. He was also an avid sports fan who enjoyed playing volleyball and rooting for Notre Dame and the White Sox.

I extend my sincere sympathies to his wife, Elizabeth, and the many family and friends who mourn his passing. It is my great honor to recognize Mr. Stephan Kaminsky today and celebrate his service to our nation and to the veterans in our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARTIN F. QUINN, RECIPIENT OF THE GREATER PITTSION FRIENDLY SONS 2019 ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Martin F. Quinn who will receive the Achievement Award from the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick at their annual St. Patrick's Day dinner on Sunday, March 17, 2019. Martin is an active member of the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons, and

he was named Man of the Year by the organization in 2010.

Martin Quinn is the son of the late Martin J. Quinn and Margaret Mitchell Quinn. He was born and raised in the Cork Lane section of Pittston Township and graduated from Pittston Central Catholic High School in 1955. Motivated by the desire to serve his country, Martin served in the United States Army. Following an honorable discharge from the Army, Martin transitioned to civilian life. Martin is a licensed electrician and served as the recording secretary for the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. 1153. Prior to returning to Northeastern Pennsylvania in 1973, he worked in the trucking industry in New Jersey and was vice president of the Teamsters Union Local No. 701. He was employed by the Lehigh Valley Railroad and ConRail, Inc. for over thirty years, retiring as a Line Foreman in 1999.

Martin is an ardent supporter of education, having served on the Pittston Area School Board for 28 years. During his time on the board, he was instrumental in the construction of the Pittston Area Primary Center in Hughestown. In recognition of his efforts, the school was named in his honor in November 2016.

Martin is a steadfast community servant and dedicates his time to many local clubs, civic organizations, and community activities. He is a charter member of the Wolfe Tone Luzerne County Division 1 Ancient Order of Hibernians. He is also a member of the Knights of Columbus John F. Kennedy Council No. 372 and its Fourth Degree Assembly. He also serves as a board member of the Parking Authority of the City of Pittston. Martin is active with the Third District Democrats, serving many years as the committeeman for his ward. He is a social member of the Polish Club in Dupont, the West Side Club in Avoca, and the Pittston Township Italian Club. He belongs to Our Lady of the Eucharist Parish.

Martin lives in Pittston with his wife Barbara. They are proud parents and proud in-law parents of Mitch and his wife Kim, Mike and his wife Tara, and Brian and his wife Denise. And they are equally proud grandparents of Zach, Jake, Samantha, Katie, and Kearney.

It is an honor to recognize Martin F. Quinn for a lifetime of community involvement and service. I am grateful for the work he has done on behalf of the people of the Greater Pittston Area and wish him all the best on this St. Patrick's Day.

INTRODUCTION OF DIGITAL GOODS AND SERVICES TAX FAIRNESS ACT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Digital Goods and Services Tax

Fairness Act, a bipartisan, bicameral bill I introduced earlier today along with my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Representative JOHN RATCLIFFE from Texas, and in the Senate, Senators JOHN THUNE from South Dakota and RON WYDEN from Oregon, to curb discriminatory taxation of digital goods and services.

We live in an increasingly digitized world. Digital goods and services make consumption of entertainment media more convenient and have a lighter carbon footprint than their tangible analogs such as e-books, movies, online documents and much more. In addition, many vital health, education, and computer systems have turned to digital goods and services to increase the reliability and efficiency of access to important data.

The lack of a uniform framework for state taxation of digital goods and services has led to a patchwork of state tax laws that confuses consumers and unnecessarily challenges the digital economy. Consumers risk being taxed by multiple jurisdictions for a single download. For instance, three different states can currently tax the same purchase of a digital good or service.

Discriminatory taxes also discourage the new, innovative, emerging technologies and products that American inventors continue to develop.

The Digital Goods and Services Tax Fairness Act would ensure that consumers are not taxed at a higher rate for purchasing digital goods than they are for purchasing tangible goods by establishing a national framework to determine which state has the right to decide whether to tax a digital transaction. It would also protect consumers from potential multiple state taxes on a single digital purchase.

This is common sense legislation that is necessary in our booming digital economy. I urge both the House and the Senate to swiftly pass this bill.

HONORING CLAUS IHLEMANN FOR RECEIVING THE TIDEWATER CHAPTER HUMANITARIAN AWARD

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Claus Ihlemann on receiving the 2019 Humanitarian Award for the Tidewater Chapter of the Virginia Center for Inclusive Communities. This is an amazing accomplishment.

This award recognizes Claus' lifetime of service and commitment to the promotion of respect among people of diverse backgrounds. His commitment to Equality Virginia, the Tidewater AIDS Crisis Task Force, and his involvement in the Hope House Foundation are just some examples of his service to the community.

• 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.

Claus' dedication to strengthening bonds among people of different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds is truly inspiring. I am proud to honor and recognize Claus' leadership and the role he plays in making our community a better place. The Tidewater Region has significantly benefited from his presence.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SEAN CASTEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I missed Roll Call vote number 121. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: H. Res. 156, Calling for accountability and justice for the assassination of Boris Nemtsov—Yes.

RECOGNIZING JIM ROBBINS

HON. BRADLEY SCOTT SCHNEIDER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Jim Robbins, a veteran of the Marine Corps who honorably served our country and his community, and who passed away in January at the age of 90.

Upon graduating from Libertyville High School in 1946, Mr. Robbins immediately enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps, serving in China and Guam in the years following World War II. During his service, Mr. Robbins was stationed in Tangku, China and was one of the Marines who defended the Hsin Ho Ammunition Supply Depot against attack in April 1947.

After returning to the U.S. in 1950, he served as Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) Post 8741's commander for several years and as the Post's quartermaster for 32 years. He was especially known for his work with young people and recent veterans.

In addition, Mr. Robbins was the primary leader in making the veterans' monument in Lakeside Cemetery in Libertyville a reality. Every Memorial Day, Jim read off the names of former Libertyville township residents who had died in service to our nation at a community observance ceremony. He viewed this as a great honor and carefully wrote down their names phonetically in a personal notebook to ensure he properly pronounced the name of each fallen hero.

In his professional life, Mr. Robbins was a contract glazing salesman for 30 years. He also worked with the Lake County Forest Preserve for many years at the Fox River Preserve. He leaves behind two children, five beloved grandchildren, and several nieces and nephews.

It is my great honor and privilege to recognize the life of Jim Robbins and thank him for his service to our country and tireless work on behalf of other veterans in our community.

RECOGNIZING RONALD E. POWELL

HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor Ronald E. Powell for a lifetime of vigorous and effective advocacy protecting the rights of workers in my home state of Illinois, and for working men and women across the United States.

Ron's service in the labor movement began in 1961, when he was hired as a Field Representative for the United Retail Workers Union (URW). Thanks to his effectiveness as an organizer, he rose quickly through the ranks, becoming a Supervisor of Field Staff in 1968, and the Vice President and Director of Field Operations in 1973.

In 1981, the URW, with a membership totaling 6,000 workers, affiliated with the United Food and Commercial Workers Union and formed Local 881 of the UFCW. (The name "Local 881" was chosen to commemorate the date of its affiliation—August of 1981.)

Ron was elected president of Local 881 in 1983. Under his leadership, Local 881 has grown to represent 34,000 workers and is one of the largest affiliates in the UFCW family of unions that represent over 1.3 million workers across the world. While managing that growth, Ron found time to shoulder other responsibilities, including serving as Vice President on the International Executive Board of UFCW, Vice President of the state of Illinois AFL-CIO, Chairman of the Illinois State Investment Board, and as a member of the Illinois Workers' Compensation Medical Fee Advisory Board, the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority Board, and the board of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Illinois.

Ron's distinguished resumé does not tell the full story of his service to our community. He has worked tirelessly to advocate for the men and women who provide essential but often invisible services in a world increasingly indifferent to their rights and needs. Countless families are grateful to Ron and the efforts of Local 881 for improved wages and safety conditions in industries that include food service and preparation, meat packing, groceries, chemical manufacturing and retail. I know Ron takes great pride in the part he played in the recent enactment of the City of Chicago Paid Sick Leave Ordinance, extending paid leave protection for the first time to thousands of workers (and UFCW members) who live in our community.

Both personally and in furtherance of his work for the UFCW, Ron has been civically engaged, serving as a Trustee on the Village Board of Mundelein, and as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention. Over the years Ron has supported countless candidates that were committed to protecting the rights of working men and women, including a young United States Senator named Barack Obama who ultimately served two terms as President of the United States.

Many charities owe thanks to Ron as well. Under his stewardship, the Local 881 Charitable Foundation has been a strong supporter of the Leukemia and Lymphoma Society. Ron also organized fundraising efforts for Jackson Park Hospital in Chicago and the Little City Foundation, which serves developmentally dis-

abled children and adults in the Chicagoland area.

Ron is blessed with four children—one of whom, Steven, currently serves as President of Local 881 and an International Vice President of the UFCW—and many children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. He is held in esteem by numerous organizers and union officials he has mentored over the course of his career, and the thousands of workers whose lives have been made better through his efforts.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the 34,000 members of Local 881 of the UFCW, and the millions of hard-working men and women of the state of Illinois who owe so much to Ron Powell, I offer my thanks for nearly 60 years of dedicated and selfless service to our community. Although Ron may have retired from his positions with the UFCW, I know he has not retired from his commitment to service, and on behalf of all Illinoisans and Americans I wish him great success in his next chapter.

TWENTY YEARS OF REPRESENTING SOUTH DAKOTA AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL

HON. DUSTY JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, it will be the 20th time Spearfish High School will represent South Dakota at the national "We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution" competition this spring.

The team won the state competition Thursday at Black Hills State University.

"It's commendable that you guys do this . . . I think this will be a memorable experience for you," Wes Brown, of the Vantage Institute, a nonprofit organization that provides education, training, and support for issues facing communities, said. He thanked the students for their hard work, the judges for their time, and everyone involved for making the event possible.

The We the People program promotes civic competence and responsibility for upper elementary and secondary students. The program was created in 1987, directed by the Center for Civic Education and funded by the U.S. Department of Education under the Education for Democracy Act.

During the competition, student units take on simulated congressional hearing questions, demonstrating their knowledge and understanding of the Constitution and Bill of Rights and current constitutional issues. Each unit prepares a four-minute statement to present to the panel of judges acting as a congressional committee, and they then answer follow-up questions posed by the committee members. The units are scored on understanding, Constitutional application, reasoning, supporting evidence, responsiveness, and participation.

The Spearfish team is made up of seniors Lily Dennison, Gene Glover, Paxton Klug, Rigel Roberdeau, Kenna Comer, Kennedy Kaitfors, Rylee Niesent, Taylor Hersch, Justin Steedley, Hannah Tysdal, Ana Buchholz, Peter Marich, Morgan Roberts, Zach Tipton, Sophia Caldwell, Nathan Davis, Thomas Friedrich, Ella Neiman, Tim Doerges, Izzy Drumm, Jay Saylor, and Chelsea Williams. Patrick Gainey teaches the class.

Unit 4, made up of Buchholz, Marich, Roberts, and Tipton, were named the best unit for the Spearfish team, and Friedrich was named the Larson Best Speaker Award for the team.

Lead-Deadwood High School, taught by Matthew Campbell, also competed. The team is made up of students Chayton Bower, Carter Nelson, Eric Schumacher, Kyler Farmer-Winsell, Hunter Gudith, Chase Ladner, Michael Crawford, Harley Priest, Jasmine Riter, Luke Fish, Keegan Huntington, Zak Mau, Wyatt VandeVelde, Dylan Arehart, Dylan Janke, CJ Murray, Megan Snow, Raygan Mattson, Maxx Percy, Mackenzie Wetz, Zoe Bourgo, Brianna Pfeiffer-Munoz, Kaitlin Wilks, Carly Mehlberg, Abiah Morrison, and Alexis Morrison.

Unit 6a, made up of Bourgo, Pfeiffer-Munoz, and Wilks, was named best unit, and Pfeiffer-Munoz was named the Larson Best Speaker Award for the team.

Brown encouraged everyone to spread the word about the program. He said in the last decade, the most teams that participated in South Dakota were seven, versus the two teams competing this year. He added that Wyoming has 18 teams competing to represent the state.

"Thanks so much for putting in the effort," Brown said.

Spearfish High School will join approximately 1,200 students from 56 high school classes from across the nation to compete in the We the People National Finals April 26–29 at the National Conference Center in Washington, D.C.

"I'm really proud of how hard the kids worked," Gainey said of the students. "They put in—it's not just class time—they meet outside of school, they meet at each other's houses, they go and interview professionals, they talk to lawyers and public officials, to get information for their presentations. It's a class, I think, that inspires a lot of devotion and commitment to each other. I like it because it's a little bit like football or basketball in that you could have the smartest kid in the state and you still might not win because it's a team effort."

RECOGNIZING FEMALE LEADERS
OF COLLIN COUNTY

HON. VAN TAYLOR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, celebrated each March, "Women's History Month" serves as a time to honor and recognize the momentous achievements of women who have and continue to shape the United States today.

What began as a week-long celebration in 1981, has evolved into a month reserved to celebrate female leaders across the nation. Established annually by Presidential Proclamations since 1995, each March, we hear stories of incredible women who have broken barriers, set records, and inspired us all from coast to coast.

This year, I am especially proud to highlight a group of women making history right in Texas' Third Congressional District.

Collin County, Texas contains eleven District Courts, with eleven presiding judges, and seven County Courts at Law, with seven presiding judges.

In 2017, the addition of new judges brought the total number of female judges serving on the District Courts to six, meaning, for the first time in history, the majority of the court seats were held by women. But, just this year, with the election of another judge in Texas' 219th District Court, there are now seven women serving on the county's district benches.

Making the accomplishment even more remarkable, just twelve years ago, there was only one female judge on the county's benches.

While only 33 percent of judges throughout the United States are women, Collin County is leading the way for women in law and justice careers with 64 percent of the district benches served by female judges.

To our great female judges, Judge Corrine Mason, Judge Angela Tucker, Judge Jennifer Edgeworth, Judge Andrea Thompson, Judge Cynthia Wheless, Judge Jill Willis, Judge Piper McCraw, and Judge Emily Miskel, I thank them for their service to our county, to Texas, and as an inspiration to so many.

Madam Speaker, today, and every day, let us honor those women setting course for the next generation of American leaders.

IN RECOGNITION OF GLOBAL
RECYCLING DAY

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise to draw my colleagues' attention to Global Recycling Day on March 18. Global Recycling Day was created in 2018 to help recognize, and celebrate, the importance recycling plays in preserving our primary resources and securing the future of our planet.

The creation of Global Recycling Day is aimed at the promotion of a global and united approach to recycling. The mission of Global Recycling Day is to help world leaders understand that recycling is too important not to be a global issue, and to ask all citizens of the world to think of recyclables in terms of what they are: valuable resources, not waste. By combining as many voices and efforts as possible on a single day, together we are raising awareness of the urgent need to be more reliable recyclers and more conscientious consumers.

There are six major natural resources on the planet, Madam Speaker—water, air, coal, oil, natural gas and minerals. I think recyclables ought to be thought of as the world's Seventh Resource.

Recycling prevents more CO₂ emissions each year than those generated by the entire aviation industry, while simultaneously reducing the need to extract the Earth's finite virgin natural resources. Without recycling, all our used refrigerators, plastic bottles, packing boxes, cars, cell phones and paper cups would contribute to the growing waste mountains, which are either incinerated or sent to landfill—never to be used again.

In the United States alone, we recycle more than 130 million metric tons of scrap materials every year and employ more than 130,000 American workers. These valuable materials go directly back into the manufacturing chain, helping manufacturers be more energy efficient.

Global Recycling Day 2019 will work to get more young people engaged with the power of the Seventh Resource through a variety of key partnerships. The initiative will also work with businesses and entrepreneurs globally to share their innovation, concepts and ideas for better recycling practices in the future.

As the House Recycling Caucus Co-Chair, I am committed to helping foster economically viable and sustainable recycling in the United States to protect our environment, save energy and conserve natural resources for my kid's and their kid's futures.

Recycling is the easiest way all of us can make a positive difference in our planet's future while supporting our economy through the creation of tens of thousands of jobs.

Madam Speaker, I would like to ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating Global Recycling Day by getting involved and, of course, by recycling.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE WATKINS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. WATKINS. Madam Speaker, on March 12, 2019 I was absent from the floor due to a visit to the Oval Office for a bill signing. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 121.

HONORING REGINA DARDEN FOR
RECEIVING THE TIDEWATER
CHAPTER HUMANITARIAN
AWARD

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Regina Darden on receiving the 2019 Humanitarian Award for the Tidewater Chapter of the Virginia Center for Inclusive Communities. This is an amazing accomplishment.

This award recognizes Regina's lifetime of service and commitment to the promotion of respect among people of diverse backgrounds. I am inspired by her commitment to create and establish the first summer homeless shelter in Hampton Roads, called Helping Others Pursue Excellence (H.O.P.E.). H.O.P.E. is an exceptional organization that has served over 600 homeless guests during the summer of 2017 and continues to grow.

Regina's dedication to strengthening bonds among people of different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds is truly inspiring. I am proud to recognize Regina's leadership and the role she plays in making our community a better place. The Tidewater Region has significantly benefited from her presence.

SUMMARY OF REVENUE ESTIMATE ON H.R. 1 FROM JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following summary of revenue estimate from the Joint Committee on Taxation.

SUMMARY OF REVENUE ESTIMATE FROM JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION (3/4/2019—Very Preliminary)

Estimate of proposed 2.75% special assessment on criminal penalties and civil penalties, generally limit nontax penalties to organizational defendants. All estimates below are in millions of dollars, by fiscal year. Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

NON-TAX CIVIL PENALTIES AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES

[By fiscal year—in millions of dollars]

Table with columns Year and Amount. Rows include Transfers to Freedom from Influence Fund, Net Revenue Change, and Reductions in transfers to other funds.

CIVIL TAX PENALTIES—EXEMPTING INDIVIDUAL TAXPAYERS WHOSE TAXABLE INCOME DOES NOT EXCEED THE DOLLAR AMOUNT AT WHICH THE TOP TAX BRACKET BEGINS—Continued

[By fiscal year—in millions of dollars]

Table with columns Year and Amount. Rows include Net revenue change and Memo: increase (+) or decrease (-) in the deficit if all Fund balances spent immediately.

TOTALS

[By fiscal year—in millions of dollars]

Table with columns Year and Amount. Rows include Transfers to Freedom from Influence Fund, Net revenue change, and Memo: increase (+) or decrease (-) in the deficit if all Fund balances spent immediately.

Laura's work on behalf of the AEMA has led this organization to become the largest membership-based mining industry trade association in the United States. Laura's career began as a lawyer in Missouri, but eventually took her through various positions in the natural resources industry.

Laura has also been widely acknowledged for her efforts on behalf of the AEMA. Among her many awards and accolades, Laura has been named President of the Independent Petroleum Association Mountain States, Regional Vice President of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, and a member of Colorado's Minerals, Energy and Geology Policy Advisory Board.

I appreciate Laura's work on behalf of the AEMA and the positive example she provides to the people of Eastern Washington. I wish her the best in this next chapter of her life.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ENSURING FULL PARTICIPATION IN THE CENSUS ACT OF 2019

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce the Ensuring Full Participation in the Census Act of 2019, which would prohibit the U.S. Census Bureau from including questions on the decennial census about citizenship, nationality or immigration status.

This bill is essential because the Department of Justice has written to the Bureau that it "reinstate on the 2020 Census questionnaire a question regarding citizenship." From 1970 to 2000, this question was sent to only approximately 16 percent of the population during any decennial census through the so-called "long-form." However, the long-form system was dropped from the census and replaced with the current American Community Survey (ACS).

HONORING LAURA SKAER

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Laura Skaer, Executive Director of the American Exploration & Mining Association. Laura is retiring this month, after serving as Executive Director of the AEMA for the last 22 years.

CIVIL TAX PENALTIES—EXEMPTING INDIVIDUAL TAXPAYERS WHOSE TAXABLE INCOME DOES NOT EXCEED THE DOLLAR AMOUNT AT WHICH THE TOP TAX BRACKET BEGINS

[By fiscal year—in millions of dollars]

Table with columns Year and Amount. Rows include Transfers to Freedom from Influence Fund, authorized to be spent.

ACS is more than sufficient to determine citizenship statistics within the U.S. We must ensure that all individuals are counted in the decennial census, thereby providing accurate allocation of federal funds and representation in Congress, not reduce participation by already undercounted minorities because they fear answering questions that are already addressed elsewhere.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING KEVIN TURPIN FOR RECEIVING THE TIDEWATER CHAPTER HUMANITARIAN AWARD

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Kevin Turpin on receiving the 2019 Humanitarian Award for the Tidewater Chapter of the Virginia Center for Inclusive Communities. This is an amazing accomplishment.

This award recognizes Kevin's lifetime of service and commitment to the promotion of respect among people of diverse backgrounds. As Executive Director of the Life Enrichment Center, he serves the local community by providing tutors for children struggling in school or at home. He has gathered over 250 volunteers to serve the children, and the ministry continues to expand. The positive impact will be seen for many generations.

Kevin's dedication to strengthening bonds among people of different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds is truly inspiring. I am proud to honor and recognize his leadership and the role he plays in making our community a better place. The Tidewater Region has significantly benefited from his presence.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 100th anniversary of The American Legion, the nation's largest wartime veterans' service organization.

Through the years, The American Legion has evolved from a group of World War I veterans into one of the most influential nonprofit groups in the United States. Today, membership stands at over two million in more than 13,000 posts worldwide. The posts are organized into 55 departments: one each for the 50 states, along with the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, France, Mexico, and the Philippines.

The Legion is a nonpartisan, not-for-profit organization, with a strong grassroots involvement in politics and the legislative process. The Legion's success depends entirely on active membership, participation, and vol-

unteerism. The organization belongs to the people it serves and the communities in which it thrives.

The Legion stands behind the issues most important to our nation's veterans, backed by resolutions passed by volunteer leadership. Legionnaires' sense of obligation to their community, state, and nation drives their advocacy for veterans and their needs.

On March 15, 1919, members of the American Expeditionary Force convened in Paris for the first American Legion caucus. Congress chartered the group that September. That November, delegates to The American Legion's first National Convention established the Legion's values of service to community, state, and nation. Those values would form the Legion's four pillars upon which this great organization of men and women still stands: Veterans Affairs & Rehabilitation, National Security, Americanism, and Children & Youth.

These pillars remain in place to support veterans, national security, patriotism, and the children and youth of America, the future of our great nation. Based on these pillars, the Legion has built programs with an unparalleled impact on American society during its first century of service.

The Legion has influenced considerable social change in America and won substantial victories for veterans, advocating for the establishment of the Veterans Administration, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the G.I. Bill. The G.I. Bill helped make higher education, home ownership, and future employment possible for veterans; it also provided an opportunity for veterans to dispute the characterization of military discharge, which had been at the discretion of the commanding officer without an explanation. Eventually, this policy led to the founding of the Board of Veterans Appeals.

For decades, the Legion also fought to strengthen the nation through a non-mandatory "Universal Military Training" so our country would be prepared in the event of war. Out of this belief came the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, which launched the modern Reserve component of our military, as well as the National Guard.

The Legion has also produced or supported many important programs for children and youth. Some of these are well-known to many Americans, including American Legion Baseball, one of the nation's most successful amateur athletic programs; Boys & Girls State and Girls & Boys Nation; the National Oratorical Contest; The American Legion Veterans & Children Foundation; the Boy Scouts; and scholarships. Around the country, the Legion has also sponsored the Junior ROTC, youth law enforcement academies, and a Junior Shooting Sports program.

Since 1989, victims of disasters have received tens of millions of dollars from the Legion's National Emergency Fund. The Legion has also funded research to help veterans who have suffered from post-traumatic stress disorder, Gulf War Illness, burn pits, and other service-connected problems and diseases. In the 1980s, the Legion partnered with Columbia University to prove Agent Orange killed thousands of Vietnam War veterans, made many more sick, and caused birth defects among their children. Eventually, the Legion sued the federal government so that affected

veterans and their families could get the necessary care they needed and were owed.

These are just some of the accomplishments and programs The American Legion provides for our veterans and youth. Our country would not be as strong as we are today without the Legion's advocacy, services, and compassion for its fellow Americans during times of war and times of peace.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating and thanking The American Legion for its 100 years of exemplary leadership, dedicated service, and outstanding commitment to ensuring our country remains strong for generations to come.

RECOGNIZING APRYLE CRISWELL JACKSON

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I want to recognize Apryle Criswell Jackson, an educator for the School District of Osceola County, Florida. Apryle graduated Cum Laude from California University of Pennsylvania with a double major. She was one of a very few women in the 1970s to participate in the coaching certification program there.

Apryle has taught for 39 years. She started in the Elizabeth Forward School District in Pennsylvania and has spent the last 36 years in Osceola County. She has always taught "at risk students" in grades kindergarten through Adult Ed.

Apryle has always been an advocate for children. She has donated her time to various athletic programs in Osceola County. Apryle was one of the first coaches when Buenaventura Lakes started their Little League program. She has served on the board of directors for numerous organizations throughout Osceola County. She is a First-Class Girl Scout and recognized the need for a program in Osceola County. Apryle worked diligently to start the Friendship Service Unit for Girl Scouts. She is also an advocate for children with disabilities in the county. She encouraged the music director at Harmony High School to start a music program for special needs students this school year.

Apryle has been active in the Osceola County Education Association for over 35 years. She has been president for the last eight years fighting for better working conditions of all educators in Osceola County. Under her leadership, OCEA has held numerous events for children. They recently distributed over 10,000 books to students. In 2017, following the tragedy of Hurricane Maria, Apryle worked with local agencies to host an event where evacuee students, and their families from Puerto Rico, could get the assistance they needed and distributed books to all children in Spanish and English. Under her leadership OCEA has developed numerous programs to support children in our community.

Apryle's dedication to serving those in our community is an inspiration to all. Apryle Criswell Jackson, for that we honor you.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARILYN PRYLE, 2019 PENNSYLVANIA TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Marilyn Pryle, who was named the 2019 Pennsylvania Teacher of the Year by the Pennsylvania Department of Education at their annual professional development conference on December 10, 2018. Marilyn was selected as the Teacher of the Year from a competitive field of twelve finalists for her dedication to students, unparalleled commitment to her field, and her innovative methods of pedagogy.

After receiving her Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Scranton, Marilyn began her teaching career with the Jesuit Volunteer Corps in Kathmandu, Nepal. In 1996, she received her Master's degree in education, also from the University of Scranton. While teaching in Braintree, Massachusetts, Marilyn earned her Master of Fine Arts in creative writing from Emerson College. She is a National Board Certified teacher in secondary English and reading instruction and has experience teaching at the middle school, high school, and college levels.

In addition to extolling the virtues of literature and the art of writing to high school students, Marilyn has devoted much of her career to educating educators. She is steadfastly dedicated to the field of teaching and has challenged educators to "create an inspired classroom." She is also an advocate for the indispensable place the humanities have in our education system. Marilyn is the author of seven books about teaching reading and writing, and she speaks regularly at local, state, and national conferences. As Teacher of the Year, she will continue to speak, educate, and inspire both pre-service teachers and experienced teachers at events and meetings across Pennsylvania.

In addition to her work in the classroom and many speaking engagements, Marilyn is an ardent community volunteer and advocate. Together with Catholic Social Services, she facilitates an English-as-a-second-language conversation group for refugees in the Scranton area.

It is an honor to recognize Marilyn Pryle as the 2019 Pennsylvania Teacher of the Year. Her level of dedication to her students, her profession, and her community has been remarkable. Marilyn has always possessed an unwavering zeal for teaching and a belief that, with the right tutelage, any student can succeed, and that has produced wonderful results. May she continue to energize and inspire students and teachers alike for many years to come.

HONORING DR. CASSANDRA NEWBY-ALEXANDER FOR RECEIVING THE TIDEWATER CHAPTER HUMANITARIAN AWARD

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Dr. Cassandra Newby-Alexander on receiving the 2019 Humanitarian Award for the Tidewater Chapter of the Virginia Center for Inclusive Communities. This is an amazing accomplishment.

This award recognizes Dr. Newby-Alexander's lifetime of service and commitment to the promotion of respect among people of diverse backgrounds. Her thought-provoking books, such as *Virginia Waterways* and *the Underground Railroad*, have educated many on the importance of the Underground Railroad for freedom seekers in our state. Dr. Newby-Alexander's input on the Jamestown-Yorktown Foundation, Virginia Law Foundation, and the Historical Commission of the Supreme Court of Virginia is invaluable.

Dr. Newby-Alexander's work shows her dedication to strengthening bonds among people of different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds. I am proud to honor and recognize Dr. Newby-Alexander's leadership and the role she plays in making our community a better place. The Tidewater Region has significantly benefited from her presence.

CONGRATULATING SENIOR OFFICER SCOTT RHODES ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE POLICE DEPARTMENT OF GRAPEVINE, TEXAS

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Scott Rhodes on his well-earned retirement from the City of Grapevine, Texas Police Department after twenty-nine years of dedicated service as a law enforcement officer.

Scott is a hardworking and highly respected officer of the Grapevine Police Department. He has honorably served his community since beginning his distinguished career with the Paris, Texas Police Department in 1990. Scott would go on to serve as an officer in Grand Prairie, Texas and then Glen Heights, Texas until joining the Grapevine Police Department in 1996 as a patrol officer.

Throughout his twenty-two years as an officer in Grapevine, Scott has received 34 police commendations as evidence of his outstanding service and professionalism. Furthermore, he has earned meritorious service bars for Special Service, Certificate of Merit, Good Conduct, Safe Driving, Police Service, FTO Officer, Honor Guard Member, Crime Prevention, Police Instructor, Police Diver, and U.S. Presidential Protection.

Scott is a Texas Commission on Law Enforcement (TCOLE) instructor, Firearms Instructor, Crime Prevention & Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Spe-

cialist, and Mental Health Peace Officer. He also holds certifications in ATV, Advanced Diver, Dry Suit Diver, and Nitrox Gas Diver and specializes in active shooter preparedness and asset protection training. Additionally, Scott served on the Board of Directors for the Texas Crime Prevention Association Inc. (TPCA) as Treasurer, Sergeant at Arms, and President. He serves as Chairman of the TCPA/TCOLE Training Advisory Review Board and has been instrumental in the inception, planning, collaboration, and implementation of the statewide TCOLE recognized Certified Crime Prevention Specialist Certification. In 2012, Scott was awarded Life Membership to the organization and received the Overall Crime Prevention Specialist Award in July of 2014. Scott is a member of the Texas Chisholm Trail Crime Prevention association and was awarded their Crime Prevention Specialist of the Year award in 2012.

Scott's contributions to the law enforcement operations in the City of Grapevine and beyond have helped to ensure countless officers were adequately trained and prepared for the challenges they face in their everyday duties. His legacy will leave a lasting mark on the City of Grapevine and the Grapevine Police Department for many years to come.

Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to recognize the exhaustive efforts Scott has contributed to the City of Grapevine, and the State of Texas. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing Senior Officer Scott Rhodes for his many years of service.

RECOGNIZING MAJOR ULISSES TAYMES

HON. AUMUA AMATA COLEMAN RADEWAGEN

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the service of Major Ulisses Taymes, who was the Executive Officer for the 9th Mission Support Theater Support Group—Pacific Battalion located in American Samoa.

In American Samoa, our men and women of the Armed Forces are very important to us. The people of our islands take great pride in being patriotic Americans and our people are known for a high rate of service in our military. In particular, our U.S. Army recruiting center ranks number one in the nation in enlistment rate.

To that end I would like to recognize all the work Major Taymes has done to prepare our Army Reserve Soldiers for success by providing them with the necessary resources and guidance, and for his efforts to instill pride and professionalism in the units.

He has an extensive list of military awards and decorations including the Bronze Star, two Meritorious Service Medals, a Joint Service Commendation Medal, and numerous other awards. He is a graduate of the prestigious Harvard University.

In honoring this outstanding officer today, we also express our deep appreciation to all who serve, including the many in uniform from American Samoa serving with distinction all over the world.

In American Samoa, we've come to appreciate Major Taymes as one of our own, and

the end of his assignment in American Samoa is bittersweet. I thank Ulisses for his outstanding leadership and commitment to our Soldiers, American Samoa and our great Nation. Best wishes to him and his family as he departs American Samoa. Congratulations to him on his next assignment and the great future ahead of him. Thank you for your service and your time on our beautiful islands. God bless your path and goodbye. Fa'amanuia le Atua i ou ala. Soifua

IN MEMORY OF THE 23 LIVES
LOST IN THE MARCH 3RD TOR-
NADOES

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the lives of the 23 victims who died in the severe weather and tornadoes that ravaged Lee County on March 3, 2019.

Of the 23 who died, their ages range from 6 years old to 89 years old. Four of the victims were children, four victims were two sets of couples engaged to be married and 10 victims were part of one family. The following names are those who lost their lives:

Ryan Pence, 22; Felicia Woodall, 22; Eric Jamal Stenson, 38; Florel Tate Stenson, 63; Henry Lewis Stenson, 65; James Henry Tate, 86; Maggie Delight Robinson, 57; Raymond Robinson, Jr., 63; Tresia Robinson, 62; Emmanuel Jones, 53; Jimmy Lee Jones, 89; Mary Louise Jones, 83.

Jonathan Marquez Bowen, 9; Mykhala Waldon, 8; Taylor Thornton, 10; Shelia Creech, 59; Marshal Lynn Grimes, 59; Armando "A.J." Hernandez, 6; Vicki Braswell, 69; David Wayne Dean, 53; Mamie Roberts Koon, 68; Charlotte Ann Miller, 59; Irma Gomez Moran, 41.

Madam Speaker, please join me in remembering these 23 victims and praying for the families and friends they left behind and recognizing the brave First Responders across the area. It has been amazing to see Alabamians come together to support Lee County after this tragedy.

HONORING PATRICIA WAINGER
FOR RECEIVING THE TIDEWATER
CHAPTER HUMANITARIAN
AWARD

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Patricia Wainger on receiving the 2019 Humanitarian Award for the Tidewater Chapter of the Virginia Center for Inclusive Communities. This is an amazing accomplishment.

This award recognizes Patricia's lifetime of service and commitment to the promotion of respect among people of diverse backgrounds. As the founding director of Norfolk Academy's Learning Bridge, an academic enrichment program, Patricia ensured that students have the best tools and resources to ac-

complish their long-term goals and achieve success in their future endeavors. Through her work at the Park Place school, she continues to empower children, their families, and their communities in the urban neighborhoods of Norfolk. Students with extra preparation for college will be well-equipped to make our community a better place.

In addition, Patricia's dedication to strengthening bonds among people of different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds is truly inspiring. I am proud to honor and recognize Patricia's leadership and the role she plays in making our community a better place. The Tidewater Region has significantly benefited from her presence.

RECOGNIZING LOUJAIN AL-
HATHLOUL

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Ms. FRANKEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in recognition of Loujain al-Hathloul, a Saudi women's rights activist and political prisoner who stands trial today in Saudi Arabia. Loujain has been imprisoned for her political activism, including for women's equality under the law. She was arrested in May 2018, along with a dozen other peaceful women's rights advocates. These activists have been held as prisoners, and have reportedly faced torture and abuse, including sexual violence, beatings, and electric shocks.

Loujain was arrested for her advocacy on behalf of an end to the male guardianship system and the ban on women driving. Fighting for women's rights is a fundamental American value that we have long championed worldwide. Today marks the first day of her sham trial. She has been denied a lawyer and any real form of defense against the Saudi government. The United States cannot stand by and watch while justice and democracy are devalued by our partners. We must hold the Saudi government accountable for such human rights violations.

That is why I introduced a bipartisan resolution condemning Saudi Arabia's continued detention and alleged abuse of women's rights activists. Saudi Arabia must release these advocates and end the discriminatory male guardianship system that restricts women's decisions about their livelihood. Let this serve as a reminder to the world that women's rights are human rights.

REMEMBERING GREG JAYNES

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember Greg Jaynes, an elegant writer and reporter who began his professional writing career at The Commercial Appeal in Memphis covering the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Mr. Jaynes died March 5 in New Orleans. After Memphis, Mr. Jaynes joined The New York Times as a foreign correspondent in East Africa, based in Nairobi.

He later worked for Time, Life and The National Geographic and wrote two well-reviewed memoirs, *Sketches from a Dirt Road* and *Come Hell On High Water: A Really Sullen Memoir*, the latter about a voyage from Britain to Tahiti aboard a Russian freighter. Describing Jaynes, one reviewer called him "irascible but sociable, tormented and laughable, a man whose tough, cranky exterior conceals a warm heart and a capacity for compassion . . . We are richer for the grace of his pen and the strength of his high good humor." I knew Greg as a thoughtful reader and writer and agree with the reviewer. We met when I noticed him walking down my street in Memphis and, shortly thereafter, returning with a copy of The New York Times; we were neighbors. Seeing him walking back up the street with The New York Times was a rather unusual sight and prompted me to introduce myself, and we became friends. He was an unusually prolific reader and was always a font of knowledge and information. I want to extend my condolences to his son Todd Jaynes and his daughter, Whitney Ann Laidlaw, his extended family and friends and his loyal readers.

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN
SLAUGHTER

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, first, I would like to thank Congressman MCGOVERN and Congressman TONKO for leading this effort in memory of our beloved friend and colleague Congresswoman Louise Slaughter.

Madam Speaker, it's almost hard to believe it's been a year since the passing of my dear friend and mentor, Louise. Her death was a monumental loss for Congress, our country, and the world. But I know we can all find solace in the amazing legacy she left for all of us.

Louise stayed true to the communities that believed in her. She loved the people of Rochester fiercely and fought for them with every breath.

Right after I was elected, Louise invited me to come with her to attend the Seneca Falls 150th anniversary in her district. She didn't even know me that well, but she said "Honey, I want to be your friend and I want you to see my district." I knew right then that Louise was something special.

A trailblazer in every respect, she made history by becoming the first woman to chair the powerful House Rules Committee. She would work late into the night, staying engaged and energized no matter how late the Committee worked. She never stopped fighting for everyday families, children, women, and communities of color.

What I miss the most about Louise was her humor. She was just hilarious. Ask any Member of Congress—Republican or Democrat—and they'll have a story about her cracking a joke.

Louise's legacy will live on in the millions of lives that she has touched and enriched. And she will live on in the halls of Congress, where none of us will ever forget her passion, her grace, or her infectious sense of humor.

We all miss Louise so much.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH—HAROLD JACKSON

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor a third-generation servant leader from my community of Tampa, Florida, Harold A. Jackson, Jr. who was born at Tampa Negro Hospital to the late Jacqueline Haynes Jackson and the late Harold A. Jackson, Sr. Jackson learned about service at a young age as his father served in the U.S. Army during World War II and returned to Tampa to become one of our hometown's pioneering African American civil rights attorneys and led local desegregation efforts. His mother was a beloved educator and retired after 33 years as an elementary school teacher in Tampa.

Mr. Jackson followed in his parents' footsteps of service and dedicated his professional life to the health and well-being of our community. In 1978, Mr. Jackson started a 30-year plus career with the Hillsborough County Parks, Recreation and Conservation Department. He rose through the ranks to become a Recreation Area Supervisor during a time of tremendous growth and change for this county. He planned, organized and directed the overall operations of community-based recreation programs, which are critical in promoting healthy, prosperous and connected communities as well as building social equity and support for working families. During his tenure with Hillsborough County, he continued to build on his legacy of community service. For 27 years, he served on the board of directors for Tampa Family Health Centers, a federally qualified health center. He was elected chair and vice chair of the board of directors on several occasions. During this time, Tampa Family Health Centers grew from one clinic to 14 and greatly expanded access to comprehensive health care services for hundreds of thousands of our neighbors, especially uninsured or underinsured individuals.

After retiring from the Hillsborough County Parks, Recreation and Conservation Department, Mr. Jackson began a leadership role for Tampa Family Health Centers as Community Relations Liaison. He truly extends himself to help meet the needs of the medically underserved, whoever and wherever they are. His efforts while serving on my 14th Congressional District of Florida Puerto Rico Recovery and Assistance Task Force were nothing short of extraordinary and very meaningful at a time when displaced Puerto Rican families faced significant challenges in re-establishing their lives following the devastating landfall of Hurricane Maria in 2017. Mr. Jackson ensured families who relocated to Tampa had access without barriers to the services of Tampa Family Health Centers, facilitating their medical appointments to cut down on wait times with scheduling and transportation challenges.

He is a graduate of St. Peter Claver Catholic School in Tampa, a 125-year old historically black school that today proudly continues to provide families and students excellence in education. Mr. Jackson returned to St. Peter Claver to serve on the school's board of directors and in 1994, as president of the school's development council, he launched a \$2 million capital campaign to establish a state-of-the-art

learning environment. Mr. Jackson also graduated from Tampa Catholic High School in 1974 and went on to complete his criminal justice degree from the University of Tampa.

Mr. Jackson strongly exhibits the unequivocal mark of a servant leader, one who quietly aspires and inspires leadership by consummately doing good—going the extra mile. His contributions to community initiatives are numerous—helping to launch the University Area Community Development Corporation, co-founding a youth council in our community that has now grown to be one of its largest and serving as organizer for Tampa's largest Veterans Day Parade.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of a grateful Tampa Bay community, I am proud to recognize Mr. Harold A. Jackson, Jr. for his servant's heart and carrying forth his family's legacy of community service across the Tampa Bay Area.

HONORING ALOK K. VERMA FOR RECEIVING THE TIDEWATER CHAPTER HUMANITARIAN AWARD

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Dr. Alok Verma on receiving the 2019 Humanitarian Award for the Tidewater Chapter of the Virginia Center for Inclusive Communities. This is an amazing accomplishment.

This award recognizes Dr. Verma's lifetime of service and commitment to the promotion of respect among people of diverse backgrounds. Dr. Verma generously serves the students of Old Dominion University and the community as a whole. His input at international conferences and in scholarly publications is exceptional. His service to the Norfolk Sister City Association, World Affairs Council, and Asian Indians of Hampton Roads demonstrates his heart for service.

Dr. Verma's dedication to strengthening bonds among people of different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds is truly inspiring. I am proud to honor and recognize Dr. Verma's leadership and the role he plays in making our community a better place. The Tidewater Region has significantly benefited from his presence.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, I missed votes on Monday, March 11. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Roll Call Vote Number 119 (Passage of H.R. 1122, the Housing Choice Voucher Mobility Demonstration Act): YES

Roll Call Vote Number 120 (Passage of H.R. 758, the Cooperate with Law Enforcement Agencies and Watch Act): YES

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAHANA HAYES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mrs. HAYES. Madam Speaker, I was unable to be present for votes on March 11th due to unavoidable travel delays. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 119; and YEA on Roll Call No. 120.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARK O'CONNOR

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Hillsborough Police Chief Mark O'Connor upon the occasion of his retirement after a total of 33 years in law enforcement, 32 of those years with the Town of Hillsborough. Chief O'Connor is an uncommon law enforcement professional, and the residents of Hillsborough have been extraordinarily lucky to have his services for over three decades.

Hillsborough is a town of 11,500 persons nestled in the hills of the San Francisco Peninsula. Mark O'Connor joined the police department of this beautiful town in 1986 after serving for a year in the Santa Clara County Sheriff's Office. He began as a Police Officer and then served as Canine Officer, Motorcycle Officer, Field Training Officer, Police Corporal, Press Information Officer, Patrol Sergeant, Administrative Captain, Patrol Captain and, finally, as the Chief of Police. However, Mark is a highly talented person, and for a while the town also tapped him to be Public Works Director. Apparently, he enjoyed catching burglars more than fixing broken sewer mains, so that stint was relatively short-lived.

Chief O'Connor served on a committee of the San Mateo County Police Chiefs' and Sheriffs Association working on technology issues and was responsible for upgrading Hillsborough's department to take advantage of computers in patrol cars, officer body cameras, and Computer Aided Dispatch equipment, among many innovations. During Mark's time in charge, Hillsborough residents were protected by the latest technology available.

As an institutional source of "lessons learned" for the department, Mark excels. For example, he once pointed out that making it easier to navigate a community isn't necessarily good for public safety. Among its many features, Hillsborough is a hard place to navigate at night without a lot of experience. Many pizzas have gone cold in the hills of Hillsborough. Burglars would also occasionally get lost. They would then meander repeatedly through the town seeking frantically to escape. The police would notice, and the thieves would become future candidates to make public endorsements on behalf of the Google Maps app for smart phones—after they were released from jail and subject to any applicable terms of probation. This story illustrates Mark's wisdom from years of on-the-ground experience. He is a walking library of such lessons.

Mark O'Connor has many obvious skills. He is respected by his staff because he is authentic. He mentors others with ease. He is smart

and has what the military calls “command presence.” My office works regularly with him on security issues that impact my office and the broader community. He is a rock-solid source of advice, even outside his formal job duties.

For example, in 2010, a 30-inch high pressure natural gas transmission pipeline operated by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company exploded in San Bruno, north of Hillsborough, killing eight persons and injuring dozens more. Mark O’Connor is a master welder. Through the months after the explosion, he lent his judgments to my staff and to federal and state officials as they sought the cause of the rupture. He also noticed the vulnerability of Hillsborough and other cities to a similar disaster. In part because of his recommendations to me and to others, new pipes have been installed. Thousands have been removed from the path of possible harm, in part due to the insights lent by Chief Mark O’Connor.

It is Chief O’Connor’s integrity, grit, and determination to be of service to all law-abiding residents that has been the secret to his success. It’s hard to imagine a man with such an active mind sitting still. Maybe, he’ll write a book about his years in law enforcement. Hillsborough is visited regularly by Presidents, Ambassadors and other global leaders. Mark’s career-based police thriller might be entitled, “I Saw The President—But He Never Saw Me.” It’s likely that many citizens and luminaries never saw Mark O’Connor, but we know that he had their backs all along their way through the community. This, in the end, is the highest mark of police service in any town—no flash, just skill and professionalism. That’s Mark O’Connor, the retiring Chief of Police of Hillsborough, California.

HONORING JOAN BROCK FOR RECEIVING THE 2019 LENORA MATHEWS LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Ms. Joan Brock for receiving the 2019 Lenora Mathews Lifetime Achievement Award through Volunteer Hampton Roads. This is an amazing accomplishment.

This award recognizes Joan’s lifetime of hard work and service to the community. Her dedication to improving global health and the Chesapeake Bay is truly inspiring. Her input on various boards and councils such as Virginia Wesleyan University’s Board of Trustees, the National Board of the United Way Women’s Leadership Council, the Chrysler Museum Board, and her leadership on the ACCESS College Foundation—just to name a few—has been invaluable. Joan’s generosity with her time and resources to improve the environment, education, and health of our community is exceptional.

I want to thank Joan for her leadership in philanthropy and the role she plays in making our community a better place. Hampton Roads has significantly benefited from her presence.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSH HARDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. HARDER of California. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, my voting card did not properly register my vote, so I was counted not present. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 123.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH—BETTY REED

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor beloved community leader, Florida State Representative Betty Reed. She was raised in Thomasville, Georgia, in a close-knit family of hardworking sharecroppers and with 12 other siblings Representative Reed and her husband, James, moved to Tampa after he was discharged from the military to raise a family of their own.

Representative Reed was an active parent while her children attended school, and her involvement grew over time in the Parent Teacher Student Association, then the Hillsborough County Council of PTSA and all the way to the Florida State PTA.

As her children became older, she was prompted to complete her own high school diploma by attending night and weekend classes. Her pursuits only grew over time—she earned an associate’s degree from Hillsborough Community College, then her bachelor’s degree in behavioral science from National Louis University.

Representative Reed’s commitment to access to education grew as a financial aid assistant for Education America (which eventually became Remington College) and then as its director of financial aid. All the while, she was active in her own community, becoming president of the Lucy Dell Civic Association. But advocating for her community didn’t stop there. She was elected as a Florida State Representative for the 59th District, a seat she held until she was elected to represent the 61th District in 2012.

During her tenure as a Florida State Representative, she passed meaningful legislation, including the Black Health Practice Initiative (BIHPI, pronounced “Bippy”), which passed both chambers of the Florida Legislature without a single dissenting vote. With stark disparities between the infant mortality rates of different races—in some areas, the rate of black infant mortality was more than four times the rate for whites—the legislation funded state grants to local Healthy Start coalitions that served counties with significant disparities: Hillsborough, Gadsden, Palm Beach, Orange, Broward, Duval, Putnam and Miami-Dade. The University of South Florida and Florida Agricultural & Mechanical University were selected to provide technical assistance and scientific guidance. BIHPI produced positive outcomes and was particularly meaningful due to the relationships built in communities with the greatest needs. She also championed and helped

to secure state funding to help open numerous Tampa Family Health Centers and expand the robust safety net of comprehensive health services to medically underserved communities. Representative Reed passed legislation to end shackling incarcerated pregnant women during labor, delivery as well as postpartum, and legislation to provide additional funds to combat homelessness throughout the state of Florida. In her final two years, she served as the Democratic Ranking member of the Higher Education Appropriations Subcommittee.

Representative Reed is a compassionate leader, who immersed herself in the challenges of her neighbors, and that allowed her to serve as a strong advocate. Madam Speaker, on behalf of a grateful Tampa Bay community, I am proud to recognize Representative Betty Reed for her drive for meaningful progress on behalf of our children, students, women, families and communities across the State of Florida.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF ROSE ENG

HON. DAN NEWHOUSE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mrs. Rose Eng, who turned 100 years old on February 22, 2019.

Rose is a model citizen who truly encapsulates the highest ideals of the American dream.

She came to the United States from China in 1948, and together with her husband Bill Y.F. Eng, a veteran of World War II, owned and operated the Canton Cafe in Walla Walla, Washington between 1949 and 1980.

Through hard work, sacrifice and perseverance, Rose and her husband were not only able to send all five of their children to college, a remarkable feat onto itself, but were also able to put a down payment on the first home for each of their children, laying the foundation for a prosperous future.

In the words of her daughter, they are “forever grateful to such amazing parents.”

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating her on this milestone birthday and wish her the best in the future.

HONORING SUSAN COLPITTS FOR RECEIVING THE 2019 CORPORATE VOLUNTEER EXCELLENCE AWARD

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Ms. Susan Colpitts on receiving the 2019 Corporate VOLUNTEER Excellence Award through Volunteer Hampton Roads. This is an amazing accomplishment.

This award recognizes Susan’s lifetime of hard work and service to her community. Her dedication to her company and to her community is truly inspiring. She founded a highly competitive firm and led a group of advisors in the service of ensuring that clients have their

financial needs met. Her dedication to offer the best financial strategic and philanthropic planning stands out.

In addition to Susan's dedication to her work, she has held multiple leadership roles in the Hampton Roads community, such as Director of the Hampton Roads Community Foundation, Vice-Chair of Virginia Humanities, and Director of Building Goodness Foundation—just to name a few. Susan's commitment to various organizations, such as United for Children and Citizens for a Better Eastern Shore, displays her passion for the welfare of others and her community.

I want to thank Susan for her leadership in service and the role she plays in making our community a better place. Hampton Roads has significantly benefited from her presence.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. WALDEN. Madam Speaker, due to my attendance at a public lands management event with President Trump at the White House, I was delayed in returning for votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 121 on H. Res 156.

IN MEMORIAM OF FORMER TEXAS CONGRESSMAN AND HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY CHAIRMAN RALPH HALL

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the entire Texas Congressional Delegation, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of former Congressman, Chairman of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, fellow Texan, and my friend Ralph Moody Hall for a life dedicated to his family, his country, and his constituents.

Congressman Hall first served his country as a Navy pilot during World War II. After the war ended, he served the people of the great state of Texas for nearly half a century; 10 years as a Texas State Senator from the 9th district and 34 years as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from Texas's 4th district. He genuinely enjoyed public service, and he was good at it.

Congressman Hall and I first met and became friends in the Texas State legislature. When I was elected to the House of Representatives, he was the first to reach out and offer his assistance. He helped me learn the ins and outs of Washington. No matter the party affiliation or political leaning, Congressman Hall was a man that could always be counted on—and one who enjoyed a good joke.

Congressman Hall made the difficult decision to switch party affiliation in 2004, a move that irritated many Democrats. I fondly recall reaching out to him to let him know he was

still loved despite his decision. He admitted to being so happy to hear my message because his wife was mad at him.

Congressman Hall was known throughout the halls of Congress as an effective legislator. He made strides in science and technology policy and was a reliable advocate for the country's space program during his time as both Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Congressman Hall's service on the Science Committee was a significant milestone in his service to our nation. In many ways, he was able to transcend the extreme partisan climate which exists in Washington today. From the first time we met to that last time I visited him at his home in Rockwall, he remained the same caring, thoughtful, humorous, and hard-working man.

Congressman Hall was preceded in death by his wife, Mary Ellen Murphy Hall, sister Rosemary Hall Scott, and brother Hugh Hall. He is survived by his three sons; Hamp, Brett, and Blakeley Hall, and many wonderful grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I would like to extend my sympathy to his family, many friends across the country, and the people of his district. The Texas community will miss him dearly.

IN RECOGNITION OF KATHY LEROUX

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Katharine S. Leroux for almost three decades of outstanding public service to the town of Hillsborough, California, the last three years as the first female city manager. Kathy is a remarkable community leader and a force to be reckoned with.

After leaving her career in the telecommunication industry, Kathy started her public service career as a water rationing coordinator in 1990, in the midst of a severe drought. She credits that job with deeply connecting her with Hillsborough residents. When her second child was born in 1991, she took some time off to focus on her family and then returned to the city in 1992 as an account clerk in the Finance Department. In 1995, she was promoted to City Clerk in which role she updated the city council agenda process and the municipal code. She also attained her Certified Municipal Clerk designation.

In 2003, Kathy was promoted to Assistant to the City Manager and then two years later to Assistant City Manager where her responsibilities increased tremendously. She oversaw the office she formerly held, City Clerk, and Human Resources. She led labor negotiations, developed annual operating budgets and served as the Acting Director for the Building and Planning Department and the Public Works Department when there were vacancies.

Working in and with all of these departments perfectly prepared Kathy to become City Manager and to effectively run the town's business. In May 2015, she became Interim City Manager and the following January City Manager. She maintained Hillsborough's fiscal

stability and General Fund reserves, navigated State mandated water use reductions, developed a process for small wire development, revamped the website, developed the Climate Action Plan, expanded management teambuilding and employment recognition, and enhanced communication with residents—an impressive list of accomplishments that has benefitted the town and will continue to do so long after her retirement.

Kathy says she was afforded amazing growth opportunities by taking two life-changing educational programs. The first one was Continuing Education for Public Officials which she completed in Santa Barbara in the late 1990s. The second was the Senior Executives in State and Local Government program at the Harvard University Kennedy School which she completed in 2007.

During her tenure, Kathy served on several boards including The Cities Group, San Mateo County Telecommunications Authority, and the Association of Bay Area Governments. She was also the Administrative Officer for the Central County Fire Department.

Born in San Francisco, Kathy grew up in South San Francisco and attended El Camino High School. She took classes at San Diego State University, Michigan State University, Skyline College and the College of San Mateo and then spent three years working in the private sector for PacTel InfoSystems in San Francisco.

Kathy and Bert, her husband of 32 years, are devoted parents of Louie and Victoria. In her well-deserved retirement, Kathy plans to remodel her San Bruno house, adopt a dog, take golf lessons and spend more time reading, cooking and traveling.

Madam Speaker, I ask the members of the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Katharine Leroux, an exemplary public servant and dear friend, who leaves behind big shoes to fill for the next City Manager of Hillsborough. Her contributions to the town over the last 28 years will be felt for years to come.

HONORING ANNE SHUMADINE FOR RECEIVING THE 2019 CORPORATE VOLUNTEER EXCELLENCE AWARD, IN MEMORIAM

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the late Anne Shumadine for receiving the 2019 Corporate VOLUNTEER Excellence Award through Volunteer Hampton Roads, in memoriam.

This award recognizes Anne's lifetime of hard work and service to the community. Her dedication to her company and to her community was truly inspiring. Anne founded a highly competitive firm and led a group of advisors in the service of ensuring that clients have their financial needs met. Anne's dedication to offer the best financial strategic and philanthropic planning stood out.

In addition to Anne's dedication to her work, she held multiple leadership roles in the Hampton Roads community, including the President of the Norfolk Day Nursery Association, the President of the ACCESS College

Foundation, and a Trustee of the Chesapeake Bay Foundation—just to name a few. Anne’s commitment to these organizations showed her passion for the welfare of others and the community as a whole.

Anne will be missed. Hampton Roads significantly benefited from her presence; she made our community a better place.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH—JUEL SMITH

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the living legacy of Dr. Juel Smith. Her story starts in Sapulpa, Oklahoma, where she was born and graduated from Sapulpa High School in 1960. She married and became a mother of five children. Tragedy struck her and her family when her husband suddenly passed away, and Dr. Smith became a widow. She realized that pursuing higher education was her best shot for her to secure a better future for her family. Dr. Smith persevered and earned her degree in elementary education in 1972 from Langston University, Oklahoma’s only historically Black college. Dr. Smith relocated to Tampa and received her master’s degree and education specialist degree with a thesis on “Women Who Combine Career and Family,” a field of study in which she was personally invested. In 1987, she received her doctorate in counselor education from the University of South Florida (USF).

Always fueled by her faith and perseverance, Dr. Smith has been driven to serve others and find solutions. As a counselor at USF, she started her life’s work helping and guiding students, particularly African American students who could not afford to continue their education. She engaged Tampa’s African American community to “give more, do more and help more” to recruit and retain students. She created the Institute on Black Life in 1986 and the Center for Africa and the Diaspora, with a mission to bridge USF’s resources with the needs of the Black community and Africa as well as provide support for Black students and faculty. The Institute on Black Life produced an annual Black family conference, the campus Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday celebrations each year and a weekly television show titled “The Bridge.” The Institute also sponsored nationally renowned guest speakers and artists. As a partner with the Urban League, they established an African American advisory board and inner-city office to plan strategies and share problems. Student enrichment programs, scholarships, graduate fellowships, faculty research, community service and fundraising activities resulted. The African center sponsored international faculty research travel to Gabon that resulted in a USF and International Center for Bantu Civilization collaboration. Dr. Smith’s effectiveness in community relations, organizing special campus initiatives and philanthropic fundraising were unmatched at other Florida colleges and universities.

In the early 2000s, motivated by research regarding the desire of professional women to support female students, Dr. Smith and USF

leaders launched a vision and plan to establish the USF Women in Leadership and Philanthropy program. Dr. Smith served as WLP’s founding executive director. The initiative raised an extraordinary amount of money in the first 18 months to create scholarships and programmatic initiatives for women faculty and students. In addition, Dr. Smith became the first African American woman to serve as president of the Tampa Athena Society. She is a trustee of the Community Foundation of Tampa Bay, Inc. and a life member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority. In addition to her local involvement, she served as international director of The LINKS, Inc., building more than 50 schools in South Africa and Nigeria, and served with President Jimmy Carter on the International Habitat for Humanity Board.

Her beloved husband, Professor John Smith, ensured her living legacy by establishing the Dr. Juel Hickman Shannon Smith Endowed Scholarship. The scholarship is designed to support full-time undergraduate students pursuing a major in Africana studies or elementary education.

Dr. Smith’s legacy of enhancing student, faculty and community opportunities, passionate endeavors that are now part of USF’s fabric, will live on through the students and educators who have more opportunities due to her leadership. Madam Speaker, on behalf of a grateful Tampa Bay community, I am proud to recognize Dr. Juel Smith for her lifelong exemplary service to education, students, women and leaders in education everywhere.

RECOGNIZING GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize several outstanding young citizens in Bucks and Montgomery counties on their attainment of the rank of the Girl Scout Gold Award: Jessica E. Aniloff, Langhorne; India C. Bickley, Lansdale; Aurora J. Budson, Doylestown; Maia J. Costanzo, Quakertown; Audrey M. Dansberry, Morrisville; Nicole DeCicco, Quakertown; Nicole L. Didenko, Perkasia; Natalie S. Douglass, Doylestown; Evelyn P. Howarth, Doylestown; Jacqueline Johnson, Langhorne; Stephanie M. Krauss, Holland; Marie U. Larounis, Newtown.

Katherine M. Loftus, Churchville; Nicole A. Middleton, Yardley; Laura L. Nagg, Doylestown; Kareena Rogers, Yardley; Danielle E. Samalonis, Quakertown; Kelly A. Sassaman, Levittown; Jasmine L. Scavo-Treiber, Yardley; Alaina G. Tarallo, Yardley; Alesandra Temerte, Jamison; Katharine Trojak, Churchville; Hope E. Walsh, Yardley; Lauren E. Wolfe, Lansdale.

As we celebrate the 107th anniversary of the Girl Scouts, let us honor the thoughtful young women who contribute immensely to our country. I appreciate their service to the community and wish them all of the best in their future endeavors.

HONORING DREW UNGVARSKY FOR RECEIVING THE 2019 HARVEY L. LINDSAY, JR. CHANGEMAKER AWARD

HON. ELAINE G. LURIA

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 2019

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Drew Ungvarsky for receiving the 2019 Harvey L. Lindsay, Jr. Changemaker Award through Volunteer Hampton Roads. This is an amazing accomplishment.

This award recognizes Drew’s many years of hard work and innovative accomplishments. His dedication transformed an idea into a highly competitive company while simultaneously giving back to the Hampton Roads community. I am inspired by Drew’s commitment to support local businesses and charities. By renting out his company’s work space for “pop ups,” and requiring each “pop up” to donate some of the proceeds to charity, he demonstrates the true meaning of a changemaker. Drew’s innovative and thoughtful business ideas are not simply benefiting his company, but the entire Hampton Roads community.

I want to thank Drew for his leadership in the digital sphere and the role he plays in making the community a better place. Hampton Roads has significantly benefited from his leadership.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 14, 2019 may be found in the Daily Digest of today’s RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 26

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Army in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program.

10 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine implementing the 21st Century Cures Act, focusing on making electronic health information available to patients and providers.

SD-430

MARCH 27

10 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on SeaPower
To hold hearings to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-232A

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
To hold hearings to examine military space operations, policy, and programs.
SR-222
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Water and Power
To hold hearings to examine the Colorado River drought contingency plan.

SD-366

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed S.J. Res. 7, Republic of Yemen, as amended.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1807–S1853

Measures Introduced: Twenty-seven bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 765–791, and S. Res. 108. **Pages S1844–45**

Measures Reported:

S. 46, to repeal the Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act. (S. Rept. No. 116–6)

S. 50, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions. (S. Rept. No. 116–7) **Page S1844**

Measures Passed:

Republic of Yemen: By 54 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 48), Senate passed 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, after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S1829–36**

Adopted:

Lee (for Paul) Amendment No. 193, to provide that nothing in the joint resolution may be construed as authorizing the use of military force. **Pages S1829–35**

Lee (for Rubio/Cornyn) Amendment No. 195, to provide a rule of construction regarding intelligence sharing. **Pages S1829–35**

Rejected:

Lee (for Inhofe/Cornyn) Amendment No. 194, to provide an exception for supporting efforts to defend against ballistic missile, cruise missile, and unmanned aerial vehicle threats to civilian population centers in coalition countries, including locations where citizens and nationals of the United States reside. (By 52 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 47), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S1829–35**

Honoring Representative Walter Beamon Jones, Jr.: Senate agreed to S. Res. 108, honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Representative Walter Beamon Jones, Jr. **Page S1853**

National Emergency Declaration—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, March 14, 2019, the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of H.J. Res. 46, relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019, and Senate begin consideration of the joint resolution, and that no amendments be in order to the joint resolution. **Page S1853**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 53 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. EX. 44), Neomi J. Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit. **Pages S1807–19**

By 55 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. EX. 46), William Beach, of Kansas, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, for a term of four years. **Pages S1819–22**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 55 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. EX. 45), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S1819–20**

Messages from the House: **Page S1842**

Measures Referred: **Page S1842**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S1853**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1842–44**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S1844**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S1844**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1845–47**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1847–50**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1840–42**

Amendments Submitted: Pages S1850–52

Authorities for Committees to Meet:
Pages S1852–53

Privileges of the Floor: Page S1835

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today.
(Total—48) Pages S1819–20, S1822, S1835

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 7:07 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, March 14, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S1853.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Heath P. Tarbert, of Maryland, to be Chairman and to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Cornyn, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of the Air Force, after receiving testimony from Heather Wilson, Secretary, and General David L. Goldfein, Chief of Staff, both of the Air Force, Department of Defense.

U.S. NAVAL FORCES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower received a closed briefing on the most significant threats to United States Naval Forces and how Naval Forces plan to operate in a contested environment from Anthony Schinella, National Intelligence Officer for Military Issues, Office of the Director of National Intelligence; and John F. Stratton, Senior Military Analyst, Office of Naval Intelligence, Vice Admiral William R. Merz, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Warfare Systems, and Lieutenant General David H. Berger, USMC, Deputy Commandant of the Marine Corps for Combat Development and Integration, all of the Department of Defense.

BUDGET

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2020, after receiving testimony

from Russell Vought, Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget.

THE NEW SPACE RACE

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the new space race, focusing on ensuring United States global leadership on the final frontier, after receiving testimony from James F. Bridenstine, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and Kevin M. O’Connell, Director, Office of Space Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce.

DIESEL EMISSIONS REDUCTION ACT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine an original bill entitled, “Diesel Emissions Reduction Act of 2019”, after receiving testimony from Dale Krapf, Krapf School Bus, West Chester, Pennsylvania; Kurt Nagle, American Association of Port Authorities, Alexandria, Virginia; and Timothy V. Johnson, Corning Incorporated, Corning, New York.

U.S.-CHINA COMPETITION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine a new approach for an era of United States-China competition, after receiving testimony from former Senator Jim Talent; and Oriana Skylar Mastro, Georgetown University Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Daniel P. Collins, and Kenneth Kiyul Lee, who was introduced by Senator Cotton, both of California, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Intellectual Property concluded an oversight hearing to examine the United States Patent and Trademark Office, after receiving testimony from Andrei Iancu, Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property, and Director, Patent and Trademark Office.

CYBER CRIME

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine cyber crime, focusing on the threat to small businesses, including S. 771, to amend section 21 of the Small Business Act to require cyber certification for small business development center counselors, S. 772, to require an annual report on the cybersecurity of the Small Business Administration, after receiving testimony from

Charles H. Romine, Director, Information Technology Laboratory, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce; Maria Roat, Chief Information Officer, Small Business Administration; Karen A. Harper, Charles River Analytics Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts, on behalf of the National Small Business Association; Elizabeth Hyman, CompTIA, Washington, D.C.; and Stacey

Smith, Cybersecurity Association of Maryland, Inc., Baltimore.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of John Lowry III, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 49 public bills, H.R. 1686, 5, 1704–1750; 2 private bills, H.R. 1751–1752; and 9 resolutions, H. Res. 220–228, were introduced. **Pages H2714–17**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2719–20**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Soto to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2683**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:52 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H2689**

Suspension: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Acknowledging that the lack of sunlight and transparency in financial transactions and corporate formation poses a threat to our national security and our economy's security and supporting efforts to close related loopholes: H. Res. 206, amended, acknowledging that the lack of sunlight and transparency in financial transactions and corporate formation poses a threat to our national security and our economy's security and supporting efforts to close related loopholes; **Pages H2697–H2701**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "Acknowledging that the lack of sunlight and transparency in financial transactions poses a threat to our national security and our economy's security and supporting efforts to close related loopholes." **Page H2701**

Expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 208, providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24) expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Con-

gress, by a yea-and-nay vote of 233 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 124, after the previous question was ordered without objection. **Pages H2690–97, H2701–02**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, March 14th. **Page H2702**

United States Holocaust Memorial Council—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Members on the part of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council: Representatives Zeldin and Kustoff (TN). **Page H2705**

British-American Interparliamentary Group—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member on the part of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group: Representative Holding. **Page H2705**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of today and appears on pages H2701–02. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:56 p.m.

Committee Meetings

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held an oversight hearing on the General Services Administration. Testimony was heard from Emily W. Murphy, Administrator, General Services Administration.

STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES: BUILDING RESILIENT COMMUNITIES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled "Stakeholder Perspectives: Building Resilient Communities". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND ENFORCEMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Gun Violence Prevention and Enforcement”. Testimony was heard from Thomas E. Brandon, Deputy Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, Department of Justice; and Christine Halvorsen, Acting Assistant Director for Criminal Justice Information Services, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Veterans Affairs, Office of Inspector General. Testimony was heard from Michael J. Missal, Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs.

SECURING FEDERAL NETWORKS AND STATE ELECTION SYSTEMS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Department of Homeland Security held a hearing entitled “Securing Federal Networks and State Election Systems”. Testimony was heard from Christopher Krebs, Director, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Health and Human Services. Testimony was heard from Alex Azar, Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

NATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES AND U.S. MILITARY ACTIVITY IN EUROPE

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “National Security Challenges and U.S. Military Activity in Europe”. Testimony was heard from General Curtis M. Scaparrotti, U.S. Army, Commander, U.S. European Command; and Kathryn Wheelbarger, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Department of Defense.

FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET REQUEST FOR U.S. CYBER COMMAND AND OPERATIONS IN CYBERSPACE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Intelligence and Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Request

for U.S. Cyber Command and Operations in Cyberspace”. Testimony was heard from Kenneth P. Rapuano, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Global Security, Principal Cyber Advisor, Department of Defense; and General Paul M. Nakasone, U.S. Army, Commander, U.S. Cyber Command, and Director, National Security Agency.

ENSURING RESILIENCY OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AND OPERATIONS IN RESPONSE TO CLIMATE CHANGES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled “Ensuring Resiliency of Military Installations and Operations in Response to Climate Changes”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

THE COST OF COLLEGE: STUDENT CENTERED REFORMS TO BRING HIGHER EDUCATION WITHIN REACH

Committee on Education and Labor: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The Cost of College: Student Centered Reforms to Bring Higher Education Within Reach”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LOWERING THE COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS: REDUCING BARRIERS TO MARKET COMPETITION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Lowering the Cost of Prescription Drugs: Reducing Barriers to Market Competition”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISMANAGING CHEMICAL RISKS: EPA’S FAILURE TO PROTECT WORKERS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change held a hearing entitled “Mismanaging Chemical Risks: EPA’s Failure to Protect Workers”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PREPARING FOR THE STORM: REAUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Preparing for the Storm: Reauthorization of the National Flood Insurance Program”. Testimony was heard from Chairman Pallone, and Representatives Duffy, Graves of Louisiana, Luetkemeyer, Pascrell, and Scalise; and public witnesses.

**PROMOTING CORPORATE TRANSPARENCY:
EXAMINING LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO
DETECT AND DETER FINANCIAL CRIME**

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on National Security, International Development, and Monetary Policy held a hearing entitled “Promoting Corporate Transparency: Examining Legislative Proposals to Detect and Deter Financial Crime”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

**NATO AT 70: AN INDISPENSABLE
ALLIANCE**

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “NATO at 70: An Indispensable Alliance”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 1004, the “Prohibiting Unauthorized Military Action in Venezuela Act”. Testimony was heard from Representative Cicilline and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1232, the “Rescinding DHS’ Waiver Authority for Border Wall Act”; H.R. 1433, the “DHS MORALE Act”; H.R. 1589, the “CBRN Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2019”; H.R. 1590, the “Terrorist and Foreign Fighter Travel Exercise Act of 2019”; H.R. 1593, the “CLASS Act of 2019”; H.R. 1598, the “U.S. Customs and Border Protection Rural and Remote Hiring and Retention Strategy Act of 2019”; and H.R. 1639, the “CBP Workload Staffing Model Act”. H.R. 1639, H.R. 1593, H.R. 1598, H.R. 1589, and H.R. 1433 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 1232 and H.R. 1590 were ordered reported, without amendment.

**IMPROVING THE FEDERAL RESPONSE:
PERSPECTIVES ON THE STATE OF
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT**

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Recovery held a hearing entitled “Improving the Federal Response: Perspectives on the State of Emergency Management”. Testimony was heard from Major Louis V. Bucchere, Commanding Officer, Emergency Management Section, State Police, New Jersey; Martin Senterfitt, Fire Deputy Chief, and Director of Emergency Management, Monroe County, Florida; James Waters, Chief, Counterterrorism, New York Police Department; and a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1585, the “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019”. H.R. 1585 was ordered reported, as amended.

**FORGOTTEN VOICES: THE INADEQUATE
REVIEW AND IMPROPER ALTERATION OF
OUR NATIONAL MONUMENTS**

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Forgotten Voices: The Inadequate Review and Improper Alteration of Our National Monuments”. Testimony was heard from Edwin Roberson, Utah State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Kathleen Clarke, Director, Public Lands Coordinating Office, Utah; Leland Pollock, Commission Chairperson, Garfield County, Utah; and public witnesses.

**FOIA: EXAMINING TRANSPARENCY
UNDER THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION**

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “FOIA: Examining Transparency Under the Trump Administration”. Testimony was heard from Melanie Ann Pustay, Director, Office of Information Policy, Department of Justice; Rachel Spector, Acting Deputy Chief Freedom of Information Act Officer, Department of the Interior; and Tim Epp, Acting Director, National Freedom of Information Act Office, Environmental Protection Agency.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties; and Subcommittee on Government Operations held a joint hearing on H.R. 1076, the “Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act”. Testimony was heard from Representative Collins of Georgia, Senator Booker, Senator Johnson; and public witnesses.

**AMERICA IN SPACE: FUTURE VISIONS,
CURRENT ISSUES**

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “America in Space: Future Visions, Current Issues”. Testimony was heard from Ellen Stofan, John and Adrienne Mars Director, Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum; and public witnesses.

**FLIPPING THE SWITCH ON RURAL
DIGITAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP**

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Flipping the Switch on Rural Digital Entrepreneurship”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ALIGNING FEDERAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION POLICY TO MEET 21ST CENTURY NEEDS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Highways and Transit held a hearing entitled “Aligning Federal Surface Transportation Policy to Meet 21st Century Needs”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PROTECTING AND IMPROVING SOCIAL SECURITY: BENEFIT ENHANCEMENTS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing entitled “Protecting and Improving Social Security: Benefit Enhancements”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D245)

S. 47, to provide for the management of the natural resources of the United States. Signed on March 12, 2019. (Public Law 116–9)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and other emerging health threats, 10 a.m., SD–124.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense budget posture in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2020 and the Future Years Defense Program, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine Financial Stability Oversight Council nonbank designations, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine opportunities to improve access, infrastructure, and permitting for outdoor recreation, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2020

for the Department of Health and Human Services, 10:15 a.m., SD–215.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2020 for the Department of the Treasury, 1:30 p.m., SD–215.

Select Committee on Intelligence: closed business meeting to consider pending intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, hearing entitled “Department of the Air Force Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces”, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Labor, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Members Day Hearing: Committee on Education and Labor”, 9 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Commerce, hearing entitled “Enhancing Vehicle Technology to Prevent Drunk Driving”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets, hearing entitled “Putting Investors First? Examining the SEC’s Best Interest Rule”, 9:30 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 920, the “Venezuela Arms Restriction Act”; H.R. 854, the “Humanitarian Assistance to the Venezuelan People Act of 2019”; and H.R. 1477, to assess and mitigate threats posed by Russian-Venezuelan security cooperation and for other purposes, 9:45 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 920, the “Venezuela Arms Restriction Act”; H.R. 854, the “Humanitarian Assistance to the Venezuelan People Act of 2019”; and H.R. 1477, to assess and mitigate threats posed by Russian-Venezuelan security cooperation and for other purposes, 9:45 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and Citizenship, business meeting on Request for a DHS Departmental Report on the Beneficiaries of H.R. 1547, 11:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States, hearing entitled “Unmasking the Hidden Crisis of Murdered and Missing Indigenous Women (MMIW): Exploring Solutions to End the Cycle of Violence”, 9 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Hearing with Commerce Secretary Wilbur L. Ross, Jr.”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The President’s Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Proposal with U.S. Secretary of the Treasury Steven Mnuchin”, 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, March 14

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, March 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will begin consideration of H.J. Res. 46, National Emergency Declaration.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H. Con. Res. 24—Expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E295, E300
 Casten, Sean, Ill., E296
 Castor, Kathy, Fla., E302, E303, E305
 Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E295, E301
 Fitzpatrick, Brian K., Pa., E305
 Frankel, Lois, Fla., E301
 Harder, Josh, Calif., E303
 Hayes, Jahana, Conn., E302
 Johnson, Dusty, S. Dak., E296
 Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E304

Lee, Barbara, Calif., E301
 Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E298
 Luria, Elaine G., Va., E295, E297, E299, E300, E301,
 E302, E303, E303, E304, E305
 Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E300
 McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E298
 Newhouse, Dan, Wash., E303
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia,
 E298
 Radewagen, Aumua Amata Coleman, American
 Samoa, E300
 Raja, Krishnamoorthi, Ill., E296

Rogers, Mike, Ala., E301
 Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E299
 Schneider, Bradley Scott, Ill., E295, E296
 Shimkus, John, Ill., E297
 Soto, Darren, Fla., E299
 Speier, Jackie, Calif., E302, E304
 Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E302
 Taylor, Van, Tex., E297
 Walden, Greg, Ore., E304
 Watkins, Steve, Kans., E297



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.