



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2018

No. 196

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 12, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KEVIN YODER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, 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.

RECOGNIZING OUTSTANDING SERVICE OF AMY PORTER

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the outstanding service of Amy Porter, my chief of staff for 17 years, including the last 6 years on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Amy is a skillful manager and leader who has been central to everything I have accomplished in Congress.

Amy has been a tremendous asset to my office in no small part because she

has the heart for tackling some of the toughest issues and the drive to see them through. She ensured that issues like combating human trafficking and protecting children in adversity were front and center to our agenda.

When I became chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, she encouraged us to use this platform to call attention to the plight of disadvantaged groups around the world, particularly women and girls. This included holding a series of hearings on ways the United States could support women's empowerment around the globe, from promoting girls' education to women's inclusion in peace processes.

But, of course, Amy made sure we didn't stop there. She pressed us to develop solutions that would make a difference. As a result, the committee has passed many pieces of legislation—the READ Act; the Women, Peace, and Security Act; and the Women's Entrepreneurship and Economic Empowerment Act—that will give more women and girls a voice in decisions affecting their lives.

Amy traveled during her personal time to Cambodia and to India to work in orphanages and shelters, helping young girls subjected to human trafficking. She was relentless in helping me press governments on human rights, from the discriminating treatment toward those some still call the untouchables, the Dalits of India, to the genocide of the Rohingya of Myanmar, to female victims of trafficking and abuse worldwide.

From day one, Amy has understood how to reach out and connect with my constituents. When she announced over a decade ago that I should hold an annual event for women in my district to network and learn more about what I was doing in Washington, others were quickly dismissive. They questioned whether women who weren't already involved in politics would be interested in attending lectures on various policy

issues or foreign affairs. However, 1,000 women in my district came to our seventh annual conference to hear former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice discuss lessons from her career.

That is the amazing thing about Amy. For her, it is never enough to point out a problem. She possesses an unshakeable drive to make this world a better place, and the vision and leadership to realize even the most lofty ambitions.

It is thanks to her dedication that we were able to bring hundreds of adopted children home from Congo to their legal parents in the United States after their exit visas were suspended. Children stuck in filthy and underfunded orphanages were dying. Amy heard about it and traveled to Kinshasa on these children's behalf.

When she landed, she ran into a protest against the government. She continued on, made her case, and was rebuffed. She vowed to return.

She returned with a congressional delegation, which I led, and thanks to her effort, hundreds of American families now have new members whose lives are better beyond comprehension. These families thank Amy. My constituents thank Amy.

Thank you, Amy Porter, for your 20 years of service to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I know when her daughter, Sara Jo, is old enough, she will thank Amy for what she has done for the empowerment of women and for what Amy has done for Sara Jo.

OPEN ENROLLMENT

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind everyone that the enrollment period to sign up for 2019 health plans on healthcare.gov, and in many States like my home State of

□ 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.

H10105

Maryland, ends in just 3 days. That is Saturday, December 15.

I have often said that voting for the Affordable Care Act was the most important vote of my career. When Congress passed the Affordable Care Act in 2010, we enshrined into law the promise that all Americans have a right to accessible and affordable health insurance coverage in this great country.

By strengthening the individual health insurance market, protecting people with preexisting conditions, and expanding Medicaid, we brought this promise closer to reality. We promised that individuals would not have to worry about affording health insurance or paying outrageous rates because of preexisting conditions. We safeguarded access to care for people who need it by preventing health insurance providers from placing limits on their coverage.

Because of the ACA, individuals and families across this country do not have to live with the daily fear of financial disaster they could face if they got sick while they were uninsured. In total, approximately 20 million Americans gained health insurance coverage as a result of the ACA.

During the November election, the American people reminded us that they want their elected officials to protect their access to affordable healthcare. In my home State of Maryland, the uninsured population is at an all-time low of 6.1 percent. As more people have gotten coverage, the cost of uncompensated care in Maryland hospitals has gone down by \$400 million from 2013 to 2017.

The open enrollment period that is quickly coming to a close in many States is the only time during which people can act to protect themselves and their families by purchasing coverage through healthcare.gov or their State health insurance marketplace.

Quality health plans for 2019 are more affordable than many people may realize. Eight in ten people using healthcare.gov qualify for financial assistance, meaning that most people can find a health plan with a premium of less than \$75 per month.

According to data released by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services through December 1, enrollment is down 11 percent on the Federal exchange compared to last year.

I am proud that Maryland has embraced the ACA to help people in our State secure the coverage they need to keep their families healthy and safe. I am proud of all the hard work the Maryland Health Connection continues to do to make it easier for people to get enrolled.

The Trump administration has focused their efforts on sabotaging the ACA by making it harder for Americans to sign up for coverage through actions such as shortening the enrollment period, slashing funding for marketing and outreach programs, and lowering spending by more than 80 percent on local in-person assistance through the navigator program.

Because of these efforts, there is fear about the future of ACA. I want to make one thing very clear: The ACA is not going anywhere, despite the efforts of the Trump administration to sabotage this law. Please know that I intend to do everything in my power to keep the ACA intact and to make sure that people have health coverage that is meaningful, affordable, and accessible.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone in the next 3 days to discuss your options and find out how to get the best plan for you as an individual and for your family.

Everyone deserves access to healthcare that will improve their lives. Healthcare is a right, not a privilege, and I pledge to do my part to protect that right.

WHY OUR BORDER MATTERS

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, every nation has a natural right and a fundamental responsibility to determine who is admitted within its borders. This is what defines a country and ultimately determines whether its culture, customs, and institutions will endure.

The unique qualities that develop within each country's borders naturally make some countries more desirable places to live than others. These differences drive immigration patterns. The more successful a nation, the greater the demand to immigrate to it, and ours is the most successful in human history.

Most of the world's 7½ billion people live in violent and impoverished conditions, and it is no wonder that they find the United States an attractive alternative. Yet uncontrolled and indiscriminate immigration from those countries to ours risks importing the same undesirable conditions that encouraged their immigration in the first place.

History offers us many examples of great civilizations that have succumbed to this paradox, and the current crisis on our southern border poses a fundamental test of whether ours may join them.

America has traditionally welcomed the truly persecuted who have escaped to our shores, but what is unfolding today makes a mockery of our asylum laws. This was not a peaceful caravan of asylum seekers, as many have attempted to portray. A caravan is a group of people traveling legally and peacefully through a foreign land. An invasion is a group of people attempting to violate a nation's border by force, whether by military or mob action.

The vast majority camped on our southern border are military-aged males. Authorities have already identified roughly 600 as known criminals,

and Mexican law enforcement has reportedly arrested roughly 100 for crimes committed in their country. The fact that this force has attacked both Mexican and U.S. law enforcement, with several injuries reported, contradicts any claims that, as a group, they come with peaceful intent.

Nor are they asylum seekers in any conventional sense. No doubt many are nonviolent and simply caught up in the group dynamic of a mob. But poverty and violence in a country does not entitle every person in it to enter ours. Asylum is reserved for those who have been specifically targeted for harm by their own government based on their race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or social group, and who have entered directly into our country from their own.

In these instances, asylum is reached by crossing a border and accomplishing separation from that government. A Central American arriving in Mexico has already achieved this and, therefore, has no call on asylum in any other country. The appropriate request to make is to the Government of Mexico, a request some have already made and Mexico has granted.

Nothing succeeds like success. If this group is allowed to muscle its way into the United States, we can expect many and still larger groups to follow.

If anything, this crisis should emphasize the importance of completing the border wall that Congress first authorized in 1996 and President Trump is desperately trying to construct.

A forceful incursion of our border can be repelled only by applying equal or greater force. That is a recipe for violence and bloodshed. The physical separation provided by a wall can prevent that.

□ 1015

It not only protects the officers who place their lives on the line in defense of our law, it also protects the lawbreakers themselves from the violent conduct that their behavior otherwise would make inevitable.

Orderly immigration, regulated by law and protected by secure borders, is a prerequisite to a civilized and prosperous nation. If our immigration laws are not enforced, then our borders become meaningless and America becomes a vast, open territory between Canada and Mexico susceptible to every social, political, and economic disorder brought to it.

This seems to be the ultimate aim of the American left and its powerful chorus in the media. We are fortunate in this crisis to have a President obedient to his constitutional command to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." In the remaining days of this session, Congress has a responsibility to give him the tools to do so. It remains one of the great remaining tests of the 115th Congress.

GIFT TO AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today, I remind my colleagues of a President who reminded us of the shining city on a Hill. I remind our colleagues of a President who led us to a kinder and gentler society. So I am stunned to hear the President speak of claiming to be asking for the government to be shut down.

This is a season where many in our Nation draw together with families and worship and celebrate. It is a very honored time. People of the Christian faith are engaged in the recognition and acknowledgment of the birth of baby Jesus. It is a holy time. It is a time when families need resources. Government workers need to ensure that their families are provided for, but also we must ensure that our government is provided for. I thank the Speaker-elect and the Democratic leader in the Senate, the other body, for recognizing that we do not want a shutdown.

To those who speak of the necessity of a wall, let me speak as a Representative of a border State who has been to the border so many times, I cannot count. I count those on the border, among many of the States, as friends, having been to every border State. I will say to the American people: There is no foreign war or attack at the southern border.

We have a northern border as well, and I have been there. There is no wall there.

The only thing that is at the southern border are mothers and children living in desperate, devastating, and disgusting conditions, and unaccompanied children fleeing from the decapitation of their brothers or fathers, fleeing politically because they disagree with the viciousness of cartels and refuse to accept their membership.

That is where America's best angels come in, when we rise to the higher occasion of giving refuge and opportunity to those who are fleeing political persecution. Here is how we do it. We process asylum seekers. We do not undermine their process. They are fleeing for their lives.

To juxtapose a stagnant wall to the lives of those fleeing political persecution is untenable. It is crucial that we design a comprehensive immigration reform policy. It is crucial that the acknowledgment that barriers of certain kinds—technology and personnel—can be a successful formula to ensure the safety and security of the American people. But at the same time, I insist that we regulate or bring into regular order Dreamers, who are firefighters, soldiers, lawyers, doctors, and family members throughout the Nation. Where is the call for that?

It is important that we remain a nation that people flee to because of the wonderful values of democracy, the underpinnings of the dignity of all people. It is sad at this time that we have

not come to that conclusion in a bipartisan manner.

So I extend the olive branch. What are we doing for the Dreamers? Why is it not reasonable to construct a funding process or scheme or formula that ensures that kind of bipartisanship and security?

Let me also encourage my colleagues to join me in working in a bipartisan way to pass the Violence Against Women Act. We are reaching out. It is a crucial initiative. Right now, there are family members dying at the hands of domestic violence.

There are law enforcement officers, including my own chief, who asked me about the funding of the STOP grants that are utilized for organizations that will protect these families subjected to violence, such as Native Americans, with healthcare for VAWA victims and ensuring that the person who has already been convicted of abuse does not have random access to a weapon, which is the weapon of choice that kills a family member.

Finally, let me say I hope that we can bring, Mr. Speaker, conclusion to a sentencing and prison reform bill that I have worked very hard on.

Why not give a gift to the American people—not a shutdown, but a bipartisan step, one by one, to make America an even greater country than it already is?

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE FOR OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my final speech in the United States House of Representatives to express my gratitude for the opportunity to serve the people of Arizona's Second Congressional District.

It has been a tremendous honor to deploy here to the people's House over the past 4 years as an advocate and champion for Tucson, Sierra Vista, Douglas, Bisbee, and all the other amazing communities in southeastern Arizona.

I am grateful to my dedicated staff in Arizona, who were omnipresent in our community and fought for constituents who needed help with Federal bureaucracies. They were able to solve nearly 6,000 cases, returning nearly \$2.5 million to seniors, veterans, and others—money that was rightfully theirs in the first place. This is one of the most meaningful and impactful parts of our job.

My D.C. staff tirelessly helped push our legislative initiatives forward. Because of them, we saved the A-10 Warthog, put the Douglas port of entry project on the map, kept the Cherrybell postal processing facility open, fast-tracked our veterans for jobs at the border, opened Arlington again to our World War II female pilot heroes, improved mental health access, stopped a harmful tax increase on sen-

iors and the middle class, led bipartisan efforts to break the gridlock on healthcare, border security, immigration, and so much more.

A heartfelt thanks to all my staff, but especially those who were with me all 4 years: my chief, Justin Roth; district director, C.J. Karamargin; LD, Pace McMullan, and deputy district director, Rosa Ruiz.

As I reflect on my two terms in the House, I will cherish many memories from this time of service. I was honored to have a front row seat to history here in our Nation's Capitol.

I will never forget sitting next to an American hero, SAM JOHNSON, on the day I was sworn in, or being on this floor as two Presidents delivered their State of the Union speeches and when Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and Pope Francis addressed a joint session of Congress.

I was blessed to pay final respects to American icons like Senator John McCain, Reverend Billy Graham, and President George H.W. Bush in the sacred grounds in the Capitol rotunda.

To my fellow Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, those who have been here awhile and those who will be sworn in soon, I humbly ask that you never forget the privilege it is to serve here and why you are here. Membership in this body is a precious opportunity. Don't take it lightly, and don't squander it.

It is not about us. As soon as we leave here, this institution will move on and, candidly, few will remember us. Use the time wisely. We have been entrusted to solve our Nation's problems and chart its course for a better future. Do the right thing. Do it for the right reasons. And get things done. This is why we are here.

The people of our great country—the people each of us represent—often have very different views on how to solve our challenges, the proper role of our government, and the priorities for our limited resources. Reconciling these differences requires rigorous and robust debate, both in this Chamber and outside of it. Disagreements are inevitable, but we can and should set the example to disagree without being disagreeable.

Our challenge is, then, to find the sometimes very tiny sliver of common ground where we can agree and govern. I am particularly proud of the fact that every one of the five bills I introduced that were signed into law had bipartisan support.

Lastly, and most importantly, to my constituents: In my time as your Representative, I deeply valued meeting with you all over our incredible district—at schools, senior centers, small businesses, nonprofits, military bases, medical facilities, farms, ranches, and other places—to hear about the challenges that you have along with the opportunities to make an impact with your lives that only come in America. You inspired me and fueled my purpose here.

I represent a diverse and amazing district. These are Americans with real issues, real problems, and real dreams who are not concerned with what party we belong to or what ads we run every 2 years. They care that we care and that we are here to serve not only ourselves, but our country and them.

Our democracy requires that our time here be spent in humility, dedication, and pride: pride to fight for those who can't, pride to work for those who are unable, pride to push back against the bureaucracy that frequently stands in the way and hampers their ability to conduct their business and live their lives.

I stand here today proud of the work we did in these 4 short years, but more proud of the people who sent me here: the citizens of Arizona's Second Congressional District. Thank you for the opportunity and the honor to serve you.

To my successor, Ann Kirkpatrick, I wish you all the best as you are sworn in to serve our amazing and inspiring community.

God bless you all and God bless America.

RECOGNIZING 15 YEARS OF PEPFAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on December 1, we commemorated World AIDS Day, celebrating our many accomplishments in the fight against HIV/AIDS around the globe. One important program for which we are also celebrating 15 years of success this year is PEPFAR.

Mr. Speaker, before Congress enacted PEPFAR, the HIV rates were skyrocketing, especially across the developing world. New cases of HIV infection were outstripping AIDS deaths by more than 60 percent.

Serving in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, we followed this issue closely, hearing from advocates and administration officials on what to do. There was an almost unchallenged notion that we were about to lose a whole generation in sub-Saharan Africa. It just seemed to be an utterly hopeless situation.

In 2003, our tremendous leader, President George W. Bush, called on us in Congress to take action in responding to this global crisis, and I am proud that we swiftly answered the President's call. Today, there are over 14 million people receiving HIV treatment globally, and over 2 million babies born HIV-free to HIV-positive women—simply astounding.

PEPFAR morphed from an emergency plan to a sustainable program, and I am so glad that USAID is at the helm of this lifesaving program. Since his time as Ambassador to Tanzania, USAID Administrator Mark Green has had a clear-eyed strategy to address

the challenges posed by the HIV/AIDS epidemic. What he has done has rein-vigorated this program.

We are so proud as Americans of what PEPFAR has achieved. It is something that we need in order to continue to be a global leader against the HIV pandemic.

I will never forget standing in the Oval Office as President George W. Bush signed this essential program, PEPFAR, into law. I hope that my colleagues continue to protect and strengthen this vital program.

I am also proud of the many organizations like the One Campaign that, day in and day out, are working to get us closer to our goal of an AIDS-free generation.

□ 1030

RECOGNIZING THE SIMON FAMILY

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Simon family of Key Biscayne for their exemplary work on the yet-to-be-named park located in my congressional district at 401 Hampton Lane in Key Biscayne, the first neighborhood park for their community.

I would like to thank Arielle Simon, the horticulture adviser; Brett Simon, the architectural designer; and their father, Steven Simon, the project coordinator, who worked tirelessly as volunteers to see this vision into fruition.

This is not just any park; it is not just any effort. In an editorial, the community, newspaper, *The Islander News*, wrote:

The park, put simply, is beautiful—but the story behind it is even more so.

From the beginning, Steven, who has a history of effective community leadership, saw an opportunity to work with local elected officials to tackle a problem which they inherited.

Steven brought in his daughter, Arielle, who worked at Miami's renowned botanical garden and became a certified horticulturist, and his son, Brett, who has a master's degree in architecture and craftsmanship education in furniture design, and other volunteers and seasoned professionals.

Together, they all worked as a team, drafting proposals and securing the necessary funds to see this project through.

And here is how the Simon family beautifully described and included south Florida limestone in their proposal. They said:

We incorporated that natural material in our park design so that, metaphorically, we bring the bedrock upon which this island community of shifting sands was founded to the surface. Functionally and aesthetically, limestone is an integral part of our creation of a gathering place . . . in our first neighborhood park.

The story, which is well documented in Key Biscayne's *Islander News* over the past 3 years, truly shows what is possible when people come together with a desire and a drive to do something positive for the betterment of their community. I invite all of my

congressional colleagues to come to Key Biscayne and visit that island paradise and especially to see this park for yourself.

THANKING THE PEOPLE OF NEW YORK'S 19TH DISTRICT

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

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my thanks to the people of the 19th Congressional District for giving me the honor of serving them in the House over these past 2 years.

I ran for Congress focused on how I could make a difference for the people of our district. It is no secret that upstate New York has been in a long, protracted period of economic decline, with many families and businesses choosing to leave due to high taxes and few employment opportunities.

As such, my focus upon taking office was how we can make upstate more economically competitive while, at the same time, making sure that our citizens, businesses, and local governments have an active voice representing their interests before the Federal Government.

I listened to the people across the district—firefighters and emergency responders, law enforcement, educators, business owners, and average working families—who told me of the issues that we face: the opioid crisis, the highest property taxes in the Nation, the exodus of people and jobs from upstate New York.

A primary focus of mine was the opioid crisis. This issue has devastated and destroyed countless lives across our Nation. I was pleased to have become the primary sponsor of legislation in the House. Working with my colleague from Michigan, MIKE BISHOP, we successfully enacted major opioid legislation, which included the STOP Act.

This legislation will crack down on the flow of illegal drugs, such as fentanyl, coming into the U.S. from places like China through the U.S. Postal Service. The STOP Act is now law, and I am proud to have had a role in its passage.

Agriculture is another major concern in the 19th District. Serving on the House Agriculture Committee, we have lowered the cost and increased the flexibility of dairy risk management programs, fought for better documentation to protect the sanctity of organic agriculture, made it easier for veterans to transition into agriculture, and supported increased broadband and cell service, which is critically important in our rural areas.

I have also led on two initiatives which are critical to the economic health of upstate New York. My legislation, offered with other members of the New York delegation, would finally have ended our State's policy of imposing a share of Medicaid costs from Albany onto local property taxpayers.

This mandate is so significant that just the county government taxpayers in New York State pay more in State-mandated Medicaid costs than local taxpayers in the 49 other States combined.

People are fleeing upstate New York because of high property taxes, and New York's Medicaid mandate is one of the reasons for that exodus.

The second initiative which I advanced was to preempt the absolute liability standard for gravity-related construction site accidents on federally funded projects. Again, New York stands alone among the 50 States in this absolute liability standard.

The fact is, this standard doesn't protect workers and adds approximately 7 percent to the cost of every building project in our State. With multi-billion-dollar projects like Gateway needing Federal support, it is critical that we use the preemption power to finally end this waste of taxpayer dollars and use those savings to rebuild and repair more infrastructure.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I must comment on the state of our political discourse in the United States. We all need to renew our efforts to conduct our debates on public issues in a civil and respectful fashion.

There is no doubt that the fragmented media and a general decline of standards has coarsened our public debate. There is plenty of blame to go around for this situation.

I encourage all those who hold elected office to recognize that we hold a sacred trust from the American people. We should uphold this responsibility in an honorable and dignified fashion and renew our efforts to improve the quality of public debate in the United States.

In doing so, we will renew our commitment to make a more perfect union. Moreover, we will give honor to those who have sacrificed to win and maintain these freedoms which we cherish.

The Constitution is forever our guide, and we should always remain true to it. We must also continue to promote individual liberty, the rule of law, and the dignity of all of our citizens. These are the characteristics of America that make ours a truly great Nation.

May God continue to bless the United States of America.

CAESAR SYRIA CIVILIAN PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, we have got a lot of really important issues we talk about every day out here. I want to talk about something that is happening a few thousand miles away but affects us all. I want to talk about what is going on in Syria.

Mr. Speaker, I remember back, I think, in 2011 being in Israel and stand-

ing in the Golan Heights and looking over towards Syria, and our guide at the time made the comment that there is a little disturbance over there. There was some concern about where that was going to lead, and we all know what has happened since.

There is a lot of attention focused on Yemen right now, but in Syria there are 500,000 Syrian civilians who have been killed by a brutal dictator, Bashar al-Assad, 50,000 of which are children. Some of those children, in spectacular displays, were murdered by the use of chemical weapons, and I give great credit to our President and this administration for responding, as an America that believes in morals and strength should, by bombing and destroying some of the facilities that did that and holding to our red line.

But the war hasn't stopped, and the egregious nature of the war continues. I actually believe that the nature of that war is creating another generation of terrorists, people who feel that they don't have hope, people who feel that they don't have opportunity. And when hope and opportunity don't exist, people turn to extremes, and this is one case.

I want to talk specifically, though, about a really sad situation, a lady from Chicago, an American citizen, Layla Shweikani, who was murdered by the Assad regime. She was Chicago born and, a few years ago, basically made the decision that she had a passion for the people of Syria and decided to go and be an aide worker in Eastern Ghouta.

Two years ago she disappeared. We know that she was put into Assad's prison camps and tortured for 10 months—an American, by the way—before being transferred to a military court.

Unfortunately, a few weeks ago our worst fears were confirmed: Miss Layla was actually tortured to death and executed on December 28, 2016, the first American we know who was tortured and killed by Bashar al-Assad.

We know there are other Americans in captivity, and we know this is something that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, there are some in our Government, in this Chamber and in the other Chamber, that express sympathy to Bashar al-Assad and believe the antiquated theory that oppression of civilians is the only way to prevent terrorism.

I would argue that, in an age of information, in an age of knowledge, oppression only leads to more terrorists. Oppression leads to hopelessness, to a lack of opportunity, and to turning to the only option they know at that time, which may be ISIS or al-Qaida, because they don't see any other opportunity or hope.

Mr. Speaker, these people in our Government who express sympathy, while I believe that is something they have to answer with their creator ultimately someday, I am curious now what the response of everybody is when we find

out that an American woman was tortured and killed in the prison camps of Assad.

We have a bill called the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act. Caesar was a brave hero from Syria who took tens of thousands of pictures of torture victims of Assad, smuggled them to the United States, brought them in front of my committee in Foreign Affairs, and showed some of these pictures.

There was an act that would sanction many members of the regime that was passed unanimously out of Foreign Affairs, passed out of the House, largely supported in the Senate, and is being held up by a junior Senator from Kentucky.

I call on the other side of this blessed Capitol to pass the Caesar Syrian Civilian Protection Act. I call on the administration—as they said they support this—to sign this, put this on the Resolute desk.

We talk a lot about the importance of women and equality, and I couldn't agree more; but in that debate, I think it is important to remember that, in Syria, an American civilian woman was tortured to death.

We look in places like Afghanistan and know the oppression of women that occurred there. We know that America stands for something greater, and it is not just through the use of the military but through what we believe and what we stand for and the light that we shine.

Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible situation, Miss Layla's death, but let us learn from it and let us go forward, and let the people of Syria be free.

ONE DAY AT A TIME

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise, and still I rise, a proud American, always proud to have the preeminent privilege of standing in the well of the Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today reflecting upon the words, the lyrics, if you will, of a song that many of us have heard. The lyrics, as I paraphrase them, are:

One day at a time, one day at a time, sweet Jesus. One day at a time. Just help me to make, just help me to take, one day at a time.

Many of us who are sons of the segregated South survived, to a certain extent, understanding the lyrics of "One Day At a Time," knowing that, if you just take one day at a time, it can become a lifetime.

Sons of the segregated South learned early that they had to compromise.

I saw something on television yesterday that caused me to reflect on all of these things, Mr. Speaker, when I saw a President who was born into plenty, not poverty, a President who was born with a pat hand, a President who was born into a life unlike that of the sons of the segregated South who were African American, who understand how to

negotiate and what negotiation is all about—of necessity they do. Not all, but generally speaking they do.

I saw a President yesterday, Mr. Speaker, who proclaims himself to be a great negotiator. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was revealed to many of us that what he sees as negotiation is dictation, a President who sees compromise as capitulation for the other side, who has always walked into his opportunities, if you will, knowing that the other side would have to give in or he would muscle his way over them.

□ 1045

Well, I am proud to say that two Members of the Congress of the United States of America, the House and the Senate—it is what the Congress consists of—two Members stood their ground. Speaker PELOSI—and I say Speaker PELOSI because once you are a Speaker, you are always a Speaker—and Minority Leader SCHUMER did not allow themselves to be dictated to. They understand that compromise is the methodology by which we can realize significant change.

I am proud of the two of them, and I am proud to say to you that, as a son of the segregated South, I saw hope when I saw them take a stand for the American people, take a stand for justice, take a stand for the great ideals that we all stand upon.

One day at a time, Mr. President, one day at a time, and we will have dealt with all of the great issues of our time.

But I am proud to know that you will find, Mr. President, that negotiation is more than your being a dictator, that you are going to have to compromise if you want to realize some of the great things that we have to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time, and I thank the creator of all of creation for giving me this one more day, and I pray that I will do better today than I did yesterday because I still see life as one day at a time.

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

HONORING SERGEANT DYLAN ELCHIN

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Air Force Staff Sergeant Dylan James Elchin, who gave his life for our country on November 27, 2018, while serving in Afghanistan.

Dylan was born in 1993 and raised in western Pennsylvania, graduating from Hopewell High School in 2012. Military service was already calling him at a young age as he read of special operations when he was 14 years old. He enlisted upon graduating from high school.

The commanding officer of Dylan's 26th Special Tactics Squadron said

Dylan “had an unusual drive to succeed and contribute to the team. He displayed maturity and stoicism beyond his years and was always level-headed, no matter the situation.”

Dylan leaves behind a grieving fiancée and family, and we as a nation, more than 300 million strong, must now stand behind them and all who have fallen for our country.

May Dylan rest in the peace of God, and may his fiancée and family know his tender mercies.

HONORING ARMY SERGEANT JASON MCCLARY

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Army Sergeant Jason Mitchell McClary, a western Pennsylvania native who gave the ultimate sacrifice while serving in the line of duty.

Sergeant McClary grew up in Export, Pennsylvania. He and his wife, Lillie, graduated from Kiski Area High School in 2013. A true patriot as a student, Jason dreamed of serving his country.

In January 2014, he achieved his dream and enlisted in the Army. Jason went on to serve in Iraq and Afghanistan, earning two Purple Hearts and three Army Commendation Medals, including one for valor and one for combat.

Tragically, this courageous soldier was taken from us too soon. On November 27, 2018, Jason was injured from an IED explosion and died 5 days later, leaving behind two little sons, a heartbroken wife, and a grieving community of family and friends.

Jason is fondly remembered as a loving father, devoted husband, and hard-working soldier.

May the good Lord welcome home this son of western Pennsylvania with open arms, and may He bless Jason's family with peace and consolation.

RECOGNIZING CONGRESSMAN GREGG HARPER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my colleague and friend Chairman GREGG HARPER for his service to Mississippi's Third Congressional District in the House of Representatives.

GREGG and I were elected to Congress in the same year, 2008, and we were friends from the start. And while he will retire at the end of this year, his contributions will be long remembered.

At the beginning of the 115th Congress, GREGG was selected by the Speaker of the House to serve as chairman of the House Administration Committee. He has had vast oversight and administrative responsibilities in the House and other institutions.

Perhaps most notably, GREGG worked to completely overhaul House policies and implement mandatory sexual harassment training for everyone from Members to interns. He worked to change the culture on the Hill, and he

said: “It has to be understood that taxpayers are not going to be responsible for someone's bad behavior.” And that is GREGG HARPER, a man of high character, always working to do the right thing.

GREGG has also dedicated much of his congressional life to that of advocating for those with intellectual disabilities. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago, he founded the Congressional Internship Program for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities.

This program partners with George Mason University's LIFE Program to connect students with disabilities to congressional offices for a semester-long internship. Students get to help office staff with administrative tasks, special projects, and they truly become part of the team.

When GREGG started the program, just 5 congressional offices participated. Today, there are nearly 200 House and Senate offices that host student interns.

GREGG, whose son, Livingston, has special needs, designed this program to not only give students exposure to Capitol Hill offices, but also to give Members and staffers the experience of working with individuals who are living with various types of disabilities.

My office continues to participate in this program, and we have hosted many students from George Mason University. It has been a wonderful experience for me and my staff, and I encourage all my colleagues to join the program next Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it will be bittersweet for me to say good-bye to my friend GREGG HARPER, but he has left his mark on this institution, and his contributions will be remembered for generations to come.

GREGG will return to Mississippi to spend more time with his wife, Sidney, their children, and his first grandbaby, a little boy named Lee. Chairman HARPER is being promoted to Grandpa HARPER, and I know that that will be his greatest role yet. I wish him the best in his next chapter of life.

PERMANENTLY FUNDING SUPPORT FOR 9/11 FIRST RESPONDERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of our 9/11 first responders and their families, urging all Members of Congress to support passage of the Never Forget the Heroes Act, H.R. 7062, which would permanently fund the 9/11 Victims Compensation Fund and extend its authorization to 2090.

Regardless of party affiliation and regardless of which district or State you come from, it is imperative that right out of the gate of the next Congress, starting next month, that this legislation is immediately passed and sent to the President to become law.

First responders who worked on the pile day and night, aiding in the search, rescue, and cleanup efforts, were breathing in toxic debris and ash that are now known to have caused over 50 different types of cancer.

James Zadroga was one of those fearless leaders. He was also the first NYPD officer whose death, in 2006, was connected to toxic exposure at the World Trade Center site. The James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act was later signed into law in 2011 to help our 9/11 first responders.

Mr. Speaker, 5 years later, the Zadroga Act was permanently reauthorized and included \$4.6 million for the 9/11 Victims Compensation Fund over 5 years, which was established to provide compensation for the victims of 9/11 and their families. However, we are hearing from the special master of the fund that this funding “may be insufficient to compensate all claims.”

Representing a district just over 50 miles from Ground Zero, fighting for the Americans affected on September 11 isn't just my job—it is personal. Whether it is losing a loved one or knowing someone who volunteered on the pile, each and every one of my constituents, including myself, has been affected.

Before Congress passed the permanent reauthorization of the Zadroga Act, I vividly recall so many first responders who had fallen ill were forced to come to our Nation's Capitol and beg for the benefits they rightfully earned. These 9/11 first responders lived not only in New York, but in 433 of the 435 congressional districts across this country.

This isn't just a New York issue. This isn't a Democratic or Republican Party platform or political football. This is a responsibility we all shoulder as Americans, first and foremost. It is the spirit of our Nation, and it is who we are as a people.

These were the very men and women who, in the face of evil, were willing to put it all on the line to help save their fellow Americans who ran into the towers while everyone else was running out. It is unconscionable that time and again they have been forced to come crawling to Washington, D.C., to plead their case as to why they are worthy of our support. It was heartbreaking and sickening, and I hope we have learned our lesson.

We must pass this legislation at the beginning of the 116th Congress so these first responders don't have to go through all of this again, so they can focus on their health and not be forced to travel to Washington, D.C., on their own dime dozens of times for the benefits they have more than earned.

This past September 11, 17 years since the attacks, we came together, as we always do, to remember those who were taken from us on that day. But this year marked an especially harrowing occasion. By the end of this year, it is anticipated that more people will have died from 9/11-related ill-

nesses than were killed on 9/11, and over 175 of those deaths occurred just this year.

Jimmy Martinez was one of those 175. Diagnosed with bone marrow cancer, he went into remission in 2016, a year after the Zadroga Act's permanent reauthorization. He responded to the 1993 attack on the World Trade Center, again on 9/11, and came to the aid of so many in the aftermath of Superstorm Sandy. This August, he died a 26-year veteran of the FDNY.

Just as there were so many who fought for the Zadroga Act who were not here to fight for its reauthorization in 2015, Jimmy is just one of the so many who are unable to continue this fight today. That is why it is up to us—to fight for others like Jimmy, for those who risked so much for us but they need our help. Congress must take action to ensure every family receives the compensation they are entitled to as soon as possible. They have earned nothing less.

On that horrific day, in the face of the worst of humanity, these men and women were the best of it. In honor of them and their families who carry on their memory, Congress must do its job and permanently fund the 9/11 Victims Compensation Fund.

In the aftermath of 9/11, we vowed we would never forget, and I am going to make sure of it.

CONGRATULATING MAYOR KEITH RIDDLE

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my good friend, Mayor Keith Riddle of Burkesville, Kentucky, on his retirement from public service after 22 years.

His years as a city council member, in addition to his years spent as mayor, have had a profound impact on his fellow citizens. By dedicating his time to taking on countless projects to improve the city and well-being of community members, Mayor Riddle has made great strides for the citizens of Burkesville.

Most notably, during Mayor Riddle's tenure, he was instrumental in the construction of a new water treatment plant, which produces 2 million gallons per day of clean water for the city and surrounding area.

Another massive waterline improvement project was completed under the watchful eye of Mayor Riddle. This project replaced nearly 100-year-old lines and addressed wastewater overflow to provide improved protection of property, rivers, and streams in the community.

Mayor Riddle has truly dedicated his time and talents to helping Burkesville grow and improve. His continuous work with the water department, fire and police departments, and various businesses in the area has helped set the stage for continued success in Burkesville.

On behalf of the First District of Kentucky, I thank Mayor Keith Riddle for his decades of public service and wish him continued success in his retirement.

□ 1100

RECOGNIZING PHILANTHROPY OF DARREN CLEARY

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my friend Darren Cleary of Tompkinsville, Kentucky, for all the great philanthropy he has given to my home county of Monroe.

Darren is the epitome of a successful businessperson who truly gives back to his community. Darren sponsors many activities and events throughout the year in Tompkinsville, including our annual July Fourth fireworks event at City Park.

He has donated countless dollars to the Monroe County School system for, among other things, a new practice football field for the varsity football team, and along with his wife, Dawn, he is the reason Monroe County now has a swim team.

Darren's main companies, Cleary Construction and Precision Engineering, together are two of the biggest private employers in Monroe County. Tompkinsville, Kentucky, is very fortunate to have Darren Cleary as its citizen.

CONGRATULATING MONROE COUNTY MAGISTRATE KAREN GORDON ON HER RETIREMENT

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Monroe County Magistrate Karen Gordon of my hometown of Tompkinsville in the First District of Kentucky on her retirement from public service.

Since taking office in a 2011 special election to fill the unexpired term of her late husband, Karen has steadfastly served her fellow Monroe Countians over the years and has continually sought opportunities to improve the lives of those around her. Her service as Monroe County's Fourth District magistrate, and a crucial member of the Heart of Tompkinsville board, has spurred economic opportunity and instilled a stronger sense of community pride in her fellow residents.

I join with her daughters, Ann Marie and Amber Lee, as well as her extended family, friends, and all those who have benefited from her efforts, to recognize her distinguished record of public service and dedication to serving others.

RECOGNIZING SERVICE OF ALONZO FORD

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize my friend Alonzo Ford from my hometown in Monroe County, Kentucky, specifically Gamaliel, Kentucky.

For nearly three decades, Alonzo's fellow citizens have reelected him to serve as the First District magistrate in Monroe County. This district includes Gamaliel and Fountain Run. He is widely respected as a public servant, and his leadership on several boards, including the farmers market board and the wellness center board, are a testament to his outstanding record of

diligent public service in all facets of life.

I am deeply thankful for his friendship, and I admire his tireless, lifelong devotion to working for the benefit of others. I join with his family and friends, as well as those he has impacted during his career, to express our dedication and gratitude for his contributions to our hometown.

HONORING THE LIFE OF GAIL SMITH COBB

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Gail Smith Cobb, a woman who touched the lives and hearts of so many in South Carolina for 84 years. Gail Cobb's life was dedicated to ensuring Union County was a great place to live, work, worship, and go to school.

She started serving her community when she was secretary of the Union County Recreation Commission and then became the program director of the commission, where she started multiple programs and events for residents.

From there, she became the director of the Union County Recreation Department, overseeing the hiring of employees, park maintenance, and programming. More importantly, she worked for the county council in maintaining effective budgets and funding for the recreation department.

On top of her work within the local government, Gail also served on the board of directors for the Salvation Army for over 5 years and sat on the Union County Fair board for 10 years.

As an active member of the community and important leader in the Union County High School Athletic Booster Club for over 30 years, she made her community a better place for everyone. Gail volunteered and gave most of her time and effort to support all of the athletic teams and cheerleaders within the Union County athletic program, and she spent tireless hours distributing tickets and collecting money to ensure the program's success.

In the recent playoff game between Chester and Union, she was recognized for her efforts, and the game was dedicated on her behalf.

In life, Gail was a shining example of a tireless servant. She was a woman of faith and service. She will be greatly missed by the community. In rest, may she find peace.

CONGRESS CONTINUES TO EXCEED LOWEST EXPECTATIONS

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee came out with a procedural resolution for the farm bill that violates both the Con-

stitution and the War Powers Act of 1973. Just when you thought Congress couldn't get any swampier, we continue to exceed even the lowest expectations.

Section 2 of House Resolution 1176, the rule for the farm bill, says that the provisions of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution shall not apply during the remainder of the 115th Congress to any concurrent resolution introduced pursuant to the War Powers Resolution.

What this means is that our leadership has decided that the House just doesn't need to vote on whether U.S. soldiers, personnel, weapons, and taxpayer dollars should go toward assisting Saudi Arabia with its brutal war on civilians in Yemen, a war that has caused the world's worst famine in over 100 years.

This isn't the first time that our leadership, using the Rules Committee, has swept under the rug the War Powers Act. They did it last month. What they did is they hid the vote inside of another resolution, a procedural resolution for a bill called Manage our Wolves Act. So, many Members of Congress swept under the rug the War Powers Act without even knowing it, because it was in a procedural resolution.

But think about what they are doing this time. Instead of specifying a certain resolution that they are going to suspend the War Powers Act for, they are saying any resolution for all of Congress.

In my opinion, this violates both the U.S. Constitution and statutory law. But, apparently, this doesn't matter to our leadership and the majority of the Rules Committee.

Just as a remainder, Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution says that Congress and Congress alone, not the executive branch, possesses the power to declare war. Although the Constitution's language unequivocally gives this power solely to Congress, Presidents, nevertheless, continued to launch military action abroad prior to receiving Congressional approval. This is why Congress passed the War Powers Act of 1973.

Section 5(c) of the War Powers Act requires the President to remove United States forces at any time, if Congress so directs by concurrent resolution, and Section 7 establishes priority procedures for consideration of such a removal resolution. It requires the Committee on Foreign Affairs to report out that resolution within 15 days. You can't let this thing die in committee. It has to come back to the floor within 15 days, according to the law since 1973.

Then it directs that the House must vote on the resolution within 3 calendar days. It can't die on the floor. There has to be a vote within 3 days.

But, instead of following the law, instead of following the Constitution, the Rules Committee last night snuck language into the rule for the farm bill, and this should upset farmers who are

depending on the farm bill. They snuck into the rule for the farm bill a resolution that deprives the entire House of Representatives of its constitutional right to decide when and where our soldiers should be sent into harm's way.

So let me sum this up. Even if you think we should be involved in Yemen, even if you think soldiers should go there, even if you think we should give the bombs to Saudi Arabia to drop on civilians, you shouldn't want to sneak that into an unrelated bill. You shouldn't want to hide that in a farm bill. What good could you be up to by hiding that in another bill?

But let's say you are okay with hiding it in another bill because you don't want your constituents to find out where you stand on this issue: I had to vote for the farm bill. Sorry.

Well, even if you are okay with hiding it in another bill, this is the wrong way to do it. Last time, when they snuck it—when they swept it under the rug last month, they specified that the resolution wouldn't have the powers of the War Powers Act, wouldn't have the privileges of the War Powers Act.

This time, not only are they sweeping it under the rug, they are preemptively sweeping all of the power of Congress under the War Powers Act under the rug for the entire remainder of this congressional session. It sets a horrible precedent. It is a dangerous precedent.

The Speaker is grabbing more powers using the Speaker's committee, the Rules Committee. He is doing so and jeopardizing the power of the House of Representatives, because for him to grab more power requires us to give more power to the executive branch, to abdicate our constitutional responsibility to decide when and where our military should go.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this illegal and unconstitutional action today by voting "no" on the rule for the farm bill. That is House Resolution 1176.

EXTENDING ANIMAL FIGHTING PROHIBITIONS TO TERRITORIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN) for 5 minutes.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to express my utter disappointment with the inclusion of extending the prohibition of cockfighting in the territories in the farm bill before us today.

While there are a lot of provisions that will benefit the largest constituency of any House Member, for over 3 million American citizens living in Puerto Rico, the inclusion of this amendment will detract from the other high points of this bill.

This bill will improve accessibility to grants and programs on the island, and for that, I am extremely grateful and confident that this will help my constituents.

But, on the other hand, since 2002, the farm bill has included the very

same wording about the Animal Welfare Act, and it will allow the States to manage and regulate this practice in the territories. For the case of Puerto Rico, we have been regulating the industry of cockfighting since 1933.

This is an industry that represents more than \$18 million in our economy and also more than 27,000 direct and indirect jobs on the island. So we are talking about how distressful the economic situation on the island is, but then we are approving another Federal regulation without even consulting the people of Puerto Rico or even the territories.

In our case, we were not even allowed to vote for that amendment here on the floor, neither in the Senate. So territories will never have a word if we cannot vote, if we are not represented.

But also, limiting this activity will also provide a lot of these industries to go underground, and that will hurt directly the economy of the island. For that reason, I invite any Member who wishes to come to Puerto Rico and see how regulated the cockfighting industry is to come and visit.

I fear that the language that is adopted will turn some underground, and overburdensome laws and regulations on the island, as they always do—and we are going to see a black market pop up and encounter more harm than good, not just to the birds of those who participate, but also for the industry itself.

For me, it is troubling that the territories were not given a proper chance to even debate this issue. We were not consulted in the drafting of this amendment or at any committee markup or as a congressional courtesy. I represent 3.2 million American citizens on the island, but I can't vote on the floor. I don't have any representation on the Senate side. But then we have another regulation coming to the island without even giving us an opportunity to debate it or an opportunity to actually vote against it. I think even the Constitution of the United States allows States to regulate and reserve those powers to the States. We can't even challenge or sue the Federal Government with this, because the constitutional amendment provided that the territories are just a possession of the U.S. Congress and Congress can do whatever they want with us.

That will affect directly the industry of the island. We are talking about not just the rules of construction of venues, penalties for events, public behavior at cockfights, the rules that have been engaged since 1933.

This is an industry, as I already said, that the government of Puerto Rico, House, Senate, and even the Governor are opposed to have this ban on cockfighting. I think this should be an issue reserved for the States as is happening right now in the current farm bill, and I hope we can have the opportunity to discuss this, any other opportunity, even having a hearing on this issue.

My constituents are concerned with how this prohibition will hurt them

and their families, and it is my responsibility to advocate for them the same as the territories of the United States. We are all against this provision.

□ 1115

HONORING CAPTAIN ANDREW P. ROSS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to express my sincere thanks to General Vincent Brooks, my classmate from West Point, upon his retirement day after 38 years of active military service.

Mr. Speaker, I came down to the floor to read a Facebook post from another West Pointer honoring his close friend who died on November 27 of this year in Afghanistan.

Time will not permit me to go through his entire post, but I think for many of us who have served in the conflicts that we have today, it underlines the sacrifice that our men and women pay to the service of our country.

And I will end with this. It was Captain Andrew Ross who died on November 27, 2018. And the last verse of our alma mater which was sung at the second singing of alma maters at the Army-Navy game, it ends with this, and I think it is appropriate:

And when our work is done.
Our course on Earth is run.
May it be said, 'Well done;
Be thou at peace.'
E'er may that line of gray.
Increase from day to day.
Live, serve, and die, we pray.
West Point for thee.

God bless the family of Captain Ross and all the men and women who serve overseas in dangerous locations.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Captain Andrew P. Ross, who passed away in Afghanistan on Tuesday, November 27th.

Captain Ross was a Virginian native who earned his education at West Point, my alma mater. He deployed to Afghanistan in 2013. Afterward, Captain Ross joined Special Forces and led Green Berets.

On November 27th, Captain Ross was killed when an IED detonated underneath his vehicle in Ghazni Province, Afghanistan. His friend, Michael Shepherd, shared the following words to honor his memory:

I am still numb and perhaps still in disbelief. I have been dreading writing this post, but I am going to get this out because I believe people should know.

"Apocalypse 36, this is Bushmaster 36. I am providing overwatch from your northwest as you move north along the route." I knew that voice better than anyone when it came over the radio. That was Drew Ross, my best friend. My West Point classmates and fellow platoon leaders know nothing is more calming than knowing your battle buddy is looking out for you.

I met Drew on July 2, 2007 when we started West Point together. We were in the same cadet basic training platoon and in the same cadet company (Go Frogs!) for three years. Then, we found ourselves together again at Fort Stewart, GA in the same cavalry squad-

ron (Mustangs!). By the time we deployed to Afghanistan in 2013, we knew more about each other than we probably would've liked. Drew was the third platoon leader in B Troop and I was the third platoon leader in A Troop. After 9 months, we sat next to each other on the flight home. When the pilot announced that we were over U.S. airspace, Drew and looked around the plane and discussed how lucky we were to bring all of our Soldiers home.

As I left the Army for law school, Drew not only stayed in but decided he wanted to join Special Forces and lead Green Berets. Of course, Drew made it through easily and married his lovely wife in February. On Tuesday, November 27, 2018 Drew was killed when an improvised explosive device detonated underneath his vehicle in Ghazni province, Afghanistan. We FaceTimed last week and the last thing he sent me was his address because I wanted to send him something for Christmas.

Drew represented the best of our country. He could have done anything he wanted, but chose time and again to put himself in between our country and the enemy under the most violent and dangerous of circumstances. I would share more about how funny and incredible of a man he was, but there are some things I want to keep only for myself.

Please don't feel sorry for me. I am beyond lucky that I knew him, let alone that I was able to call him a fellow classmate, Frog, Soldier, Mustang, platoon leader, executive officer, and most importantly (according to him at least) a workout partner. Please keep in your thoughts and prayers his wife, family, and Green Berets whose time with him was cut short. Mourn for our country who lost a man who gave so much in 29 years, but had so much more to give.

Mr. Speaker, Captain Ross served our nation honorably and courageously. He will be dearly missed.

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 11 o'clock and 16 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

The Sun grows dim and the daylight is measured. In the darkness, phantoms loom. The eye cannot discern as the distance fades. Be for us light, O Lord.

Bless the Members of this people's House with clear judgment that the work to be concluded might propel our Nation into a prosperous future.

And as always, we pray that whatever is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CICILLINE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

CELEBRATING SATURDAY AS BILL OF RIGHTS DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize December 15 as the Bill of Rights Day.

The Bill of Rights, which is the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, was first ratified in 1791. It protects the rights and liberties of all Americans. The Bill of Rights guarantees our freedoms of religion, speech, press, and to peaceably assemble and petition our government; and it protects our right to bear arms, our private property rights, our right to a fair trial, and our right against unreasonable searches and seizures.

It establishes that we as a nation promote the power of individual liberties and limit the scope of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, Bill of Rights Day came into existence in 1941 on its 150th anniversary. Congress passed a joint resolution authorizing President Franklin D. Roosevelt to make it a national holi-

day. Roosevelt referred to the document as "the great American charter of personal liberty and human dignity."

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we use this day to educate younger generations of Americans on our Bill of Rights and the values it embodies for all.

HONORING SETON HALL FULBRIGHT SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Aidan Miller and Kylie Lan Tumiatti for receiving the prestigious Fulbright scholarships this year. Aidan and Kylie are both recent graduates of Seton Hall University's School of Diplomacy.

Aidan is a student of international relations, modern languages, and Eastern European studies. Over the next year, he will be teaching English at a university in Russia while learning about Russian traditions and culture. Aidan plans to enter public service when he returns home.

Kylie also majored in international relations and modern languages, with a minor in economics. The Fulbright scholarship has given her the opportunity to teach English in Malaysia. When she returns from Malaysia, Kylie will finish her graduate degree in public affairs at Columbia University and then enter the foreign service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating these bright young people who are committed to making our world a better place.

RICHARD WAYNE "R.W." ALLEN II

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great joy that I rise today to recognize and celebrate the life of my 13th grandchild on his first-month birthday.

On November 7, 2018, my family and I welcomed Richard Wayne "R.W." Allen II, my namesake, into our family. Of our 13 grandchildren, R.W. is our fourth grandson. I am truly humbled that my fourth grandson was named in my honor.

Robin and I are the proud parents of four wonderful children, and our only son, Andy, and his wife, Betsy, are now the parents of R.W. and his older sister, Elsie, who is named after my mother.

Andy is a foreign service officer with the State Department, and right now he and his family are living here in Washington and training for his next assignment. I cannot put in words how happy we are that Andy, Betty, Elsie, and R.W. are here with us in D.C. as we celebrate this addition to our growing family.

My prayer for R.W. is he will grow strong in his faith and personally experience the mercy, grace, peace, and love of our Savior, Jesus Christ.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, this week we mark the sixth anniversary of the tragic shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School, which left 26 dead, including 20 children ages 6 and 7. In the years since, there have been 1,917 mass shootings, killing 2,175 men, women, and children and wounding more than 6,000.

The worst of these shootings occurred in the heart of my district at the Route 91 music festival when a gunman opened fire on the crowd, killing 58 and injuring more than 800.

The list of victims grows every day, and yet on this floor there is only silence. This past November, voters sent a strong message by rejecting those who stand in the way of commonsense gun violence prevention.

We can never bring back those who are lost to gun violence, but from universal background checks to a ban on bump stocks, come January, we can and will take action.

2018 FARM BILL

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on the farm bill, and I can't help but be reminded of the more than 1,100 attendees at the farm bill listening sessions we held across the country. What an honor it was to take the comments, the feedback, and the suggestions they had and work to address those concerns.

Those 1,100 attendees represented the full spectrum of American agriculture. From citrus producers in Florida to wheat farmers in Kansas, we saw and heard amazing stories of the grit and determination of the people who wake up every morning, pull their boots on, and work to feed, clothe, and fuel this world.

As we vote today, I salute and honor each of them and their families. Mr. Speaker, Kansans sent me to Congress to get a farm bill done, and I am honored to be here today and to say that we delivered for Kansas.

SHUTDOWN, SHOWDOWN

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, in 9 days, we are going to face another government shutdown.

The American people want a responsible Federal Government that works for them, but yesterday President

Trump said that he will be proud to shut down the government. The President believes that his idea for an ineffective, \$70 billion, 1,000-mile long border wall is more important than keeping the government open for business.

Our constituents are sick of this stuff. The President told them that Mexico would pay for the wall, and now he is threatening to close the government if he doesn't get what he wants. This is exactly why our constituents voted to put Democrats in control of Congress last month. They don't want their hard-earned money wasted on an expensive, ineffective border wall.

We should listen to them. Democrats and Republicans need to come together and work together to meet their needs, not President Trump's.

While the President throws another Twitter tantrum, let's keep the government open and work on solutions for the real challenges facing our constituents: good-paying jobs, lower healthcare costs, and ending the corruption in Washington. That is what Democrats are committed to doing.

It is time for Republicans to stand up to this President and work with Democrats for the benefit of the American people.

BUDGET CRISIS

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

Mr. HERN. Mr. Speaker, in the last 10 years, our country's national debt has grown from \$10 trillion to nearly \$22 trillion. This trajectory is not sustainable. While there is no easy fix to this, the first step is clear: stop adding to it.

President Trump is leading by example telling his Cabinet to eliminate waste in their departments. He understands the fiscal cliff we are standing on and is taking the right steps to get our spending under control.

Now it is time for us to do our job. We cannot govern from crisis to crisis. We need a budget that balances, and we need to get back to regular order by passing all 12 appropriations bills.

Short-term spending bills are not the solution, and we cannot rely on them anymore. With the national debt growing every day, we cannot continue to kick the can down the road. We need to face this crisis head-on.

Frankly, Americans deserve better. It is time we put in the work to get it right and solve our budget crisis. Let's get to work.

REFUGEES REVITALIZE COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, this good and generous Nation has a long tradition of welcoming those seeking refuge and a better life in America.

America is, in fact, a nation of immigrants. For generations, immigrants and refugees—my ancestors included—have contributed to a diverse and strong Nation built on the foundation that, through hard work, anything is possible.

The State Department recently announced plans to cut the very programs to provide refugees with the tools toward economic independence, self-sufficiency, and success. It is a counterproductive move by the administration that cites the economy as a priority.

Refugees are helping to revitalize older communities like the Buffalo-Niagara region, increasing our population, contributing to a dedicated workforce, and bringing new quality of life and economic life back to neighborhoods like Buffalo's west side.

We are calling on Secretary Pompeo to immediately reverse any plans to cut resettlement agencies and reaffirm this Nation's commitment to the American Dream.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:
DECEMBER 11, 2018.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 3(b) of the Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Act of 2001 (42 U.S.C. 15202), I am pleased to reappoint Mr. Brian Fengel of Bartonville, Illinois, to the Medal of Valor Review Board.

Thank you for your consideration of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

□ 1215

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2, AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1176 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1176

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546) shall

not apply during the remainder of the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress to a concurrent resolution introduced pursuant to section 5 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544) with respect to the Republic of Yemen.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my friend, 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. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1176, providing for further consideration of a very important piece of legislation for America's farmers and ranchers: the conference report to accompany H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act, commonly referred to as the farm bill. This rule provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, as the House considered its version of the farm bill, I spoke in this Chamber about a farm bill listening tour I conducted in my own district, traveling to every county that I represent to hear from and listen to input and the concerns from farmers, ranchers, and producers across the State of Washington.

In the days since the House passed that bill earlier this summer, there has been growing concern that the job would not get done and that the 2014 farm bill would expire and our Nation's farm country would be left without the crucial tools this legislation provides to strengthen the farm safety net and provide certainty and flexibility to America's farmers and ranchers.

Fortunately, with the legislation before us today, we can report that this is not the case. After months of painstaking negotiations between the House and the Senate conferees, we have an agreement before us. This agreement, while not including several provisions I would have liked to have seen, sets us on a better path for our farmers and ranchers, for our rural communities, for small businesses, and for consumers across the country at the grocery store and at kitchen tables.

With this conference agreement to the farm bill, I can now go back to my district and confidently report to my constituents that we have provided a strong foundation to help our farmers survive a 50 percent drop in net farm income over the past 4 years. I can go back to Okanogan County and tell my constituents in Pateros that we have

strengthened market access programs and provided strong resources to open new sources for exporting across the globe.

I can tell farmers in Grant County that we have protected crop insurance and made several key improvements, including for whole farm revenue coverage for specialty crop producers. I can tell dairy producers in Yakima County that we have improved the dairy safety net for large, mid-sized, and small dairies. I can report back to producers in Prosser, in Benton County, who stressed the importance of agriculture research, that we have provided an increase in funding for research, extension, and education projects.

With the bill before us, I can let key agriculture partners in our community like Washington State University know that we will keep American agriculture at the forefront of innovation and productivity. Farmers from East Wenatchee will hear from me that this farm bill invests in critical cost-share and incentive-based programs to help farm families improve our soil, water, and other natural resources. I can tell farmers in Othello, in Adams County, concerned with the regulatory burdens on their shoulders, that this legislation protects our producers from costly, additional, and unnecessary red tape.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today as a third-generation farmer to say that this farm bill takes strong steps to address challenges facing America's agricultural community. The rule we bring before the House provides for further consideration of the conference report to H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act, legislation that is critically important to my district in central Washington, and to rural districts across this great country.

This legislation maintains and strengthens important policies like Price Loss Coverage, Agricultural Risk Coverage, commodity loans, Dairy Margin Coverage, livestock disaster programs, and crop insurance. It enhances and permanently funds the Foreign Market Development Program and Technical Assistance for Specialty Crops, which are so vital for export-driven agricultural economies like those in my State of Washington.

It increases funding for land-grant universities, research, and education, as well as special research initiatives, including for specialty crops and organic research.

This legislation makes strides to expand quality broadband to all of rural America by including forward-looking standards to ensure we are meeting next-generation rural broadband needs. It also improves the tools available to reduce forest fuel loads that increase the size and force of catastrophic wildfires. By renewing key categorical exclusion and expanding its purpose to allow for expedited reduction of hazardous fuels in our forests, we can continue to reduce the threat these wildfires pose on rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, with support from the 2014 farm bill, American farmers have been able to combat depressed prices and severe drops in farm income, but they would not have been able to do so without a robust safety net in place. The conference report before us will build upon this effort and ensure a steady food supply will be on the shelves and in our markets for years to come.

As I mentioned, it doesn't include everything I would have liked to have seen in this bill, but, in reality, no piece of legislation is perfect, particularly comprehensive bills that have been negotiated for months. But the fact of the matter is, this farm bill includes important and significant wins for American farmers and ranchers. It is now our responsibility to get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, the people's House has more than 20 farmers, ranchers, and producers serving in this body. Among us are a dairyman from central California; a blueberry farmer from Maine; a rancher from South Dakota; two rice farmers, one from California and another from Minnesota; a cattleman from Kentucky; an almond farmer from California; and, yes, a proud hops farmer from the Yakima Valley of Washington State.

This is the first farm bill that I have had the opportunity to engage in since coming to Congress, Mr. Speaker. I have spent my whole life on the farm, and my life in public service, including serving as Washington State's Director of the Department of Agriculture, has been spent working on behalf of American farmers, ranchers, rural communities, and families.

It is an honor today to bring this rule forward for the conference report to accompany the farm bill, H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act. I humbly urge my colleagues to support the rule, support the bill, and strengthen the future for America's farmers and all those who depend on them.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my friend, for yielding the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will be submitting a longer statement for the RECORD, so I will be keeping my floor remarks today fairly brief.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this farm bill. This farm bill is not perfect. It is not the bill that I would have written. But this conference report, unlike the farm bill that the House produced, is a good, bipartisan product.

I want to thank Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW for their tireless efforts to protect SNAP benefits throughout this process. Because of their work, hungry people across this country will have access to

the modest benefits they need to feed their families. I thank as well Chairman CONAWAY, who recognized the importance of getting a farm bill over the finish line this year.

I especially want to recognize the efforts of Ranking Member PETERSON. He is truly an amazing guy who presides over a committee that is very diverse with rural, suburban, and urban Members of Congress. It has conservatives, moderates, and liberals like me. Yet, he has managed to bring us together and not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Farmers, consumers, and hungry people all across the country owe him a debt of gratitude.

I also want to thank the staff of the minority and the majority who put in endless hours trying to negotiate a compromise. I want to thank Kaitlin Hodgkins, who was my point person on these ag issues, for all of her work.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of hunger and food insecurity has been my primary cause in Congress. I have been proud to work on these issues as a member of the Agriculture Committee and to oversee the SNAP program as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Nutrition.

As members of this House well know, I have been very critical of the legislation that the Republican majority in this House initially produced. It included more than \$20 billion in SNAP cuts that would have disproportionately harmed the most vulnerable among us—kids, disabled, and the elderly—the very people who are often left to wonder where they will get their next meal. Many would have been cut off from assistance altogether if the House version actually prevailed.

The Senate, however, took a much different course. Their Agriculture Committee chairman, Senator ROBERTS, actually consulted with Ranking Member STABENOW. There were no disastrous work requirements, no partisan policies cooked up in some extreme conservative think tank somewhere. It largely continued proven policies that both sides have traditionally agreed on.

Thankfully, the conference committee took the same course. This final bill does not include any SNAP benefits cuts. No one is getting kicked off the rolls, there are no changes to categorical eligibility or severing of the link between SNAP and LIHEAP. And importantly, there are no additional burdensome work requirements.

In fact, this conference report makes a number of administrative improvement and efficiencies, saving \$1 billion. These are reinvested into nutrition programs. As a result, more Americans will have access to healthy food and SNAP employment and training programs will be strengthened.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Secretary of Agriculture and the President are tuning in to this debate. Right now, we have heard rumors that they are trying to work behind the scenes to circumvent the will of this Congress by

instituting more onerous work requirements administratively. Such a move, I believe, will likely lead to legal action.

In the next Congress, when Democrats are in the majority, we will use every legislative tool available to block such a move at every turn. We will not tolerate more of their disrespect and callousness toward the most vulnerable in this country. No more beating up on poor people, period. We will be watching them very closely, and if they do anything—and I mean anything—to increase hunger in America, we will fight them. And that is a promise.

When a Congress as polarized as the 115th can negotiate and arrive at a bipartisan agreement, we should be celebrating it. It is mind-boggling to think there are some on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue working to overturn it even before it is signed into law.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to be able to vote for this rule today, since I said I was going to support the underlying legislation. But my Republican friends screwed it up again. Tucked inside this rule is language that turns off fast track procedures for all Yemen resolutions through the end of this Congress. That is right. The Republican leadership has declared that the worst humanitarian conflict in the world, where the U.N. has just announced famine is taking place due to the war, is not worth the time and attention of the people's House. This is an offensive abdication of our responsibility. We should not be sitting idly by, waiting for the start of the next Congress, as this conflict rages on. We should be doing something today.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of this Yemen language that I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this Farm Bill isn't perfect. It's not the bill that I would have written. But very rarely do we get the chance to vote on professionalism in this body. And this conference report is the product of a professional process that was made better by deliberative, bipartisan debate.

The issue of food insecurity has been my primary cause. As members of the House know well, I have been very critical of the Farm Bill that House Republicans initially produced. It included more than \$20 billion in SNAP cuts that would have disproportionately harmed the most vulnerable among us. Kids. The disabled. And the elderly. The very people who are often left to wonder where they'll get their next meal. Many would have been cut off from assistance altogether.

These cuts were put forward to try and hoist an unproved and drastically underfunded state-based workforce bureaucracy experiment on the entire nation. Without any evidence or any study proving its effectiveness, House Republicans wanted to disadvantage poor parents.

The Senate, however, took a much different course. Their Ag Committee chairman, Senator ROBERTS, actually consulted with their ranking member, Senator STABENOW. There were no disastrous work requirements. No

partisan policies cooked up in some extreme conservative think tank somewhere. It largely continued proven policies that both sides have traditionally agreed on.

Thankfully, the conference committee took this same course. This final bill doesn't include devastating SNAP benefit cuts. No one is getting kicked off the rolls. There are no changes to categorical eligibility or severing of the link between SNAP and LIHEAP.

The conference committee rejected the House's onerous child support enforcement proposal, and instead required a study of the current child support option. This study will only be useful in improving policy if USDA includes the experiences of grandparents, victims of domestic violence, and others who may avoid participating in SNAP out of fear that the provision.

This conference report rejects many provisions of the House bill including the state option to privatize SNAP operation. Current law and the administration's standards around merit systems personnel was the appropriate course.

And importantly, there are no additional work requirements.

That's because the existing flexibility that states have to respond to local labor conditions works. And as the conference report notes, we expect states to continue to be able to identify the areas that they wish to include in their areas and to be able to use the labor surplus definition of unemployment for the area having to be twenty percent above the national average for a two-year period. This has worked well for over twenty years. While the flexibly to waive this harsh and unfair rule does not go far enough, we do not wish to make it more restrictive or limiting for states.

While the Farm Bill does clarify that state agency-drafted waivers need the governor's support, this does not require additional steps in the waiver process or interfere with the discretion and authority that a chief executive may have in place. The conference committee does not intend this provision to interfere with state operations by changing the waiver process that states have relied on for twenty years.

This conference report makes a number of administrative improvements and efficiencies, saving a billion dollars. One provision requires state participation in the National Accuracy Clearinghouse, which is a database that allows for checks of participation across state lines. Let me be clear: a data match does not mean an individual is committing fraud by intentionally seeking benefits in more than one state. A match can also mean that a participant's first state of residence has failed to act on the individuals' reported move.

The National Accuracy Clearinghouse can play an important role in cleaning up state caseloads. This is important because even if a household requests a closure of the case due to a change in residency, the state may not act on it in a timely manner, and there's little a household can do to prove they tried to close their case. States have a duty to assist individuals in the application process and that means, to me, that a state must help individuals who have recently moved. Without evidence of an individual's intent to defraud the program, state agencies should assume dual enrollment is unintentional.

The conference report sets up a reasonable approach to dealing with matches from exter-

nal data sources. This provision codifies recent USDA regulations that identify the limited number of circumstances in which a state must follow up with most households to verify information it obtains that is likely to impact eligibility or is not required to be reported by the household. There is no change to current policy.

The conference report also supports and codifies recent efforts by USDA to establish clearer and more consistent quality control measures. I expect USDA to develop clear and consistent review standards but not to change what is meant by an error, nor to change the essential quality control review process.

The conference report, as I mentioned earlier, saves a billion dollars. These savings are directly reinvested into nutrition programs. Because of this, more Americans will have access to healthy food. The investments also help to improve SNAP employment and training programs, reinforcing the requirement that states properly assess clients and assign them to programs appropriate to their needs and skills, and asking states to build programs with a demonstrated impact on improving outcomes.

We addressed a long-standing problem—when a SNAP participant is referred to a training program, and the program determines that the services they provide are not well-matched to the need of the participant. States have long been required to do meaningful assessments in order to properly assign clients. The expanded investment in case management should improve this capacity. And this bill emphasized that reassessment is important as well. If a client fails to be successful in a program it is often the result of an inability to comply versus a refusal to comply with what's needed.

The bill and report make clear that states must reassess and reassign the partisan if appropriate. Participants will no longer lose benefits because states are doing a poor job of assigning them to programs that don't work for them.

The conference report also includes an improvement to ensure all states use a standard homeless shelter allowance. When implemented, this provision must maintain the current flexibility that states have around documenting the household circumstances. People experiencing homelessness may now be able to obtain and track receipts or records of their expenses—that is why a standard allowance is such a useful policy. It allows states to deduct modest shelter costs for homeless individuals who have no way of documenting those costs. In addition, a homeless individual may have costs that exceed the standard allowance and they must be able to claim the higher deduction. The standard allowance does not preempt the individuals' rights to deduct actual costs.

I have long argued that we should be increasing SNAP benefits, which currently average a mere \$1.40 per person, per meal, to help hungry Americans afford nutritious food. While the bill unfortunately does not provide any additional increase in SNAP benefits, it does require USDA to revise the Thrifty Food Plan on a regular basis. Prior revisions to the Thrifty Food Plan were done in a way that did not increase costs despite food prices increasing and decreasing time available to prepare many foods at home. This provision allows for

future revisions to increase the cost of the plan to more accurately reflect the reality of food purchasing for most Americans. If the cost of the plan goes up, we expect the Secretary to adjust the plan.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Secretary of Agriculture and the president are tuning into this debate. Right now, they are reportedly working behind the scenes to circumvent the will of this Congress by instituting more onerous work requirements administratively. Such a move, I believe, will likely lead to legal action. And next Congress when Democrats are in the Majority, we will use every legislative tool available to block such a move at every turn.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report to H.R. 2, the farm bill.

Our ag community has faced far too much uncertainty and challenges this past year, and I am glad to see we are finally able to reach a consensus that sets our country forward on a better path to help farmers, ranchers, and rural communities throughout America—communities like mine.

□ 1230

The bill addresses the urgent needs of rural communities and agricultural communities, including those in Michigan's 10th Congressional District.

First, the bill authorizes a huge investment in rural broadband, \$350 million a year. As hard as it may be for people to believe, access to stable, high-speed Internet is not commonplace in rural America. It hinders economic development. It hinders the economic opportunity. It hinders them in many ways.

This bill also raises the minimum standards for rural broadband and targets grants and financial support to communities that are most in need of assistance.

The farm bill also assists our dairy producers, especially the small dairy producers like in my community who have faced real challenges with dairy prices, by expanding affordable coverage for all producers of all sizes.

It maintains the sugar program urgently needed in my district to protect American farmers from anticompetitive foreign programs that dump sugar at artificially low prices.

Lastly, the conference report makes important changes to protect the financial integrity of the SNAP program and to make it more effective for recipients. We need to be concerned that we cannot keep people on SNAP forever who can work. We have to help people return to the labor market and support themselves, despite what my colleague may believe.

I am pleased we were able to come to a consensus, finally, with the Senate, and I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say for the RECORD, in response to my colleague who just spoke, that the average SNAP recipient is on the benefit for less than a year, and the majority of SNAP recipients who can work, in fact, do work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, first, in opposition to the rule. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts is correct. Here we are in the waning days of this session of Congress, and we can't produce a rule that specifically focused on the farm bill. They had to include, in the late hours of last night, language that affects our policy as it relates to Yemen.

I commend my colleague from Massachusetts for his efforts to try to strip section 2 out of the title of this rule, so we could have a rule that specifically addresses the farm bill. It wasn't done. We should go back and make sure that it is and allow that policy to develop in the debate that we need on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am a representative of one of the largest agriculture producing districts in the Nation, my rural western Wisconsin district. I own a farm myself. We rotate corn and beans. We have some beef cattle in from time to time. No one appreciates the hard work that our family farmers are going through to stay in business today more than I.

This past year, I had countless meetings with family farmers throughout my State. I have never seen the palpable fear in their eyes or heard it in their voices than we have this last year after dealing with multiple years of low commodity prices. Our family farmers are being driven out of the business in droves right now.

I appreciate, having been involved in farm policy in the past—and mind you, we only have a chance to correct farm policy every 5 or 6 years in this place—how difficult it is to put together a coalition to get a farm bill done.

There are many things in this bill that are commendable. As co-chair of the House Organic Caucus, we have perhaps the strongest organic title of any farm bill ever produced. We have good agriculture research programs in this farm bill, a plus-up in funding for rural broadband expansion, a new beginning farmer program, and the nutrition title was protected after what was initially reported out of the House earlier this year.

But I reluctantly stand today in opposition of the overall bill because it is not addressing the two evils that are driving our family farmers out of business today: overproduction and the trade war that President Trump has created.

In fact, they are doubling down on encouraging policy that will lead to more production, which will flood the

market and drive commodity prices down even more, by expanding the title 1 subsidy programs.

These are taxpayer subsidies that primarily go to a few, but very large, agribusinesses. Mr. Speaker, 80 percent of the title 1 subsidies are going to the 20 percent largest farm operations in the country.

The average person back home would be astounded to see how many subsidy checks are being mailed to addresses in Washington, D.C., New York City, Chicago, and San Francisco. Under this bill, they are even expanding those subsidy opportunities by what is called a multiple entity rule that was, again, included in the final conference report.

That means no longer just husbands and wives will qualify for subsidies operating on the farm, but sons and daughters, uncles and aunts, nieces and nephews, and cousins will be able to qualify now for these subsidy programs. Not only will that encourage, again, these large operations to ramp up production, driving prices down, but it is not fiscally responsible.

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

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, we are in an era now of huge budget deficits, yet we are finding an additional \$1 billion under the title 1 subsidy programs, primarily by taking it out of the conservation fund by reducing funding under the Conservation Stewardship Program from \$1.8 billion to \$1 billion. That will jeopardize quality water programs throughout our Nation.

So, unfortunately, this bill is not going to solve the problem, the crisis that our farmers are facing today, which is driving them out of business in record numbers: the overproduction in agriculture in our country and this trade war.

I think we should take a little bit more time and get the policy right, because we won't have another opportunity for another 5 or 6 years, and that is going to be too late for too many of our family farmers.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), who will expound on the importance of this bill and how it does respond to the plights in which farmers find themselves today and actually does give certainty to family farmers around the country.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership here managing this rule debate and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as vice chair of the Agriculture Committee and a conferee, I rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying bill, the farm bill of 2018.

Over the past 3 years, the House and Senate Agriculture Committees comprehensively reviewed the 2014 farm bill through a variety of hearings to gain feedback from hundreds of farmers, ranchers, landowners, and stakeholders. This conference report is the

final product of this process and months of bipartisan, bicameral compromise.

While there are many important provisions within the bill to highlight, at its core, the farm bill is about supporting American agriculture and access to food. It is about supporting our domestic food supply and our ability to feed, clothe, and provide energy and fiber for all Americans.

One portion of this bill I am particularly pleased with is the dairy reforms contained in title 1. These reforms build on the positive changes made to the dairy margin insurance program in this year's bipartisan budget agreement.

Our dairy farmers have continued to face difficult times over the past decade, and I am hopeful that the 2018 farm bill will help to provide some stability in this sector.

Also of note is a strong conservation title and support for active land management. This includes reauthorization of the Conservation Reserve Program, the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, and the Regional Conservation Partnership Program.

Finally, I would like to mention the positive reforms that we made to SNAP included in this conference report. These changes will help with program integrity. It will encourage work for able-bodied adults without dependents and better ensure that SNAP funding and resources are going to our most vulnerable and those truly in need.

I would like to thank Chairman CONAWAY, Ranking Member PETERSON, and all the committee staff for their hard work on this conference report and dedication to agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this rule and the underlying farm bill and ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on both.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as I said, some of us who support this farm bill wanted to support the rule as well. But, again, the Republicans thought it was important to basically tuck inside this rule language that turns off fast track for procedures for all Yemen resolutions through the end of this Congress.

This is the worst humanitarian crisis in the world right now, and we don't have time to talk about it. In fact, the Republican leadership takes the extraordinary step of doing everything they can to block debate. It is unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), who has been a leader on this issue.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, Americans around this country are wondering: What does a farm bill have to do with the war in Yemen? And the answer is absolutely nothing.

You wonder why people are frustrated with Congress, why they think Congress lacks common sense. It is because no one understands why you would have a vote on a farm bill and

you would tie it to a vote on war and peace in Yemen.

The only reason the leadership is doing this is because they know that there are dozens of Republicans who will stand with Democrats to stop the killing in Yemen.

How do they know this? Because Senate Republicans are voting to stop the killing in Yemen.

I came to Congress because of my grandfather, who inspired me. He spent 4 years in jail in Gandhi's independence movement. I came to Congress to say that America should always stand for human rights.

I urge my Republican colleagues to look at the pictures in *The New York Times* and *Huffington Post*: 5-year-old kids, 7-year-old kids starving to death, a Yemeni child dying every 10 minutes.

They tell us to wait until January. That would mean thousands more Yemeni kids dead.

I don't think this is a partisan issue. This is an American issue. Let's stop the killing in Yemen. Let's end the famine. Let's have a vote in this House so we can stop the civil war in Yemen and save lives.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, we all look forward to the classified briefing that we will be a part of tomorrow with the Department of Defense and others to talk about the situation in Yemen. It seems premature to make decisions regarding that issue at this present time, but tomorrow will give us much enlightenment on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) to get back to the issue at hand, the farm bill.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the farm bill, the rule that allows us to bring this to the floor, and the lives I want to save in the West and across America, because this bill takes important steps to help improve the management of our Federal forests by extending expedited management tools for insect and disease projects in eastern Oregon and expanding it to hazardous fuels reduction to reduce the threat of fire and smoke. These are real life and safety issues in our communities.

The great tragedies we have seen in California this last summer, in Paradise this last fall, I guess, they are repeating themselves year after year as climate change and drought and higher temperatures and the overgrowth in our forests all come together to create catastrophic wildfires, as pictured here. These are monsters when they fire up. They kill.

It is unfortunate that the provisions that the House passed as part of the farm bill were rejected by the Democrats in the Senate. It is unfortunate because, after these catastrophic fires, we should get in and be able to remove the fuel load so that the next fire doesn't burn even more intensely, which is what happens. It is a bigger threat to the firefighters, because these snags that remain are destined to

fall. This year, we lost a firefighter to a snag that fell.

But they rejected that.

While we are expanding CE authorities, categorical exclusion authorities, in some forests, the House provision said we should expand it to all forests so that we can begin to catch up and remove the excess fuel load from our forests, so that when we do get fire, which is a natural part of environment, it does not become so destructive that it burns up entire towns.

Unfortunately, again, Senate Democrats rejected that.

So we are left with a bill that is pretty good. The farm bill provisions are terrific, as the leader has said.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WALDEN. But when we are losing towns, and people and firefighters in our communities are choked with smoke, we can do better.

Last night, in Medford, Oregon, the Jackson County Commission held a public meeting to talk about this fire situation we face. A dad from Jackson County recounted how his daughter with cystic fibrosis had to move away. He told the audience: "It's been devastating for us as a family. We wish our daughter could live with us." Then he went on to say: "When you can't breathe, nothing else matters."

So you want to talk about life and safety and health issues in America, we should have done better with the Senate. But we are doing okay with this bill, and I intend to support it.

Today I rise in support of the underlying legislation: the 2018 Farm Bill.

This bill takes steps to help improve the management of our federal forests by extending expedited management tools for insect and disease projects in eastern Oregon and expanding it to hazardous fuels reduction to reduce the threat of fire and smoke.

We've also allowed more local involvement from counties in forest management projects and extended funding for collaborative forest projects.

These all help, but it is unfortunate the Senate Democrats rejected provisions from the House bill that would have greatly reduce the threat of fires and smoke in all of Oregon.

The ability to clean up the burned dead timber after a fire—responsibly and where it makes sense—and replant a new, healthy forest for the next generation? Excluded.

Providing tools that help manage our forests in western and southern Oregon—where some of Oregon's worst fires have been in recent years? Excluded, even after devastating fires like the Klondike Fire pictured here burned more than 175,000 acres.

People in southern Oregon are tired of choking on smoke every year because of poor management. Recently a dad from Jackson County recounted how his daughter with cystic fibrosis had to move away saying "it's been devastating for us as a family. We wish our daughter could live with us." But, as he went on to say, "When you can't breathe, nothing else matters."

You can understand people's disappointment when they see little here to help their region, while efforts continue to lock up more southern Oregon forests as more wilderness—a contributor to several large fires in recent years.

As someone from Medford told me last night, if something doesn't change, "We're gonna get killed."

Meanwhile, in central Oregon, the 5,000 residents of Crooked River Ranch are worried they will become the next Paradise, California. We've worked together on a simple public safety bill to make a small adjustment to a neighboring Wilderness Study Area so critical fire prevention work can be done to protect the community.

Our bill passed the House unanimously, passed a Senate Committee unanimously, has broad support from the local community, and is ready to be voted on today.

Unfortunately, partisan posturing in the Senate is holding this critical public safety bill hostage over unrelated public lands measures.

The Senate needs to stop playing with fire and the lives of people of Crooked River Ranch, and pass my legislation before the end of this Congress. We do not want to see images of homes turned to ash and lives destroyed in central Oregon all because politics got in the way of protecting lives.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), who has been one of the leaders in this Congress, fighting on behalf of the most vulnerable in our country.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding, and I commend my colleagues of the farm bill conference committee in both the House and the Senate for strengthening the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and rejecting harmful cuts and onerous hurdles that would have made efforts of struggling families working to escape poverty more difficult.

This conference agreement very specifically protects SNAP's categorical eligibility. What a victory we have won by not throwing 235,000 children, including 23,000 in my home State of Wisconsin, off school lunch, as the House bill proposed.

□ 1245

It rejected language to impose a lifetime ban on SNAP assistance for individuals reentering the community from incarceration. It rejected harsh work requirements and extremely limited time restrictions proposed in the House bill, which would have left millions of Americans hungry and vulnerable.

And as a true compromise, Mr. Speaker, nobody got everything they wanted. For example, we still must work to strengthen access for seniors and people with disabilities who face difficulties participating in SNAP. That is a fight that we are going to continue to fight in the next Congress.

But for the meantime, let's not have the perfect be the enemy of the good, and let's celebrate that we won't be taking food off the table for millions this holiday season.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving me an opportunity to speak today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the work of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees. This afternoon, we will be considering the conference report of the 2018 farm bill. I am proud to have had the chance to work alongside two of my great mentors, Senator PAT ROBERTS and my House colleague, Chairman MIKE CONAWAY, on this bill.

While the national media might not spend much time reporting on this one, I want to take a moment and recognize both the importance of this bill and the work done by the farmers and ranchers it protects.

Mr. Speaker, Kansans sent us to Congress to get a farm bill done, and I am honored to be here today to say we delivered for Kansans.

I can't hold a townhall or listening session in my district without hearing about the importance of this bill. Our farmers need certainty and a responsible safety net that can protect them from the whims of nature and markets that are far out of control.

Crop prices have dropped 50 percent since the last farm bill, and that impact is showing up in the bottom lines of producers across the country. In Kansas, farm bankruptcies are up six times in just 3 years. I am not here to fear-monger but to share the seriousness of the state of the agriculture economy.

Mr. Speaker, as I vote here today, I will be thinking of and honoring my parents and grandparents, knowing this legislation well preserved the rural way of life from which I was raised and the work ethic that was taught to me on those family farms.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, for those of us who support the farm bill, we want to be able to support the rule for consideration of the farm bill; but, unfortunately, the Republican leadership decided to mess things up by inserting language that would prevent this Congress from debating the war in Yemen, one of the worst humanitarian crises in the world.

The gentleman from Washington states: Well, we are going to have a briefing tomorrow. It is not timely.

Well, the bottom line is, in this rule, it not only prohibits us from debating the war in Yemen with regard to the War Powers Resolution, it prohibits us from debating it for the rest of the Congress. What if we learn something tomorrow that prompts action on the other side of the aisle? You basically have said, "No. No."

This is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tax Policy.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, what cruel irony that this rule, dealing, in part, with too much food in America, will deny food to millions in Yemen.

In that remote corner of the world, of which most Americans know very little, 85,000 children have already died, and another 12 million people are on starvation's brink. This very day, more children will die of starvation and disease.

In an eloquent plea this week, Nick Kristof reports on one of them, an 8-year-old boy who is starving, and his limbs are like sticks. "He gazes stolidly ahead, tuning out everything," as his "body focuses every calorie simply on keeping [his] organs functioning," weighing just over 30 pounds.

United Nations officials have warned that "this could become the worst famine" in the world in a generation. Mr. Kristof rightly concludes very succinctly. "The bottom line: Our tax dollars are going to starve children."

Suffering is rising; American bombs are still falling. When the Saudi coalition attacked a schoolbus, killing 40 little children, scrawled on the remains of the bomb were words that meant "made in America."

With today's rule, Trump's enablers here in this House, they tell him to keep it up, keep supporting the murderous Saudi regime for whom they can see no evil and hear no evil, even if there is a recording of the Saudi murder and dismemberment of an American resident available to listen to.

This rule today prohibits a fair debate and a vote on this floor because the Republican leaders know that so many members of their own party, along with Democrats, can no longer stomach these atrocities.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from the State of Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, atrocities that are supported with American tax dollars. They fear that a bipartisan majority of this House would reject what has become a wretched stain on our Nation.

Last month, this same group of Trump enablers buried consideration of our resolution to end this atrocity in a bill about gray wolves, and, today, they bury Yemenis again with a bill about American agricultural abundance.

As Americans celebrate this special, joyous season of Christmas, the Trump administration, if we do not act today, will continue to write the epitaph on the mass graves in Yemen.

Let's reject this rule today and put a stop to this egregious wrongdoing.

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

Mr. Speaker, just let me say: Are the atrocities that are taking place in Yemen a serious matter? Absolutely, they are.

Do they deserve to be debated and discussed to find solutions on what we

can provide? Absolutely. And after tomorrow morning's briefing, if there is something that we feel that we need to do, we can respond with quickness, with nimbleness, and we can provide those solutions if we think there is a necessary solution to be had.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

This farm bill is a win for Montana's farmers and ranchers who work the land, feed our country and the world.

As they know too well, weather and markets bring uncertainty. This farm bill gives our farmers and ranchers a strong safety net that protects them against the impact of natural disasters and unpredictable, unfair trade practices of other countries.

Mr. Speaker, this farm bill has Montana's fingerprints on it, and it addresses many of our key priorities. It protects Montana's sugar beet growers and processors, and it supports the Agricultural Research Service, which includes several experiment stations in Montana.

It helps Montanans throughout the State by providing a grant for rural emergency services, training, and equipment, particularly in our rural areas. It improves how we manage our forests by empowering county governments to improve management of neighboring national forest lands. It also improves rural broadband that is so important to our small communities.

Mr. Speaker, this farm bill works for Montana. I urge my colleagues to give America's farmers and ranchers the certainty they need and vote for the farm bill conference report.

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I rise today in support of the farm bill conference report.

It is absolutely no secret that rural America, our farming communities, from Franklin County and Addison County in Vermont to the plains of Kansas and Iowa, to the Central Valley in California, are facing a crisis. This conference report contains a number of positive changes that will help in Vermont.

First, nutrition: Thankfully, we are acceding to the Senate position. We have an economy where profits are up, record incomes for many people, and increased poverty and nutrition challenges for children. This makes certain that our kids are going to get the nutrition they need.

Second, dairy: This farm bill revamps the existing dairy insurance program, known as Margin Protection, for a more effective and affordable insurance tool that is going to help our family farmers hang on. I still believe we need supply management. It is the only sustainable way to go, but this will help,

and no one in Vermont needs more help and is deserving of more help than our dairy farmers who have done so much for our State.

Third, maple: Maple syrup is really an important component, including for our dairy farmers. This bill halts a misguided FDA effort to require an "added sugar" label to pure maple syrup. This is a pretty stupid FDA regulation. It is now dead, gone forever, and it is really helpful to our maple industry.

Fourth, organics: This farm bill doubles funding for Federal research into organic protection methods, improves oversight of the global organic trade, and funds the organic certification cost-share program. More organics, better nutrition, more local agriculture, that is a very good thing.

Fifth, hemp: This legislation legalizes industrial hemp production.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from the State of Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, this legislation legalizes industrial hemp production, something that Vermonters have been advocating for for decades. This is going to be a boost for local agriculture in Vermont and other parts of our country.

And beyond these, there are a number of additional positive changes contained in the bill. While no one got everything they wanted and many of the urgent reforms that are needed on the commodity side are not part of this, this will be a positive contribution to the well-being of Vermont agriculture.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington State for his leadership and the floor debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 2018 farm bill, and I thank Chairman CONAWAY, COLLIN PETERSON, and all the members of the House Agriculture Committee staff for all their hard work. There is no single piece of legislation more important in my district or rural communities throughout this Nation than the farm bill, and given the depressed state of the farm economy, there has never been a more pressing time to get one passed.

The 2018 farm bill significantly strengthens the agriculture safety net, which will give our producers the certainty they need to keep providing a safe and affordable supply of food to our families. It also makes important investments in rural infrastructure to help sustain these small towns that are so critical to our vibrant agriculture economy.

Additionally, 18 of the 21 House-passed reforms to the Food Stamp program are reflected in the final report, which strengthen the program's integrity, provide needed oversight, and reduce waste, fraud, and abuse.

Finally, this farm bill stewards the American taxpayer monies in a fiscally responsible way by having a farm bill that is budget neutral.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture and traditional American values go hand in hand. Farmers and ranchers represent more than food and fiber. They symbolize a culture of faith, hard work, and independence, which has always been at the heart of America's greatness.

The 2018 farm bill will not only support our producers and families living in rural America, it will provide security and peace of mind to all Americans by maintaining our ability to feed and clothe our own people, or agriculture independence.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support our farmers and ranchers, to support rural America, to support agriculture independence in these United States, and I urge them to vote "yes" for the 2018 farm bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I am here to support the farm bill. Unfortunately, my Republican friends made the rule controversial.

But another reason to support the farm bill, in addition to the strong nutrition title for those who are vulnerable here in the United States, the conference report also provides strong support for international food assistance programs, like Food for Peace, Food for Progress in McGovern-Dole, which is a program that I helped write several years ago, which provides food to some of the most vulnerable and poor children in the world in school settings.

□ 1300

So this farm bill, in addition to helping our farmers, in addition to providing food security for people here in the United States, I think, also contributes to our national security around the world. And I point that out so my colleagues understand that this farm bill covers a whole, wide range of areas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that Ranking Member COLLIN PETERSON on the committee has done a good job balancing many special interests that are profoundly affected by the farm bill; solving a delicate series of political problems; and holding firm, protecting vital nutrition programs and things that I care about, that I have been working on for years, like hemp. But unfortunately, the bill is not addressing the crisis in American agriculture.

I published a book earlier this year. The Fight for Food had an alternative farm bill. Some of the provisions have found their way into it. But this bill does not affect the crisis that we are facing in American agriculture; having small and medium-sized producers

being squeezed out; the battle in terms of the chemical warfare in parts of America with Monsanto products that are threatening agriculture production; and we are actually seeing violence break out in terms of being unable to deal with this.

We have a profound problem in terms of the environmental context that farmers face. Only one in four farmers are going to get access to the environmental programs they need.

Now, there are some improvements in there, things I have been working on for years, but the fundamental problem, by flatlining it, we are not meeting the needs and, in fact, it is going to represent a reduction in absolute terms.

It does nothing to address the crisis that agriculture is facing because of climate change and carbon pollution. We have a crop insurance program that doesn't work for most farmers and ranchers, and it is grotesquely expensive.

We have had efforts in Congress, committees, outside experts, that point to ways we can rein in these unjustified subsidies, save money, and have a program that works for most farmers and ranchers. But sadly, that will have to wait for another day.

We are not investing in the future. We are not investing in farmers and ranchers who need the help the most, accelerating research, accelerating environmental programs, accelerating and investing more in beginning farmers.

Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough to be able to solve the political problem, to solve the bill, and prevent the worst abuses that were being proposed. We need a farm and food bill for Americans who eat, who pay taxes, and for farmers and ranchers who want to practice on a sustainable basis on the smaller scale, not massive agricultural industrial production.

This bill is a missed opportunity. And even though it has got some good things in it, I am going to vote against it because it is not nearly good enough.

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

I would just like to say that my farmers and ranchers in the State of Washington, as well as we have heard earlier from the State of Oregon, do support the strengthening of the provisions in this bill to make sure that the farm economy can continue on in as strong a manner as possible, so there is widespread support in agricultural country around the Nation for this farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was blessed to be a walk-on football player for the University of Arkansas and participate on two 10-win conference championship teams.

Coach Ken Hatfield's triple option offense averaged over 300 yards per game, but it came in small chunks that re-

sulted in first downs, that resulted in touchdowns, and eventually led to victories.

Mr. Speaker, farm incomes are down across the board. The West is consumed by wildfires. China and other nations are taking advantage of unfair trade laws.

What rural America needs is a first down. Our farmers and ranchers need to see Congress move the ball forward and provide their families the protection and relief they need during these hard times.

This conference report is not a Hail Mary. It does not contain everything that I would like to see in a farm bill, but it does move the ball forward. It is progress that our farmers need right now.

I am disappointed that Senate Democrats blocked many needed forest management provisions as we continue to sift through the ashes of catastrophic wildfires.

However, this conference report strengthens the farm safety net and provides certainty to our farmers. It does address some forest management issues. It provides millions of dollars in new funding to combat a range of issues facing rural America, from funding to eradicate feral hogs, to address the opioid crisis, and to expand rural broadband.

This conference report moves farm policy in the right direction. I urge the adoption of the rule for this farm bill.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation and, as a farm bill conferee, I would like to pass along my sincere thanks to the Members and staff who worked diligently to put together a good final product for the American people.

This farm bill strikes the right balance by providing certainty to our hardworking farmers, while protecting our most vulnerable by rejecting the harsh SNAP cuts that were contained in the original House Republican bill, a very meaningful restoral.

In fact, today, I was reminded, as I volunteered at the Capital Area Food Bank, that they serve 500,000 individuals who are food insecure annually in the Maryland, D.C., and Virginia area.

I am particularly pleased with provisions that will benefit New York's dairy farmers and producers of specialty crops, which together form the backbone of the agricultural economy in my 20th Congressional District and across upstate New York.

This farm bill also recognizes the importance of expanding broadband access to the American people and, particularly, to those who don't have access to a high-speed connection.

I am disappointed, however, that we were unable to agree on stronger language to ensure Federal money is spent wisely. Investments in broadband internet infrastructure have the greatest impact on American lives and

should be dealt with in a very resourceful way.

Specifically, I argued for more inter-agency coordination. The Federal Communications Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, need to coordinate with each other, not merely consult, when funding critical broadband internet infrastructure.

When it comes to broadband internet spending, this bill provides limited investments and, because of that, we have a duty to stretch every dollar as far as possible.

It is unfortunate that this concept was not included in the farm bill, but I plan to continue advocating for legislation that would require greater coordination amongst Federal agencies as we build out broadband. I was proud to work on a bipartisan basis to provide coordination language in the ACCESS BROADBAND Act which has already passed the House and is now being considered in the Senate.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. TONKO. I will continue working with my colleagues to improve coordination of Federal broadband programs so we can increase efficiency and eliminate duplicative or wasteful efforts.

Finally, while I am grateful for the overall outcome of the legislation, as a conferee representing the views of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I was disappointed that on many issues in this legislation involving committee jurisdiction, the committee was not properly consulted. It is my hope that, in the future, all conferees will be allowed greater involvement and their voices will be heard, especially on issues that cross committee lines.

Again, I would urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman CONAWAY and my fellow conferees on reaching a conference agreement that benefits all of agriculture. This bill maintains programs critical for central Illinois farmers, strengthens agricultural research, and improves protection for organic products.

First and foremost, this bill ensures crop insurance remains a vital risk management tool for farmers. It also ensures farmers have a choice between two different commodity protection programs, something I fought for in the 2014 farm bill, and I am glad we were successful again in this farm bill.

Consumer demand for organic products continues to increase, and this bill makes positive changes to support organic products by placing higher scrutiny on organic imports, helping farmers who seek organic certification, and increasing funding for organic research.

The bill also strengthens agricultural research by including my bill to ensure USDA's research focuses on agriculture's most-needed priorities and helps universities like the University of Illinois, Illinois State University, and Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, in my district, continue important research.

Additionally, ensuring rural communities have access to broadband is an important part of this bill. Not only do we invest in expanding broadband, we ensure rural communities have access to broadband that will now meet minimum standards and requirements for today's technological age.

We have written a strong bill for our farmers but, Mr. Speaker, 80 percent of this farm bill is related to SNAP, and that cannot be ignored. We missed a golden opportunity to fill in the cracks of our existing workforce development programs to get millions of families the opportunity to get educational benefits to get them out of poverty with the jobs that we know are available in this community.

I am disappointed we weren't successful, but I look forward to supporting this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule because, once again, the majority is stifling debate on a critical national security issue.

The gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) has tried again and again to bring a debate forward in this body about where and how the United States military is engaged around the world. This is Congress' responsibility, and not only has the majority abdicated that responsibility, they won't even let us talk about it.

Resolutions dealing with war powers have special privileges in Congress because these are such grave issues. That is how Congress wrote the law. The other body is grappling with this problem, but the majority in this body wants to pretend these issues just don't exist, and they strip those privileges away with this rule.

That is wrong. It is a betrayal of the men and women who serve this country in uniform. We won't ignore these issues in the next Congress.

We should defeat this rule and have a real debate.

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

Our military is not involved in hostilities surrounding the Yemeni civil war. As I said, tomorrow we are having a briefing that if we learn things, we can respond with urgency and nimbleness.

To speak on this issue further, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman, Mr. NEWHOUSE, for giving me the time.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that, from time to time, the Rules Committee does need to take the authority and the responsibility that they have, and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts will soon learn this next year as I assume he will assume that role as the new chairman of the Rules Committee.

In fact, the arguments that are being made today relate to the substance of the bill. The bill that is at hand is very important, and that is the farm bill, the farm bill that we know has a 10-year window, that is net neutral, that protects the balances that we have talked about.

But it updates not only the opportunities for people who were in rural areas to update that policy, but it reinvigorates our establishment by this House, and the United States Senate, that has already handled this bill, and the President, to reassert that which they believe is important; and that is, the men and women who live in the rural areas, the men and women who get up at 4 o'clock in the morning; men and women who are there protecting the grass roots, the soil, the topsoil of this country. We need them to serve not only this Nation but the world.

It is true that hemp was added. Mr. COMER, who is a Member of Congress from Kentucky, last year began engaging me on this issue. We agreed that we would put it in. It is an important agricultural product and will aid and help very much so, not only a marketplace, but farmers in Kentucky and other places.

□ 1315

As it relates to the Authorization for Use of Military Force, AUMF, I would like to tell my colleagues that, in fact, I did make that decision that we would include by not allowing, not debate, but a vote that would take place on this floor.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 10 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, so what we are going to do is, we are going to have a classified briefing tomorrow that will further allow debate based upon the facts of the case. Mr. Speaker, I assure you that we will be here all next week, and if the facts of the case warrant, we will address the issue then.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on my side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. I think I am the final speaker here, so I will let the Republicans go ahead.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the good gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to speak out on behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Iowa, which I claim is the number one agriculture-producing congressional district in all of America, and to support this underlying bill, which does a number of good things.

I have heard that it provides certainty. When you deal with agriculture, I have some apprehension about that, Mr. Speaker, because certainty in agriculture seems to be an oxymoron to me. But it does provide predictability, and we owe that to our producers, in particular.

So it does a number of good things. It sets up the ARC payments so that they will be identified to the physical location of the farm. That corrects an inequity.

It has \$255 million a year in there for MAP, market access, for foreign market development, for technical assistance, and the Emerging Markets Program.

It addresses FMD beyond foreign market developments in another way, and that establishes a vaccine bank for foot and mouth disease, which we anticipate could well be something that could befall the United States. We need to be ready.

I encourage also that we develop a GMO vaccine for FMD, so we can produce it in this country in sufficient quantities. This bill allows for that to be developed.

Then it also increases the loan guarantees along the line, especially for our young producers, up to \$1.75 million, and the direct loans to \$400,000, and the direct farm ownership loans to \$600,000. Those are all good things.

I am really happy about the piece that goes in for Iowa State genome and phenotype.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address this.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if I can inquire of the gentleman from Washington whether he has any additional speakers.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I have a couple more speakers, yes.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of interest in this issue, as you can tell.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to speak here. I will just speak off-the-cuff. My staff wrote me a speech, but I have only 30 seconds to get this done.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what farmers across my district say. They say that if you can get the Federal Government to relieve the regulatory burden and open up markets, we can farm in this country. We can succeed.

Mother Nature is a treacherous business partner, and so the Federal Government needs to do all that it can to

make sure that we are mitigating those uncertainties inflicted by Mother Nature that we have seen across the country this year, certainly in my district and other parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to lend my support to this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman CONAWAY for his exemplary leadership. To all those who supported this effort on the House and Senate side, I thank them so much.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the underlying bill.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman has additional speakers over there. Would it be appropriate to ask unanimous consent to give the gentleman an additional 2 minutes? I have 3½, but I am going to use that, but could we give them an additional 2 minutes?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection from this side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts may yield 2 minutes to the majority.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to yield 2 minutes. I ask unanimous consent for the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) to have an additional 2 minutes. If there is no objection, is that—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot entertain that unanimous consent request.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) to control.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I can't tell you how much gratitude I feel to the gentleman from Massachusetts for leading in a bipartisan manner. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), my good colleague.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, the American farmer is the greatest antipoverty program that the world has ever seen. Certainly in my district, agriculture is a way of life. It is our number one industry, and getting this farm bill done this year is a top priority for eastern Washington.

I am proud that this legislation includes important priorities around crop insurance, expanding the Market Access Program, and ensuring agriculture research for cutting-edge products that is done at Washington State University and many others.

As I talk with farmers all around eastern Washington, they often stress the importance of these priorities.

I was grateful to have the Secretary of Agriculture, Sonny Perdue, visit and talk with the farmers of eastern Washington, as well as the chairman of the committee, MICHAEL CONAWAY, come to eastern Washington.

This legislation also includes important provisions for forestry: better forest management on forests like the Colville National Forest, which is in my district; expanding the Good Neighbor

Authority; fixing fire borrowing. This is all so important to healthy forests.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the farm bill conference report.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have any more speakers?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for being gracious with his time, but, no, I have no more speakers.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, do I have 2½ minutes remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 7264, a continuing resolution to fund the remainder of the government and extend the National Flood Insurance Program, the Violence Against Women Act, and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Act until September 30.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I hope people will vote "no" on the previous question so we can debate this and vote on keeping our government open. But I would just close by again saying to my colleagues that this farm bill is not a great bill, but it is a good bill. It is the result of bipartisan negotiations at a conference committee that produced something that I think both Democrats and Republicans can come together and support.

I am supporting this bill because it is good on the nutrition title. As you know, I have spent a lot of time in this Chamber talking about the issues of hunger and food insecurity in this country.

There are 40 million Americans who don't have enough to eat, who are hungry, and this is in the richest and most powerful country in the world. I am ashamed of that fact. Every Member of this House should be ashamed of that fact.

Hunger is a political condition. We can fix it, if we had the political will.

This farm bill is not as robust as I would like it to be under the nutrition title, but it does no harm. It doesn't increase hunger. It doesn't throw people off of SNAP. It doesn't make hunger worse in this country. It is deserving of bipartisan support, so I hope all of my Democratic colleagues will vote in favor of this farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank all those who came together to construct this compromise. It is a much, much better product than what came out of this House, and this is a vote

that we can be proud of. I hope that everybody will support it.

Finally, I regretfully have to say I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule, because the Republicans couldn't help themselves and had to insert this Yemen issue into this rule.

This issue has been going on for years. This is not a new phenomenon, what is happening in Yemen. It is a tragedy that has gone on for years. We know it is happening. We know it is long time past since we should act.

Mr. Speaker, we should defeat the rule, have another rule that is just on the farm bill, and we ought to be debating this issue of Yemen.

Mr. Speaker, vote "no" on the previous question, vote "no" on the rule, and vote "yes" on the farm bill.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. Again, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his yielding extra time to us to allow many of our Members to speak on this important issue. I look forward to reciprocating at some point in the future.

Mr. Speaker, as you heard, there are a lot of wins in this bill for rural America, especially in these extremely difficult economic times in farm country around the United States. The 2018 farm bill will help provide certainty for the American farmer and for the rural communities that they support.

Families who work every day to put food on our tables deserve our support.

Before I yield back, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter that was led by the American Farm Bureau that has no fewer than 489 organizations around the country, every State in the union, supporting H.R. 2.

DECEMBER 12, 2018.

THE HONORABLE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations would like to express our support for H.R. 2, the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, and urge its adoption.

This farm bill supports farmers and ranchers, protects crop insurance and conservation programs, invests in efforts to expand foreign markets, protects animal health and prioritizes agricultural research and rural development. This bill is critical to providing all stakeholders, including farmers, ranchers and consumers, with consistent policy for the next five years as well as the sectors and industries that rely on them.

American rural economies are struggling in the face of successive years of declining prices, high and rising foreign tariffs and subsidies, and the unpredictability of Mother Nature. This farm bill helps address these and countless other issues to ensure farmers, ranchers, and rural America can survive these difficult times.

Your support is key to enacting this important piece of legislation. We respectfully urge you to vote "yes" on H.R. 2.

Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics; Ag New Mexico, Farm Credit Services, ACA; Ag Carolina Farm Credit, ACA; AgChoice Farm Credit, ACA; AgCountry Farm Credit Services, ACA; AgCredit, ACA; AgFirst Farm Credit Bank; AgGeorgia Farm Credit, ACA; AgHeritage Farm Credit Services, ACA;

AgPreference, ACA; AgriBank, FCB; Agricultural Council of Arkansas; AgSouth Farm Credit, ACA; AgTexas Farm Credit Services; AgVantis, Inc.; Alabama Ag Credit, ACA.

Alabama Cotton Commission; Alabama Farm Credit, ACA; Alabama Farmers Federation; Alabama Independent Insurance Agents Association; Alabama Peanut Producers Association; Alaska Farm Bureau, Inc.; Amalgamated Sugar Company LLC; Amcot; American AgCredit, ACA; American Agri-Women; American Association of Crop Insurers; American Bankers Association; American Beekeeping Federation; American Beverage Association; American Cotton Shippers Association.

American Crystal Sugar Company; American Farm Bureau Federation; American Farmland Trust; American Malting Barley Association; American Pulse Association; American Seed Trade Association; American Sheep Industry; American Society of Agronomy; American Society of Animal Science; American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers; American Soybean Association; American Sugar Alliance; American Sugar Cane League; American Sugarbeet Growers Association; American Veterinary Medical Association.

American Water Works Association; American Wood Council; Anderson's Maple Syrup, Inc.; Animal Health Institute; ArborOne Farm Credit; ArborOne, ACA; Arizona Cotton Growers Association; Arizona Farm Bureau Federation; Arkansas Cattlemen's Association; Arkansas Community Bankers; Arkansas Cotton Warehouse Association; Arkansas Farm Bureau; Arkansas Forestry Association; Arkansas Rice Federation; Association of American Universities.

Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges; Association of Equipment Manufacturers; Bascom Maple Farms, Inc.; Big I New Jersey; Big I New York; Biotechnology Innovation Organization; Blackland Cotton and Grain Producers, Inc.; Calcot, LTD; California Association of Wheat Growers; California Cotton Ginners and Growers Association; California Farm Bureau Federation; Cape Fear Farm Credit, ACA; Capital Farm Credit, ACA; Carolina Farm Credit, ACA; Catfish Farmers of Arkansas; Central Kentucky, ACA.

Central Texas Farm Credit, ACA; Cherry Marketing Institute; Clemson University Extension; CoBank, ACB; College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences at the University of Illinois; Colonial Farm Credit, ACA; Colorado Association of Wheat Growers; Colorado Corn Growers Association; Colorado Farm Bureau; Colorado Sorghum Association; Community Bankers Association of Georgia; Community Bankers Association of Illinois; Community Bankers Association of Kansas; Community Bankers Association of Ohio; Community Bankers of Michigan; Compeer Financial, ACA.

Connecticut Farm Bureau Association; Corn Growers of North Carolina; Corn Refiners Association; Cotton and Grain Producers of Lower Rio Grande Valley; Cotton Growers Cooperative; Cotton Growers Warehouse Association; Cotton Producers of Missouri; Cotton Warehouse Association of America; Cottonseed and Feed Association; Crop Insurance and Reinsurance Bureau; Crop Insurance Professionals Association; Crop Science Society of America; Dairy Farmers of America-Michigan; Delaware Farm Bureau; Delta Agricultural Credit Association; Delta Council.

Ducks Unlimited; Edge Dairy Farmer Cooperative; Entomological Society of America; Farm Credit Bank of Texas; Farm Credit Council; Farm Credit East, ACA; Farm Credit Illinois, ACA; Farm Credit Mid-America, ACA; Farm Credit Midsouth, ACA; Farm Credit of Central Florida, ACA; Farm Credit

of Enid, ACA; Farm Credit of Florida, ACA; Farm Credit of New Mexico, ACA; Farm Credit of Northwest Florida, ACA; Farm Credit of Southern Colorado, ACA.

Farm Credit of the Virginias, ACA; Farm Credit of Western Kansas, ACA; Farm Credit of Western Oklahoma, ACA; Farm Credit Services of America, ACA; Farm Credit Services of Colusa-Glenn, ACA; Farm Credit Services of Hawaii, ACA; Farm Credit Services of Mandan, ACA; Farm Credit Services of North Dakota, ACA; Farm Credit Services of Western Arkansas, ACA; Farm Credit Southeast Missouri, ACA; Farm Journal Foundation; FCS Financial, ACA; First South Farm Credit, ACA; Florida Association of Insurance Agents; Florida Cattlemen's Association.

Florida Citrus Mutual; Florida Farm Bureau Federation; Florida Peanut Producers Association; Florida Sugar Cane League; Food Producers of Idaho; Fresno-Madera Farm Credit, ACA; Frontier Farm Credit, ACA; Georgia Agribusiness Council; Georgia Bankers Association; Georgia Cattlemen's Association; Georgia Cotton Commission; Georgia Farm Bureau; Georgia Forestry Association; Georgia Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association; Georgia Peanut Commission.

Georgia Poultry Federation; Georgia/Florida Soybean Associations; Glades Crop Care, Inc.; Global Cold Chain Alliance; Golden State Farm Credit, ACA; Great Plains Canola Association; GreenStone Farm Credit Services, ACA; Harvest Land Co-op; Heritage Land Bank, ACA; High Plains Farm Credit, ACA; Hill Country Conservancy; Idaho AgCredit, ACA; Idaho Alfalfa/Clover Seed Commission; Idaho Alfalfa/Clover Seed Growers Association; Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

Idaho Cooperative Council, Inc.; Idaho Dairymen's Association; Idaho Farm Bureau Federation; Idaho Grain Producers Association; Idaho Hay & Forage Association; Idaho Honey Industry Association; Idaho Oilseed Commission; Idaho Onion Growers' Association; Idaho Weed Control Association; Illinois Farm Bureau; Illinois Soybean Growers; Independent Bankers Association of New York State; Independent Bankers Association of Texas; Independent Bankers of Colorado; Independent Banks of South Carolina.

Independent Community Bankers Association of New Mexico; Independent Community Bankers of America; Independent Community Bankers of Minnesota; Independent Community Bankers of South Dakota; Independent Community Banks of North Dakota; Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America; Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of Louisiana; Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of South Carolina; Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of Arizona; Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of California; Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of Idaho; Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of Oregon; Independent Insurance Agents Association of Montana; Independent Insurance Agents of Arkansas; Independent Insurance Agents of Connecticut.

Independent Insurance Agents of Illinois; Independent Insurance Agents of Indiana; Independent Insurance Agents of Iowa; Independent Insurance Agents of Maryland; Independent Insurance Agents of Mississippi; Independent Insurance Agents of Nebraska; Independent Insurance Agents of New Mexico; Independent Insurance Agents of North Dakota; Independent Insurance Agents of Rhode Island; Independent Insurance Agents of South Dakota; Independent Insurance Agents of Virginia; Independent Insurance Agents of Wisconsin; Indiana Bankers Association; Indiana Corn Growers Association; Indiana Farm Bureau.

Indiana Soybean Alliance; Insurance Agents & Brokers of Delaware; Insurance Agents & Brokers of Pennsylvania; International Dairy Foods Association; International Maple Syrup Institute; Iowa Farm Bureau Federation; Iowa Soybean Association; IR-4 Project; Kansas Association of Wheat Growers; Kansas Cotton Association; Kansas Farm Bureau; Kansas Grain Sorghum Producers Association; Kansas Soybean Association; Kansas State University; Kentucky Cattlemen's Associations.

Kentucky Corn Growers Association; Kentucky Dairy Development Council; Kentucky Farm Bureau; Kentucky Forage and Grassland Council; Kentucky Pork Producers Association; Kentucky Poultry Federation; Kentucky Sheep and Goat Association; Kentucky Small Grain Growers Association; Kentucky Soybean Association; Kentucky Woodland Owners Association; Land O'Lakes, Inc.; Legacy Ag Credit, ACA; Livestock Marketing Association; Lone Star, ACA; Louisiana Cotton and Grain Associations.

Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation; Louisiana Independent Rice Producers Association; Louisiana Independent Warehouse Association; Louisiana Land Bank, ACA; MACMA Processing Apple Growers; MACMA Processing Asparagus Growers; Maine Farm Bureau; Maine Insurance Agents Association; Maine Maple Products, Inc.; Maple Syrup Producers Association of Connecticut; Maryland Farm Bureau; Massachusetts Association of Insurance Agents; MBG Marketing, The Blueberry People; Metro Detroit Flower Growers Association; Michigan Ag Commodities.

Michigan Allied Poultry Industries; Michigan Apple Association; Michigan Aquaculture Association; Michigan Asparagus Research Committee; Michigan Association of Insurance Agents; Michigan Bean Commission; Michigan Cattlemen's Association; Michigan Christmas Tree Association; Michigan Corn Growers Association; Michigan Equine Partnership; Michigan Farm Bureau; Michigan Food Processors Association; Michigan Great Lakes International; Michigan Greenhouse Growers Council; Michigan Milk Producers Association.

Michigan Nursery Lawn and Landscape Association; Michigan Pork Producers Association; Michigan Sheep Producers Association; Michigan Soybean Association; Michigan State University, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources; Michigan Sugar Company; Michigan Vegetable Council; MidAtlantic Farm Credit, ACA; Mid-Atlantic Soybean Association; Minn-Dak Farmers Cooperative; Minnesota Association of Wheat Growers; Minnesota Barley Growers Association; Minnesota Corn Growers Association; Minnesota Farm Bureau; Minnesota Soybean Growers Association.

Mississippi Beekeepers Association; Mississippi Cattlemen's Association; Mississippi Corn Growers Association; Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation; Mississippi Land Bank, ACA; Mississippi Peanut Growers Association; Mississippi Poultry Association; Mississippi Rice Council; Mississippi Soybean Association; Missouri Association of Insurance Agents; Missouri Farm Bureau; Missouri Independent Bankers Association; Missouri Soybean Association; Montana Association of Wheat Growers; Montana Farm Bureau Federation.

National All-Jersey Inc; National Association for the Advancement of Animal Science; National Association of Conservation Districts; National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies; National Association of Plant Breeders; National Association of Professional Insurance Agents; National Association of State Departments of Agriculture; National Association of Wheat Growers; National Barley Growers Association; National

Barley Improvement Committee; National Bobwhite Conservation Initiative; National Coalition for Food and Agricultural Research; National Corn Growers Association; National Cotton Council.

National Cotton Ginners Association; National Cottonseed Products Association; National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; National Council of Textile Organizations; National Crop Insurance Services; National Farmers Union; National Grain and Feed Association; National Milk Producers Federation; National Oilseed Processors Association; National Onion Association; National Peach Council; National Pork Producers Council; National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; National Rural Lenders; National Sorghum Producers.

National Sunflower Association; Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation; Nebraska Independent Community Bankers; Nebraska Soybean Association; Nebraska Wheat Growers Association; New Hampshire Farm Bureau; New Hampshire Maple Producers Association; New Jersey Farm Bureau; New Mexico Sorghum Association; New York Corn and Soybean Growers Association; New York Farm Bureau; Nezperce Prairie Grass Growers Association; Non-Land-Grant Agriculture and Renewable Resources Universities; North Carolina Agribusiness Council, Inc.; North Carolina Cattlemen's Association.

North Carolina Cotton Producers Association; North Carolina Farm Bureau; North Carolina Peanut Growers Association; North Carolina Pork Council; North Carolina Small Grain Growers Association; North Carolina Soybean Producers Association; North Carolina State University, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences; North Carolina Sweet Potato Commission; North Dakota Farm Bureau; North Dakota Grain Growers Association; North Dakota Soybean Growers Association; Northeast Dairy Farmers Cooperatives; Northern Canola Growers Association; Northern Pulse Growers Association; Northwest Farm Credit Services, ACA.

Ohio Corn and Wheat Association; Ohio Farm Bureau Federation; Ohio Insurance Agents Association; Ohio Soybean Association; Oklahoma AgCredit, ACA; Oklahoma Cotton Council; Oklahoma Farm Bureau; Oklahoma Sorghum Association; Oklahoma Wheat Growers Association; Oregon Bankers Association; Oregon Farm Bureau Federation; Oregon Wheat Growers League; Pacific Northwest Canola Association; Palmetto AgriBusiness Council; Panhandle Peanut Growers Association; Penn State University.

Pennsylvania Farm Bureau; Pheasants Forever; Plains Cotton Cooperative Association; Plains Cotton Growers, Inc.; Plains Land Bank, FLCA; Pollinator Partnership; Potato Growers of Michigan; Prairie Water User Group; Premier Farm Credit, ACA; Produce Marketing Association; Puerto Rico Farm Credit, ACA; Purdue University; Quail Forever; Rain and Hail Insurance Society; Reinsurance Association of America.

Rhode Island Farm Bureau Federation; Rice Producers of California; Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers; River Valley AgCredit, ACA; Rochester Institute of Technology; Rolling Plains Cotton Growers, Inc.; Rural Community Insurance Services; San Joaquin Valley Quality Cotton Growers Association; Select Milk Producers, Inc.; Sidney Sugars Incorporated; Society of American Florists; Soil Science Society of America; South Carolina Cotton Board; South Carolina Farm Bureau; South Carolina Peach Council.

South Dakota Farm Bureau; South Dakota Wheat Incorporated; South East Dairy Farmers Association; South Texas Cotton and Grain Association; Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association; Southern AgCredit, ACA; Southern Association of Ag-

ricultural Experiment Station Directors; Southern Cotton Growers, Inc.; Southern Minnesota Beet Sugar Cooperative; Southern Peanut Farmers Federation; Southern Rolling Plains Cotton Growers Association; Southwest Council of Agribusiness; Southwest Georgia Farm Credit, ACA; Spreckels Sugar Company; St. Lawrence Cotton Growers Association.

Staploctn Coop Association; Supporters of Agricultural Research (SoAR) Foundation; Sustainable Food Policy Alliance; Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation; Texas Agricultural Cooperative Council; Texas Agricultural Irrigation Association; Texas Cattle Feeders Association; Texas Citrus Mutual; Texas Corn Producers Association; Texas Farm Bureau; Texas Farm Credit Services; Texas Grain and Feed Association; Texas Grain Sorghum Association; Texas Pecan Growers Association; Texas Rice Council.

Texas Rice Producers Legislative Group; Texas Seed Trade Association; Texas Soybean Association; Texas Wheat Producers Association; The Fertilizer Institute; The Property Casualty Insurers Association of America; U.S. Apple Association; U.S. Pea and Lentil Trade Association; United Dairymen of Arizona; United Fresh Produce Association; United Onions USA, Inc.; University of Tennessee at Martin College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences; US Beet Sugar Association; US Canola Association; US Dry Bean Council.

US Rice Producers Association; US Sweet Potato Council; USA Dry Pea & Lentil Council; USA Rice; Vermont Farm Bureau; Vermont Insurance Agents Association; Virginia Agribusiness Council; Virginia Cotton Growers Association; Virginia Farm Bureau; Virginia Soybean Association; Washington Association of Wheat Growers; Washington Farm Bureau; Washington State Potato Commission; Washington State Sheep Producers; Washington State University; Washington State University, CAHNRS; Washington State University, College of Veterinary Medicine.

Weed Science Society of America; Western AgCredit, ACA; Western Equipment Dealers Association; Western Growers; Western Peanut Growers Association; Western Pulse Growers Association; Western Sugar Cooperative; Western United Dairymen; Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation; Wisconsin Maple Syrup Producers Association; Wisconsin Soybean Association; Women Involved in Farm Economics; Wyoming Sugar Company, LLC; Wyoming Wheat Growers Association; Yankee Farm Credit, ACA; Yosemite Farm Credit, ACA; Yuma Fresh Vegetable Association; Zurich North America.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the rule and the conference report to accompany H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1176 OFFERED BY
Mr. MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule VIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7264) making further additional continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled

by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Cause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 7264.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule

[a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 191, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

YEAS—220

Abraham	Culberson	Hern
Allen	Curbelo (FL)	Herrera Beutler
Amash	Curtis	Hice, Jody B.
Amodei	Davidson	Higgins (LA)
Arrington	Davis, Rodney	Hill
Babin	Denham	Holding
Bacon	DesJarlais	Hollingsworth
Balderson	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Banks (IN)	Donovan	Huizenga
Barr	Duffy	Hultgren
Barton	Duncan (SC)	Hurd
Bergman	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Biggs	Dunn	Jenkins (KS)
Bilirakis	Emmer	Johnson (LA)
Bishop (MI)	Estes (KS)	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Faso	Johnson, Sam
Blum	Ferguson	Jordan
Bost	Fitzpatrick	Joyce (OH)
Brady (TX)	Fleischmann	Katko
Brat	Flores	Kelly (MS)
Brooks (AL)	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Fox	King (IA)
Buck	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Bucshon	Gaetz	Kinzing
Budd	Gallagher	Kustoff (TN)
Burgess	Garrett	Labrador
Byrne	Gianforte	LaHood
Calvert	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Carter (GA)	Gohmert	Lamborn
Carter (TX)	Goodlatte	Lance
Chabot	Gosar	Latta
Cheney	Gowdy	Lesko
Cloud	Granger	Lewis (MN)
Coffman	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
Cole	Graves (LA)	Long
Collins (GA)	Graves (MO)	Loudermilk
Collins (NY)	Griffith	Love
Comer	Grothman	Lucas
Conaway	Guthrie	Luetkemeyer
Cook	Handel	MacArthur
Costello (PA)	Harper	Marchant
Cramer	Harris	Marino
Crawford	Hensarling	Marshall

Massie	Reichert	Stivers
Mast	Renacci	Taylor
McCarthy	Rice (SC)	Tenney
McCaul	Roby	Thompson (PA)
McClintock	Roe (TN)	Thornberry
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
McKinley	Rogers (KY)	Trott
McMorris	Rohrabacher	Turner
Rodgers	Rokita	Upton
McSally	Rooney, Francis	Valadao
Meadows	Ros-Lehtinen	Wagner
Messer	Ross	Walberg
Mitchell	Rothfus	Walden
Moolenaar	Rouzer	Walker
Mooney (WV)	Royce (CA)	Walorski
Mullin	Russell	Walters, Mimi
Newhouse	Rutherford	Weber (TX)
Norman	Sanford	Webster (FL)
Nunes	Scalise	Wenstrup
Olson	Schweikert	Westerman
Palazzo	Scott, Austin	Williams
Palmer	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)
Paulsen	Sessions	Wittman
Pearce	Shimkus	Womack
Perry	Simpson	Woodall
Pittenger	Smith (MO)	Yoder
Poe (TX)	Smith (NE)	Yoho
Poliquin	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Posey	Smith (TX)	Young (IA)
Ratcliffe	Smucker	Zeldin
Reed	Stefanik	

NAYS—191

Adams	Gallego	Nolan
Aguilar	Garamendi	Norcross
Barragán	Gomez	O’Halloran
Bass	Gonzalez (TX)	O’Rourke
Beatty	Gottheimer	Pallone
Bera	Green, Al	Panetta
Beyer	Green, Gene	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Payne
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Blunt Rochester	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Heck	Peters
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins (NY)	Peterson
F.	Himes	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Pocan
Brown (MD)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Bustos	Jayapal	Raskin
Butterfield	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Carbajal	Johnson, E. B.	Rosen
Cárdenas	Jones (MI)	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Rush
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Kihuen	Sánchez
Cicilline	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Scanlon
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schakowsky
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Clyburn	Lamb	Schrader
Cohen	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Correa	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Lee	Sherman
Crist	Levin	Sinema
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lipinski	Soto
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Suozzi
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lowe	Takano
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
DeBene	Maloney,	Titus
Demings	Carolyn B.	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Torres
Deutch	Matsui	Tsongas
Dingell	McCollum	Vargas
Doggett	McEachin	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	McGovern	Vela
F.	McNerney	Velázquez
Engel	Meeke	Visclosky
Eshoo	Meng	Wasserman
Espallat	Moore	Schultz
Esty (CT)	Morelle	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Wild
Fudge	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Neal	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Aderholt	Hastings	Polis
Barletta	Hunter	Rooney, Thomas
Black	Jones (NC)	J.
Blackburn	Keating	Roskam
Buchanan	Knight	Shuster
Comstock	Lujan Grisham,	Stewart
Ellison	M.	Walz
Hartzler	Noem	

□ 1400

Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Messrs. SCHNEIDER, and PASCARELL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. AMASH and BROOKS of Alabama changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 203, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

AYES—206

Abraham	Estes (KS)	Latta
Allen	Faso	Lawson (FL)
Amodei	Ferguson	Lesko
Arrington	Fitzpatrick	Lewis (MN)
Babin	Fleischmann	LoBiondo
Bacon	Flores	Long
Balderson	Fortenberry	Loudermilk
Banks (IN)	Fox	Love
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Barton	Gallagher	Luetkemeyer
Bergman	Gianforte	MacArthur
Bilirakis	Gibbs	Marchant
Bishop (MI)	Goodlatte	Marino
Bishop (UT)	Gowdy	Marshall
Bost	Granger	Mast
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	McCarthy
Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	McCaul
Brooks (IN)	Griffith	McClintock
Buck	Grothman	McHenry
Bucshon	Guthrie	McKinley
Budd	Handel	McMorris
Burgess	Harper	Rodgers
Byrne	Harris	McSally
Calvert	Hensarling	Messer
Carter (GA)	Hern	Mitchell
Carter (TX)	Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar
Chabot	Hice, Jody B.	Mooney (WV)
Cheney	Higgins (LA)	Mullin
Coffman	Hill	Newhouse
Cole	Holding	Norman
Collins (GA)	Hollingsworth	Nunes
Collins (NY)	Hudson	Olson
Comer	Huizenga	Palazzo
Conaway	Hultgren	Palmer
Cook	Hurd	Paulsen
Costa	Issa	Pearce
Costello (PA)	Jenkins (KS)	Peterson
Cramer	Johnson (LA)	Pittenger
Crawford	Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Poliquin
Curbelo (FL)	Joyce (OH)	Ratcliffe
Curtis	Katko	Reed
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (MS)	Reichert
Denham	Kelly (PA)	Renacci
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Rice (SC)
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Roby
Donovan	Kinzing	Roe (TN)
Duffy	Kustoff (TN)	Rogers (AL)
Duncan (SC)	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (TN)	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher
Dunn	Lamborn	Rokita
Emmer	Lance	Rooney, Francis

Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce (CA)
 Ruppertsberger
 Russell
 Rutherford
 Ryan (WI)
 Scalise
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Smucker
 Stefanik
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Tenney
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden

Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Zeldin

NOES—203

Adams
 Aguilar
 Amash
 Barragán
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Biggs
 Bishop (GA)
 Blum
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brat
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capuano
 Carballo
 Cárdenas
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Cloud
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Cooper
 Correa
 Courtney
 Crist
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Esty (CT)
 Evans
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard

Gaetz
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garrett
 Gohmert
 Gomez
 Gonzalez (TX)
 Gutierrez
 Hanabusa
 Heck
 Higgins (NY)
 Himes
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (MI)
 Jordan
 Kaptur
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kihuen
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Labrador
 Lamb
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Luján, Ben Ray
 Lynch
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Massie
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meadows
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)

Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Halloran
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Perry
 Peters
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Posey
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rosen
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Speier
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Heck
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wild
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Aderholt
 Barletta
 Black
 Blackburn
 Buchanan
 Comstock
 Davidson
 Ellison
 Grijalva

Hartzler
 Hastings
 Hunter
 Jones (NC)
 Keating
 Knight
 Lujan Grisham,
 M.
 Noem

Polis
 Rooney, Thomas
 J.
 Roskam
 Shuster
 Smith (NJ)
 Stewart
 Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1408

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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 169, answered “present” 4, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

YEAS—226

Abraham
 Adams
 Allen
 Amodei
 Babin
 Bacon
 Balderson
 Banks (IN)
 Barton
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Brooks (IN)
 Brown (MD)
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Bustos
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (TX)
 Cartwright
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Handel
 Harper
 Harris
 Heck
 Hensarling
 Hern
 Higgins (LA)
 Himes
 Hollingsworth
 Huffman
 Hultgren
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Davis, Rodney

DeGette
 DeLauro
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Doggett
 Donovan
 Duncan (TN)
 Dunn
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Estes (KS)
 Evans
 Ferguson
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Long
 Frankel (FL)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gabbard
 Gaetz
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Lujan, Ben Ray
 Gibbs
 Goodlatte
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guthrie
 Hanabusa
 Handel
 Harper
 Harris
 Heck
 Hensarling
 Hern
 Higgins (LA)
 Himes
 Hollingsworth
 Huffman
 Hultgren
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)

Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kildee
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Kustoff (TN)
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamb
 Lamborn
 Larson (CT)
 Lesko
 Lewis (MN)
 Lipinski
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan, Ben Ray
 Marchant
 Marino
 Marshall
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McHenry
 McNeerney
 Meadows
 Meng
 Messer
 Mitchell
 Mooney (WV)
 Moore
 Moulton
 Mullin
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Newhouse
 Norman
 Nunes
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer

Pascrell
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree
 Pittenger
 Pocan
 Posey
 Quigley
 Reichert
 Rice (SC)
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rooney, Francis
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Royce (CA)
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Russell

Aguilar
 Amash
 Barragán
 Bass
 Bera
 Bergman
 Beyer
 Biggs
 Blum
 Bost
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brooks (AL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Buck
 Burgess
 Butterfield
 Capuano
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carter (GA)
 Castor (FL)
 Clarke (NY)
 Coffman
 Comer
 Connolly
 Correa
 Costa
 Costello (PA)
 Courtney
 Crist
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Davidson
 DeFazio
 Delaney
 DelBene
 Denham
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Emmer
 Espallat
 Esty (CT)
 Faso
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Fudge
 Gallagher
 Garrett
 Gomez
 Gonzalez (TX)
 Gosar
 Gottheimer
 Graves (GA)

Rutherford
 Scalise
 Scanlon
 Schneider
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Smucker
 Speler
 Takano
 Thornberry

NAYS—169

Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Gutiérrez
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Higgins (NY)
 Hill
 Holding
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Hurd
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Jenkins (KS)
 Johnson (OH)
 Jones (MI)
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Kelly (IL)
 Kihuen
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kinzinger
 LaHood
 Lance
 Langevin
 Latta
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lynch
 MacArthur
 Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Mast
 Matsui
 McGovern
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meeks
 Moolenaar
 Morelle
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Halloran
 Pallone

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—4

Dingell
 Gohmert
 Payne
 Tonko

NOT VOTING—33

Aderholt
 Arrington
 Barletta
 Beatty
 Black
 Blackburn
 Buchanan
 Comstock
 Cramer

Diaz-Balart
 Ellison
 Grijalva
 Hartzler
 Hastings
 Hunter
 Jones (NC)
 Keating
 Knight
 Larsen (WA)

Lieu, Ted
 Lujan Grisham,
 M.
 McEachin
 Noem
 Polis
 Raskin
 Rooney, Thomas
 J.

Roskam Stefanik Walz
Shuster Stewart Waters, Maxine

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1416

Messrs. COFFMAN and SUOZZI changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). 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.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY DATA FRAMEWORK ACT OF 2017

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2454) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a data framework to provide access for appropriate personnel to law enforcement and other information of the Department, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Homeland Security Data Framework Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY DATA FRAMEWORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop a data framework to integrate existing Department of Homeland Security datasets and systems, as appropriate, for access by authorized personnel in a manner consistent with relevant legal authorities and privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties policies and protections.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In developing the framework required under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure, in accordance with all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements, the following information is included:

(A) All information acquired, held, or obtained by an office or component of the Department of Homeland Security that falls within the scope of the information sharing environment, including homeland security information, terrorism information, weapons of mass destruction information, and national intelligence.

(B) Any information or intelligence relevant to priority mission needs and capability requirements of the homeland security enterprise, as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(b) DATA FRAMEWORK ACCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that the data framework required under this section is accessible to employees of the Department of Homeland Security who the Secretary determines—

(A) have an appropriate security clearance;

(B) are assigned to perform a function that requires access to information in such framework; and

(C) are trained in applicable standards for safeguarding and using such information.

(2) GUIDANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(A) issue guidance for Department of Homeland Security employees authorized to access and contribute to the data framework pursuant to paragraph (1); and

(B) ensure that such guidance enforces a duty to share between offices and components of the Department when accessing or contributing to such framework for mission needs.

(3) EFFICIENCY.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall promulgate data standards and instruct components of the Department of Homeland Security to make available information through the data framework required under this section in a machine-readable standard format, to the greatest extent practicable.

(c) EXCLUSION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may exclude information from the data framework required under this section if the Secretary determines inclusion of such information may—

(1) jeopardize the protection of sources, methods, or activities;

(2) compromise a criminal or national security investigation;

(3) be inconsistent with other Federal laws or regulations; or

(4) be duplicative or not serve an operational purpose if included in such framework.

(d) SAFEGUARDS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall incorporate into the data framework required under this section systems capabilities for auditing and ensuring the security of information included in such framework. Such capabilities shall include the following:

(1) Mechanisms for identifying insider threats.

(2) Mechanisms for identifying security risks.

(3) Safeguards for privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties.

(e) DEADLINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure the data framework required under this section has the ability to include appropriate information in existence within the Department of Homeland Security to meet the critical mission operations of the Department of Homeland Security.

(f) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—

(1) STATUS UPDATES.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees regular updates on the status of the data framework until the framework is fully operational.

(2) OPERATIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the data framework required under this section is fully operational, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide notice to the appropriate congressional committees that the data framework is fully operational.

(3) VALUE ADDED.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall annually brief Congress on component use of the data framework required under this section to support operations that disrupt terrorist activities and incidents in the homeland.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE; HOMELAND.—The terms “appropriate congressional committee” and “homeland” have the meaning given those terms in section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101).

(2) HOMELAND SECURITY INFORMATION.—The term “homeland security information” has the meaning given such term in section 892 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 482).

(3) NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—The term “national intelligence” has the meaning given such term in section 3(5) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(5)).

(4) TERRORISM INFORMATION.—The term “terrorism information” has the meaning given such term in section 1016 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (6 U.S.C. 485).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2454, the Department of Homeland Security Data Framework Act. This legislation provides the first ever authorization for the DHS data framework.

Under this initiative, the Department is bringing together vital DHS databases, including travel and cargo information, investigative data, and critical infrastructure data, among other things.

Mr. Speaker, Americans would not only be surprised, but appalled to learn about the number of information-sharing stovepipes that still exist within the Department of Homeland Security. This bill will bring together the datasets in each of the classified and unclassified spaces to ensure that the men and women working at the Department have the information they need to keep our Nation safe.

This bill also mandates privacy and security safeguards, training for departmental personnel, and requires the Secretary to ensure information in the framework is both protected and auditable.

The House has overwhelmingly supported this measure twice before as part of the DHS Authorization Act, on July 20, 2017, and again as a standalone measure on September 12, 2017.

The Senate made some minor changes to the bill and passed it on December 6. With today's vote, we will send this bill to the President's desk for his signature.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to again support this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2454, the Department of Homeland Security Data Framework Act of 2017.

The Department of Homeland Security Data Framework Act directs the

Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a data framework consolidating existing databases and systems at the Department. H.R. 2454 requires the Secretary to ensure that this data framework is accessible to DHS employees with proper clearances and that they are trained to safeguard and use such information when appropriate.

The central data framework will help cut down on the processing time of data searches and allow analysts at DHS agencies to more efficiently access information across the Department.

I want to thank my colleague, Congressman WILL HURD, for introducing this legislation, and Senator MAGGIE HASSAN for introducing its companion in the Senate. This bill has already passed the House once before, and I look forward to the President signing it into law this year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an important piece of legislation that has strong support on both sides of the aisle. It will improve DHS' operations by moving it towards a consolidated data system, enhancing the ability of the men and women serving at DHS to access, in a timely manner, the data that they need to fulfill their critical missions. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2454.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation once again.

Again, we are authorizing the Department of Homeland Security's data framework. It holds DHS accountable with aggressive timelines, includes robust requirements for privacy and data standards and data safeguards, as well as ensuring important congressional notifications continue.

I would like to thank Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON for their support in moving this measure through the House, as well as all of our colleagues on the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee for moving this bill through the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2454.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further pro-

ceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

ASIA REASSURANCE INITIATIVE ACT OF 2018

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2736) to develop a long-term strategic vision and a comprehensive, multifaceted, and principled United States policy for the Indo-Pacific region, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2736

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.

TITLE I—UNITED STATES POLICY AND DIPLOMATIC STRATEGY IN THE INDO- PACIFIC REGION

Sec. 101. Policy.
Sec. 102. Diplomatic strategy.

TITLE II—PROMOTING UNITED STATES SECURITY INTERESTS IN THE INDO-PA- CIFIC REGION

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 202. Treaty alliances in the Indo-Pacific region.
Sec. 203. United States-China relationship.
Sec. 204. United States-India strategic partnership.
Sec. 205. United States-ASEAN strategic partnership.
Sec. 206. United States-Republic of Korea-Japan trilateral security partnership.
Sec. 207. Quadrilateral security dialogue.
Sec. 208. Enhanced security partnerships in Southeast Asia.
Sec. 209. Commitment to Taiwan.
Sec. 210. North Korea strategy.
Sec. 211. New Zealand.
Sec. 212. The Pacific Islands.
Sec. 213. Freedom of navigation and overflight; promotion of international law.
Sec. 214. Combating terrorism in Southeast Asia.
Sec. 215. Cybersecurity cooperation.
Sec. 216. Nonproliferation and arms control in the Indo-Pacific region.

TITLE III—PROMOTING UNITED STATES ECONOMIC INTERESTS IN THE INDO- PACIFIC REGION

Sec. 301. Findings; sense of Congress.
Sec. 302. Trade negotiations, multilateral agreements, and regional economic summits.
Sec. 303. United States-ASEAN economic partnership.
Sec. 304. Trade capacity building and trade facilitation.
Sec. 305. Intellectual property protection.
Sec. 306. Energy programs and initiatives.
Sec. 307. Lower Mekong initiative.
Sec. 308. Sense of Congress on economic growth and natural resource conservation.
Sec. 309. Sense of Congress in support of women's economic rights.

TITLE IV—PROMOTING UNITED STATES VALUES IN THE INDO-PACIFIC REGION

Sec. 401. Findings.
Sec. 402. Trafficking-in-persons.
Sec. 403. Freedom of the press.
Sec. 404. Democracy, human rights, and labor personnel.
Sec. 405. Bilateral and regional dialogues; people-to-people engagement.
Sec. 406. Association of Southeast Asian Nations Human Rights Strategy.
Sec. 407. Freedom of information to North Korea.
Sec. 408. Sense of Congress on imposition of sanctions and suspension of United States assistance.
Sec. 409. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 410. Indo-Pacific human rights defenders.
Sec. 411. Young leaders people-to-people initiatives.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Indo-Pacific region—
(A) represents nearly 50 percent of the global population;

(B) is home to some of the most dynamic economies in the world; and

(C) poses security challenges that threaten to undermine United States national security interests, regional peace, and global stability.

(2) The core tenets of the United States-backed international system are being challenged, including by—

(A) China's illegal construction and militarization of artificial features in the South China Sea and coercive economic practices;

(B) North Korea's acceleration of its nuclear and ballistic missile capabilities; and

(C) the increased presence throughout Southeast Asia of the Islamic State (referred to in this Act as "ISIS") and other international terrorist organizations that threaten the United States.

(3) The economic order in the Indo-Pacific region continues to transform, presenting opportunities and challenges to United States economic interests.

(4) The United States has a fundamental interest in defending human rights and promoting the rule of law in the Indo-Pacific region. Although many countries in the region have improved the treatment of their citizens, several Indo-Pacific governments continue to commit human rights abuses and place restrictions on basic human rights and political and civil liberties.

(5) Without strong leadership from the United States, the international system, fundamentally rooted in the rule of law, may wither, to the detriment of United States, regional, and global interests. It is imperative that the United States continue to play a leading role in the Indo-Pacific region by—

(A) defending peace and security;
(B) advancing economic prosperity; and
(C) promoting respect for fundamental human rights.

(6) In 2017, the Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate held a series of hearings on United States leadership in the Indo-Pacific region, in which—

(A) experts, including Representative Randy Forbes, Ambassador Robert Gallucci, Ms. Tami Overby, Dr. Robert Orr, Ambassador Derek Mitchell, Ambassador Robert King, Mr. Murray Hiebert, and others detailed the security challenges, economic opportunities, and imperatives of promoting the rule of law, human rights, and democracy, in the Indo-Pacific region; and

(B) Dr. Graham Allison, the Douglas Dillon Professor of Government at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, testified, "As realistic students of

history, Chinese leaders recognize that the role the United States has played since World War II as the architect and underwriter of regional stability and security has been essential to the rise of Asia, including China itself. But they believe that as the tide that brought the United States to Asia recedes, America must leave with it. Much as Britain's role in the Western Hemisphere faded at the beginning of the twentieth century, so must America's role in Asia as the region's historic superpower resumes its place."

(7) The United States National Security Strategy (referred to in this Act as the "National Security Strategy"), which was released in December 2017, states—

(A) "A geopolitical competition between free and repressive visions of world order is taking place in the Indo-Pacific region. The region, which stretches from the west coast of India to the western shores of the United States, represents the most populous and economically dynamic part of the world. The United States interest in a free and open Indo-Pacific extends back to the earliest days of our republic."; and

(B) "Our vision for the Indo-Pacific excludes no nation. We will redouble our commitment to established alliances and partnerships, while expanding and deepening relationships with new partners that share respect for sovereignty, fair and reciprocal trade, and the rule of law. We will reinforce our commitment to freedom of the seas and the peaceful resolution of territorial and maritime disputes in accordance with international law. We will work with allies and partners to achieve complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization on the Korean Peninsula and preserve the non-proliferation regime in Northeast Asia."

TITLE I—UNITED STATES POLICY AND DIPLOMATIC STRATEGY IN THE INDO-PACIFIC REGION

SEC. 101. POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to develop and commit to a long-term strategic vision and a comprehensive, multifaceted, and principled United States policy for the Indo-Pacific region that—

(1) secures the vital national security interests of the United States and our allies and partners;

(2) promotes American prosperity and economic interests by advancing economic growth and development of a rules-based Indo-Pacific economic community;

(3) advances American influence by reflecting the values of the American people and universal human rights;

(4) supports functional problem-solving regional architecture; and

(5) accords with and supports the rule of law and international norms.

SEC. 102. DIPLOMATIC STRATEGY.

It is the diplomatic strategy of the United States—

(1) to work with United States allies—

(A) to confront common challenges;

(B) to improve information sharing;

(C) to increase defense investment and trade;

(D) to ensure interoperability; and

(E) to strengthen shared capabilities;

(2) to strengthen relationships with partners who—

(A) share mutual respect for the rule of law;

(B) agree with fair and reciprocal trade; and

(C) understand the importance of civil society, the rule of law, the free and reliable flow of information, and transparent governance;

(3) to support functional problem-solving regional architecture, including through the

Association of Southeast Asian Nations, Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, and the East Asia Summit;

(4) to emphasize the commitment of the United States—

(A) to freedom of navigation under international law;

(B) to promote peaceful resolutions of maritime and territorial disputes; and

(C) to expand security and defense cooperation with allies and partners, as appropriate;

(5) to pursue diplomatic measures to achieve complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization of North Korea;

(6) to improve civil society, strengthen the rule of law, and advocate for transparent governance;

(7) to develop and grow the economy through private sector partnerships between the United States and Indo-Pacific partners;

(8) to pursue multilateral and bilateral trade agreements in a free, fair, and reciprocal manner and build a network of partners in the Indo-Pacific committed to free markets;

(9) to work with and encourage Indo-Pacific countries—

(A) to pursue high-quality and transparent infrastructure projects;

(B) to maintain unimpeded commerce, open sea lines or air ways, and communication; and

(C) to seek the peaceful resolution of disputes; and

(10) to sustain a strong military presence in the Indo-Pacific region and strengthen security relationships with allies and partners throughout the region.

TITLE II—PROMOTING UNITED STATES SECURITY INTERESTS IN THE INDO-PACIFIC REGION

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(5) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(6) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and, as appropriate, the Department of Defense, \$1,500,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2019 through 2023, which shall be used—

(1) to advance United States foreign policy interests and objectives in the Indo-Pacific region in recognition of the value of diplomatic initiatives and programs in the furtherance of United States strategy;

(2) to improve the defense capacity and resiliency of partner nations to resist coercion and deter and defend against security threats, including through foreign military financing and international military education and training programs;

(3) to conduct regular bilateral and multilateral engagements, particularly with the United States' most highly-capable allies and partners, to meet strategic challenges, including—

(A) certain destabilizing activities of the People's Republic of China; and

(B) emerging threats, such as the nuclear and ballistic missile programs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

(4) to build new counterterrorism partnership programs in Southeast Asia to combat

the growing presence of ISIS and other terrorist organizations that pose a significant threat to the United States, its allies, and its citizens' interests abroad;

(5) to help partner countries strengthen their democratic systems, with a focus on good governance;

(6) to ensure that the regulatory environments for trade, infrastructure, and investment in partner countries are transparent, open, and free of corruption;

(7) to encourage responsible natural resource management in partner countries, which is closely associated with economic growth; and

(8) to increase maritime domain awareness programs in South Asia and Southeast Asia—

(A) by expanding the scope of naval and coast guard training efforts with Southeast Asian countries;

(B) by expanding cooperation with democratic partners in South Asia, including Bangladesh, Nepal, and Sri Lanka;

(C) through intelligence sharing and other information-sharing efforts; and

(D) through multilateral engagements, including by involving Japan, Australia, and India in such efforts.

(c) COUNTERING CHINA'S INFLUENCE TO UNDERMINE THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (b) shall be made available for United States Government efforts to counter the strategic influence of the People's Republic of China, in accordance with the strategy required under section 7043(e)(3) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2014 (division K of Public Law 113-76; 128 Stat. 536) and in consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress.

(d) BURMA.—None of the amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (b) may be made available for International Military Education and Training and Foreign Military Financing Programs for the armed forces of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar (historically known as "Burma").

(e) PHILIPPINES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—None of the amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (b) may be made available for counternarcotics assistance for the Philippine National Police unless the Secretary of State determines and reports to the appropriate committees of Congress that the Government of the Philippines has adopted and is implementing a counternarcotics strategy that is consistent with international human rights standards, including investigating and prosecuting individuals who are credibly alleged to have ordered, committed, or covered up extrajudicial killings and other gross violations of human rights in the conduct of counternarcotics operations.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The limitation under paragraph (1) shall not apply to funds made available—

(A) for drug demand reduction, maritime programs, or transnational interdiction programs; or

(B) to support for the development of such counternarcotics strategy, after consultation with the appropriate committees of Congress.

(f) CAMBODIA.—None of the amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to subsection (b) may be made available for United States assistance programs that benefit the Government of Cambodia unless the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the requirements under section 7043(b)(1) of division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115-141) have been met.

SEC. 202. TREATY ALLIANCES IN THE INDO-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) UNITED STATES-JAPAN ALLIANCE.—The United States Government—

(1) is committed to the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan, done at Washington, January 19, 1960, and all related and subsequent bilateral security agreements and arrangements concluded on or before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) recognizes the vital role of the alliance between the United States and Japan in promoting peace and security in the Indo-Pacific region; and

(3) calls for the strengthening and broadening of diplomatic, economic, and security ties between the United States and Japan.

(b) UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA ALLIANCE.—The United States Government—

(1) is committed to the Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of Korea, done at Washington October 1, 1953, and all related and subsequent bilateral security agreements and arrangements concluded on or before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) recognizes the vital role of the alliance between the United States and South Korea in promoting peace and security in the Indo-Pacific region; and

(3) calls for the strengthening and broadening of diplomatic, economic, and security ties between the United States and the Republic of Korea.

(c) UNITED STATES-AUSTRALIA ALLIANCE.—The United States Government—

(1) is committed to the Security Treaty Between Australia and the United States of America, done at San Francisco September 1, 1951, and all related and subsequent bilateral security agreements and arrangements concluded on or before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) recognizes the vital role of the alliance between the United States and Australia in promoting peace and security in the Indo-Pacific region; and

(3) calls for the strengthening and broadening of diplomatic, economic, and security ties between the United States and Australia.

(d) UNITED STATES-PHILIPPINES ALLIANCE.—The United States Government is committed to the Mutual Defense Treaty between the Republic of the Philippines and the United States of America, done at Washington August 30, 1951, and all related and subsequent bilateral security agreements and arrangements concluded on or before the date of the enactment of this Act, including the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement, done at Manila April 28, 2014.

(e) THAILAND.—The United States Government is committed to—

(1) the Agreement Respecting Military Assistance Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Thailand, done at Bangkok October 17, 1950;

(2) the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, done at Manila September 8, 1954; and

(3) all related and subsequent bilateral security agreements and arrangements concluded on or before the date of the enactment of this Act, including the Joint Vision Statement for the Thai-United States Defense Alliance, issued in Bangkok November 15, 2012.

SEC. 203. UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States Government—

(1) expresses grave concerns with Chinese actions that seek—

(A) to further constrain space for civil society and religion within China; and

(B) to undermine a rules-based order in the Indo-Pacific region;

(2) encourages China to play a constructive role in world affairs by demonstrating consistent respect for the rule of law and international norms;

(3) seeks to build a positive, cooperative, and comprehensive relationship with China—

(A) by expanding areas of cooperation; and
(B) by addressing areas of disagreement, including over human rights, economic policies, and maritime security; and

(4) is committed to working with China on shared regional and global challenges, especially—

(A) upholding and strengthening the rules-based international system; and

(B) the denuclearization of North Korea.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) welcome a decision by China to change course and pursue a responsible results-oriented relationship with the United States and engagement on global issues;

(2) encourage China to play a constructive role in the Indo-Pacific region and globally; and

(3) continue to call out Chinese actions that undermine the rules-based international system.

SEC. 204. UNITED STATES-INDIA STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States Government—

(1) recognizes the vital role of the strategic partnership between the United States and India in promoting peace and security in the Indo-Pacific region;

(2) calls for the strengthening and broadening of diplomatic, economic, and security ties between the United States and India; and

(3) is committed to—

(A) the New Framework for the United States-India Defense Relationship, done at Arlington, Virginia on June 28, 2005;

(B) the United States-India Defense Technology and Trade Initiative, launched in 2012;

(C) the Joint Strategic Vision for the Indo-Pacific and Indian Ocean Region, announced on January 25, 2015;

(D) the United States-India Joint Statement on Prosperity Through Partnership, issued on June 26, 2017; and

(E) all related and subsequent bilateral and security agreements and arrangements concluded as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) INDIA AS MAJOR DEFENSE PARTNER.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Section 1292(a)(1)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat. 2559; 22 U.S.C. 2751 note) requires the recognition of India as a major defense partner.

(2) The designation of India as a major defense partner, which is unique to India—

(A) institutionalizes the progress made to facilitate defense trade and technology sharing between the United States and India;

(B) elevates defense trade and technology cooperation between the United States and India to a level commensurate with the closest allies and partners of the United States;

(C) facilitates technology sharing between the United States and India, including license-free access to a wide range of dual-use technologies, after taking into account national security concerns; and

(D) facilitates joint exercises, coordination on defense strategy and policy, military exchanges, and port calls in support of defense cooperation between the United States and India.

SEC. 205. UNITED STATES-ASEAN STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) support and reaffirm the elevation of the United States-Association of Southeast Asian Nations (referred to in this section as “ASEAN”) relationship to a strategic partnership;

(2) recommit to ASEAN centrality by helping build a strong, stable, politically cohesive, economically integrated, and socially responsible community of nations that has common rules, norms, procedures, and standards which are consistent with international law and the principles of a rules-based Indo-Pacific community;

(3) urge ASEAN to continue its efforts to foster greater integration among its members;

(4) recognize the value of—

(A) ASEAN engagement with economic, political, and security partners within Asia and elsewhere, including Australia, Canada, the European Union, India, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan; and

(B) strategic economic initiatives, such as activities under the United States-ASEAN Trade and Investment Framework Arrangement and the United States-ASEAN Connect, which demonstrate a commitment to ASEAN and the ASEAN Economic Community and build upon economic relationships in the Indo-Pacific region;

(5) support efforts by the nations comprising ASEAN—

(A) to address maritime and territorial disputes in a constructive manner; and

(B) to pursue claims through peaceful, diplomatic, and legitimate regional and international arbitration mechanisms, consistent with international law, including through the adoption of a code of conduct in the South China Sea to further promote peace and stability in the Indo-Pacific region;

(6) support efforts by United States partners and allies in ASEAN—

(A) to enhance maritime capability and maritime domain awareness;

(B) to protect unhindered access to, and use of, international waterways in the Asia-Pacific region that are critical to ensuring the security and free flow of commerce;

(C) to counter piracy;

(D) to disrupt illicit maritime trafficking activities such as the trafficking of persons, goods, and drugs; and

(E) to enhance the maritime capabilities of countries or regional organizations to respond to emerging threats to maritime security in the Asia-Pacific region; and

(7) urge ASEAN member states to develop a common approach to reaffirm the decision of the Permanent Court of Arbitration’s ruling with respect to the case between the Republic of the Philippines and the People’s Republic of China.

(b) REPORT ON STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH ASEAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for the following 5 years, the Secretary of State, in consultation with other Federal agencies, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on a strategic framework to administer programs, projects, and activities of the United States to support diplomatic and economic engagement between the United States and ASEAN member countries for the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall address the following elements of United States strategy:

(A) Promoting commercial engagement between the United States and member countries of ASEAN.

(B) Helping member countries of ASEAN use sustainable, efficient, and innovative

technologies in their respective energy sectors.

(C) Supporting economic conditions in member countries of ASEAN that promote innovation, the creation of new businesses, sustainable growth, and the education of the region's future innovators, entrepreneurs, and business leaders.

(D) Working with member countries of ASEAN to improve the policy and regulatory environment for growth, trade, innovation, and investment.

(E) Supporting the regional integration objectives of member countries of ASEAN under the ASEAN Economic Community.

(F) Partnership opportunities with the governments of other countries friendly to the United States that have committed to a high set of standards for investment and development with ASEAN, as determined by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 206. UNITED STATES-REPUBLIC OF KOREA-JAPAN TRILATERAL SECURITY PARTNERSHIP.

It is the sense of Congress that the President should develop a strategy to deepen the trilateral security cooperation between the United States, South Korea, and Japan, including missile defense, intelligence-sharing, and other defense-related initiatives.

SEC. 207. QUADRILATERAL SECURITY DIALOGUE.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the security dialogue between the United States, Australia, India, and Japan is vital to address pressing security challenges in the Indo-Pacific region in order to promote—

- (A) a rules-based order;
 - (B) respect for international law; and
 - (C) a free and open Indo-Pacific; and
- (2) such a dialogue is intended to augment, rather than to replace, current mechanisms.

SEC. 208. ENHANCED SECURITY PARTNERSHIPS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA.

(a) INDONESIA.—The United States Government is committed to—

(1) the United States-Indonesia Comprehensive Partnership, done in Washington November 9, 2010;

(2) the Joint Statement on Comprehensive Defense Cooperation, done in Washington October 26, 2015; and

(3) all related and subsequent bilateral and security agreements and arrangements between the United States and Indonesia concluded on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) MALAYSIA.—The United States Government is committed to—

(1) the United States-Malaysia Comprehensive Partnership, done at Putrajaya April 27, 2014;

(2) the Joint Statement for Enhancing the Comprehensive Partnership between the United States of America and Malaysia, done in Washington September 13, 2017; and

(3) all related and subsequent bilateral and security agreements and arrangements between the United States and Malaysia concluded on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SINGAPORE.—The United States Government is committed to—

(1) the Strategic Framework Agreement Between the United States of America and the Republic of Singapore for a Closer Cooperation Partnership in Defense and Security, done at Washington July 12, 2005;

(2) the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement, done at Arlington, Virginia December 7, 2015; and

(3) all related and subsequent bilateral and security agreements and arrangements between the United States and Singapore concluded on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) VIETNAM.—The United States Government is committed to—

(1) the United States-Vietnam Comprehensive Partnership, done at Washington December 16, 2013;

(2) the United States-Vietnam Joint Vision Statement on Defense Relations, done at Hanoi on June 1, 2015;

(3) the United States-Vietnam Joint Vision Statement, done at Washington May 31, 2017; and

(4) all related and subsequent bilateral and security agreements and arrangements between the United States and Vietnam concluded on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should deepen diplomatic, economic, and security cooperation, especially in the areas of maritime security and counterterrorism, with Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Vietnam.

SEC. 209. COMMITMENT TO TAIWAN.

(a) UNITED STATES COMMITMENT TO TAIWAN.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to support the close economic, political, and security relationship between Taiwan and the United States;

(2) to faithfully enforce all existing United States Government commitments to Taiwan, consistent with the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 (Public Law 96-8), the 3 joint communiqués, and the Six Assurances agreed to by President Ronald Reagan in July 1982; and

(3) to counter efforts to change the status quo and to support peaceful resolution acceptable to both sides of the Taiwan Strait.

(b) ARMS SALES TO TAIWAN.—The President should conduct regular transfers of defense articles to Taiwan that are tailored to meet the existing and likely future threats from the People's Republic of China, including supporting the efforts of Taiwan to develop and integrate asymmetric capabilities, as appropriate, including mobile, survivable, and cost-effective capabilities, into its military forces.

(c) TRAVEL.—The President should encourage the travel of highlevel United States officials to Taiwan, in accordance with the Taiwan Travel Act (Public Law 115-135).

SEC. 210. NORTH KOREA STRATEGY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has flagrantly defied the international community by illicitly developing its nuclear and ballistic missile programs, in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1718 (2006), 1874 (2009), 2087 (2013), 2094 (2013), 2270 (2016), 2321 (2016), 2371 (2017), 2375 (2017), and 2397 (2017).

(2) The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea engages in gross human rights abuses against its own people and citizens of other countries, including the United States, the Republic of Korea, and Japan.

(3) The United States is committed to pursuing a peaceful denuclearization of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea through a policy of maximum pressure and engagement, in close concert with its partners.

(b) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SANCTIONS AGAINST THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA.—

(1) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to continue to impose sanctions with respect to activities of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, persons acting for or on behalf of such government, or other persons in accordance with Executive Order 13551 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of certain persons with respect to North Korea), Executive Order 13687 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to imposing additional sanctions), Executive Order 13694 (50 U.S.C. 1701

note; relating to blocking the property of certain persons engaging in significant malicious cyberenabled activities), Executive Order 13722 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking the property of the Government of North Korea and the Workers' Party of Korea, and prohibiting certain transactions with respect to North Korea), and Executive Order 13810 (82 Fed. Reg. 44705; relating to imposing additional sanctions with respect to North Korea), as such Executive orders are in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, until the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is no longer engaged in the illicit activities described in such Executive orders, including actions in violation of the United Nations Security Council resolutions referred to in subsection (a)(1).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after terminating any sanction with respect to the activities of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, a person acting for or on behalf of such government, or any other person provided for in an Executive order listed in subsection (a), the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees justifying the termination of the sanction and explaining the relationship between such termination and the cessation of any illicit activity that violates any of the United Nations Security Council resolutions referred to in subsection (a)(1) by such Government or person. The reporting requirement under this paragraph shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the authority of the President pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(c) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO NEGOTIATION ON THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA'S NUCLEAR AND BALLISTIC MISSILE PROGRAMS.—It is the policy of the United States that the objective of negotiations with respect to the nuclear and ballistic missile programs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea be the complete, verifiable, and irreversible dismantlement of such programs.

(d) REPORT ON A STRATEGY TO ADDRESS THE THREATS POSED BY, AND THE CAPABILITIES OF, THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for the following 5 years, the Secretary of State, or a designee of the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes actions taken by the United States to address the threats posed by, and the capabilities of, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a summary of ongoing efforts by the United States to identify strategies and policies, including an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of such strategies and policies—

(i) to achieve peaceful denuclearization of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; and

(ii) to eliminate the threat posed by the ballistic missile program of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

(B) an assessment of—

(i) potential road maps toward peaceful denuclearization of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the elimination of the nuclear and ballistic missile threats posed by

the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; and

(ii) specific actions that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would need to take for each such roadmap to become viable;

(C) a summary of the United States strategy to increase international coordination and cooperation, whether unilaterally, bilaterally, or multilaterally, including sanctions enforcement and interdiction, to address the threat posed by the nuclear and ballistic missile programs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which shall include—

(i) a description of the actions taken by the Secretary of State, or designees of the Secretary, to consult with governments around the world, with the purpose of inducing such governments to fully implement the United Nations Security Council resolutions referred to in subsection (a)(1);

(ii) a description of the actions taken by such governments to fully implement United Nations Security Council resolutions related to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

(iii) a list of countries with governments that the Secretary has determined are non-cooperative with respect to implementing the United Nations Security Council resolutions referred to in subsection (a)(1); and

(iv) a plan of action to engage, and increase cooperation with respect to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, with the governments of the countries on the list described in clause (iii);

(D) an assessment of the adequacy of the national export control regimes of countries that are members of the United Nations, and multilateral export control regimes, that are necessary to enforce sanctions imposed with respect to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea pursuant to the United Nations Security Council resolutions referred to in subsection (a)(1); and

(E) an action plan to encourage and assist countries in adopting and using authorities necessary to enforce export controls required by United Nations Security Council resolutions.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(e) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) representatives of the United States shall use the voice and vote of the United States in all international organizations, as appropriate, to advocate for the expulsion of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from such organizations, until such time as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea meets its commitments under the United Nations Security Council resolutions referred to in subsection (a)(1); and

(2) the Secretary of State should work to induce countries to meet their commitments under the United Nations Security Council resolutions referred to in subsection (a)(1), including by considering appropriate adjustments to the diplomatic posture and foreign assistance of the United States with governments that the Secretary has determined are noncooperative with respect to implementing the United Nations Security Council resolutions referred to in subsection (a)(1).

SEC. 211. NEW ZEALAND.

The United States Government is committed to—

(1) the Wellington Declaration, signed on November 5, 2010, which reaffirmed close ties and outlined future practical cooperation between the United States and New Zealand;

(2) the Washington Declaration, signed on June 19, 2012, which strengthened the defense

relationship by providing a framework and strategic guidance for security cooperation and defense dialogues; and

(3) all related and subsequent bilateral and security agreements and arrangements between the United States and New Zealand concluded on or before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 212. THE PACIFIC ISLANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) support strong United States engagement with the nations of the South Pacific, including Fiji, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu;

(2) deepen its cooperation with the nations of the South Pacific in areas of mutual interest, including—

(A) fisheries and marine resource conservation;

(B) environmental challenges and resilience;

(C) global health;

(D) development and trade; and

(E) people-to-people ties; and

(3) continue to provide assistance to the Pacific Islands, as appropriate, to support the rule of law, good governance, and economic development.

(b) UNITED STATES-COMPACTS OF FREE ASSOCIATION.—It is the sense of Congress that the Compacts of Free Association entered between the United States and the Freely Associated States (Republic of Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau)—

(1) enhance the strategic posture of the United States in the Western Pacific;

(2) reinforce United States regional commitment;

(3) preempt potential adversaries from establishing positional advantage; and

(4) further self-governance, economic development, and self-sufficiency of the Freely Associated States.

SEC. 213. FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION AND OVERFLIGHT; PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW.

(a) FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION.—It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to conduct, as part of its global Freedom of Navigation Program, regular freedom of navigation, and overflight operations in the Indo-Pacific region, in accordance with applicable international law; and

(2) to promote genuine multilateral negotiations to peacefully resolve maritime disputes in the South China Sea, in accordance with applicable international law.

(b) JOINT INDO-PACIFIC DIPLOMATIC STRATEGY.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should develop a diplomatic strategy that includes working with United States allies and partners to conduct joint maritime training and freedom of navigation operations in the Indo-Pacific region, including the East China Sea and the South China Sea, in support of a rules-based international system benefitting all countries.

SEC. 214. COMBATING TERRORISM IN SOUTHEAST ASIA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) ISIS.—The term “ISIS” means the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and other appropriate Federal officials, shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress that contains an assessment of the current and future capabilities and activities of ISIS-linked, al-Qaeda-linked, and other violent extremist groups in Southeast Asia that pose a significant threat to the United States, its allies, and its citizens interests abroad.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (b) shall include—

(1) the current number of ISIS-linked, al-Qaeda-linked, and other violent extremist group-affiliated fighters in Southeast Asia;

(2) an estimate of the number of ISIS-linked, al-Qaeda-linked, and other violent extremist group-affiliated fighters expected to return to Southeast Asia from fighting in the Middle East;

(3) an analysis of the amounts and sources of ISIS-linked, al-Qaeda-linked, and other various extremist group affiliated-fighters in Southeast Asia;

(4) the current resources available to combat the threat of ISIS-linked, al-Qaeda-linked, and other violent extremist group-affiliated fighters in Southeast Asia, and the additional resources required to combat such threat;

(5) a detailed assessment of the capabilities of ISIS-linked, al-Qaeda-linked, and other violent extremist group-affiliated fighters to operate effectively in the Indo-Pacific region, including the Philippines, Indonesia, and Malaysia;

(6) a description of the capabilities and resources of governments in Southeast Asia to counter violent extremist groups; and

(7) a list of additional United States resources and capabilities that the Department of Defense and the Department of State recommend providing to governments in Southeast Asia to combat violent extremist groups.

SEC. 215. CYBERSECURITY COOPERATION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that there should be robust cybersecurity cooperation between the United States and nations in the Indo-Pacific region—

(1) to effectively respond to cybersecurity threats, including state-sponsored threats;

(2) to share best practices to combat such threats;

(3) to strengthen resilience against cyberattacks, misinformation, and propaganda; and

(4) to strengthen the resilience of critical infrastructure.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2019 through 2023 to enhance cooperation between the United States and Indo-Pacific nations for the purposes of combatting cybersecurity threats.

SEC. 216. NONPROLIFERATION AND ARMS CONTROL IN THE INDO-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The United States Government—

(1) recognizes that the spread of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, and their means of delivery, constitutes a threat to international peace and security;

(2) seeks to peacefully address the unique challenge posed to regional and global stability by the illicit use, and the proliferation to and from North Korea, of sensitive nuclear and missile technologies, and other weapons of mass destruction;

(3) notes efforts by China and Russia—

(A) to expand and modernize their respective nuclear arsenals, including through significant research and development resources

in hypersonic glide vehicles and other advanced technologies; and

(B) to pursue sales of commercial nuclear technologies; and

(4) recognizes the legitimate pursuit by many countries in the Indo-Pacific region of nuclear energy for a variety of peaceful applications.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States Government should undertake all reasonable and appropriate efforts to pursue effective arms control and nonproliferation policies in the Indo-Pacific region to limit the further spread of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

TITLE III—PROMOTING UNITED STATES ECONOMIC INTERESTS IN THE INDO-PACIFIC REGION

SEC. 301. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) According to the United States Chamber of Commerce, by 2030—

(A) 66 percent of the global middle class population will be living in Asia; and

(B) 59 percent of middle class consumption will take place in Asia.

(2) According to the Asian Development Bank—

(A) Asian countries have signed 140 bilateral or regional trade agreements; and

(B) 75 more trade agreements with Asian countries are under negotiation or concluded and awaiting entry into force.

(3) Free trade agreements between the United States and 3 nations in the Indo-Pacific region (Australia, Singapore, and the Republic of Korea) have entered into force.

(4) The member states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (referred to in this section as “ASEAN”), as a group—

(A) represent the fifth largest economy in the world; and

(B) have a combined gross domestic product of \$2,400,000,000,000.

(5) The economy comprised of ASEAN member states grew by 66 percent between 2006 and 2015, and the total value of bilateral trade between the United States and ASEAN member states has increased by 78 percent since 2004.

(6) In 2015, the trade surplus of goods sold by companies in ASEAN member states to consumers in the United States was \$77,000,000,000, while the United States 2015 trade surplus of services provided to consumers in ASEAN member states was \$8,000,000,000.

(7) According to US-ASEAN Business Council, goods and services exported from the United States to ASEAN member states support 550,000 jobs in the United States.

(8) According to the Business Roundtable—

(A) the United States, Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam were responsible for a combined 40 percent of global gross domestic product in 2017; and

(B) United States bilateral trade with the other nations referred to in subparagraph (A) supports 15,600,000 jobs in the United States.

(9) According to the United States National Security Strategy—

(A) ASEAN and Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation “remain centerpieces of the Indo-Pacific’s regional architecture and platforms for promoting an order based on freedom”; and

(B) the United States will “work with partners to build a network of states dedicated to free markets and protected from forces that would subvert their sovereignty.”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that trade between the United States and the nations in the Indo-Pacific region is vitally important to the United

States economy, United States exports, and jobs in the United States.

SEC. 302. INDO-PACIFIC TRADE NEGOTIATIONS, MULTILATERAL AGREEMENTS, AND REGIONAL ECONOMIC SUMMITS.

Congress supports—

(1) multilateral, bilateral, or regional trade agreements with partners that—

(A) comply with trade obligations and respect, promote, and strictly adhere to the rule of law; and

(B) increase United States employment and expand the economy;

(2) formal economic dialogues that include concrete, verifiable, and measured outcomes;

(3) negotiations under the auspices of the World Trade Organization, including negotiations to enter into appropriate plurilateral and sectoral agreements;

(4) full implementation of the World Trade Organization’s Trade Facilitation Agreement by Indo-Pacific countries; and

(5) the proactive, strategic, and continuing high-level use of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum, the East Asia Summit, and the Group of 20 to pursue United States economic objectives in the Indo-Pacific region.

SEC. 303. UNITED STATES-ASEAN ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP.

The President should seek to develop to negotiate a comprehensive economic engagement framework with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

SEC. 304. TRADE CAPACITY BUILDING AND TRADE FACILITATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is encouraged to produce a robust and comprehensive trade capacity building and trade facilitation strategy, including leveling the playing field for American companies competing in the Indo-Pacific region.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out subsection (a).

SEC. 305. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President should take steps to strengthen the enforcement of United States intellectual property laws as a top priority, including taking all appropriate action to deter and punish commercial cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for the following 5 years, the President shall submit a report to Congress that—

(1) describes the efforts of the United States Government to combat intellectual property violations and commercial cyber-enabled theft in the Indo-Pacific region, particularly the People’s Republic of China; and

(2) includes a country-by-country assessment of priority areas for United States engagement and capacity building assistance.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the United States Trade Representative such amounts as may be necessary to sponsor bilateral and multilateral activities designed to build capacity in the identified priority areas described in the annual report required under subsection (b).

SEC. 306. ENERGY PROGRAMS AND INITIATIVES.

(a) INDO-PACIFIC ENERGY STRATEGY.—

(1) STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for the following 5 years, the President shall establish a comprehensive, integrated, multiyear strategy to encourage the efforts of Indo-Pacific countries to implement national power strategies and cooperation with United States energy companies and the Department of Energy national laboratories to de-

velop an appropriate mix of power solutions to provide access to sufficient, reliable, and affordable power in order to reduce poverty, drive economic growth and job creation, and to increase energy security in the Indo-Pacific region.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2019 through 2023 to carry out paragraph (1).

(b) RELIABLE ENERGY PARTNERSHIPS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should explore opportunities to partner with the private sector and multilateral institutions, such as the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, to promote universal access to reliable electricity in the Indo-Pacific region, including Myanmar (historically known as “Burma”).

SEC. 307. LOWER MEKONG INITIATIVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, in cooperation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, should increase regional engagement in the areas of environment, health, education, and infrastructure development with the Lower Mekong countries, including—

(1) assisting in the development of programs that focus on forecasting environmental challenges and resilience;

(2) assisting with transnational cooperation on sustainable uses of forest and water resources with the goal of preserving the biodiversity of the Mekong Basin and access to safe drinking water;

(3) assisting with education enrollment and broadband internet connectivity, particularly English training and connectivity in rural communities; and

(4) improving global health in the Lower Mekong countries, including—

(A) reducing the HIV/AIDS infection rate; and

(B) helping regional partners to track and treat malaria and tuberculosis.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through 2023, the Secretary of State, in cooperation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit a report to Congress that includes—

(1) a list and evaluation of Lower Mekong Initiative activities since its inception in 2009;

(2) a strategy for any increased regional engagement and measures of success for the activities described in paragraph (1); and

(3) an accounting of funds used to execute Lower Mekong Initiative activities.

SEC. 308. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION.

It is the sense of Congress that the President should encourage the governments of countries in the Indo-Pacific region and United States private sector interests with operations and investments in the region to deploy agriculture practices that—

(1) conserve natural resources; and

(2) preserve culturally and ecological valuable lands and water bodies.

SEC. 309. SENSE OF CONGRESS IN SUPPORT OF WOMEN’S ECONOMIC RIGHTS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the United States should—

(1) support activities that secure private property rights and land tenure for women in developing countries in Asia, including—

(A) establishing legal frameworks to give women equal rights to own, register, use, profit from, and inherit land and property;

(B) improving legal literacy to enable women to exercise the rights described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) increasing the capacity of law enforcement and community leaders to enforce such rights;

(2) work with Asian civil society, governments, and multilateral organizations to increase the capability of disadvantaged women and girls in Asia—

- (A) to realize their rights;
 - (B) to determine their life outcomes;
 - (C) to assume leadership roles; and
 - (D) to influence decision-making in their households, communities, and societies; and
- (3) seek to expand access to appropriate financial products and services for women-owned micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises in Asia.

TITLE IV—PROMOTING UNITED STATES VALUES IN THE INDO-PACIFIC REGION

SEC. 401. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The promotion of human rights and respect for democratic values in the Indo-Pacific region is in the United States' national security interest.

(2) Continued support for human rights, democratic values, and good governance is critical to a successful United States diplomatic strategy in the Indo-Pacific.

(3) Strong support for human rights and democracy in the Indo-Pacific region is critical to efforts to reduce poverty, build rule of law, combat corruption, reduce the allure of extremism, and promote economic growth.

(4) There are serious concerns with the rule of law and civil liberties in Cambodia, China, North Korea, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam, which have all been identified by Freedom House as "Not Free".

(5) There have been unacceptable human rights developments in—

(A) Burma (Myanmar), which has been identified by Freedom House as "Partly Free", and the Department of State has declared that the violence against the Rohingya constitutes ethnic cleansing;

(B) the Philippines, which has been identified by Freedom House as "Partly Free", and where there are continued disturbing reports of extra-judicial killings; and

(C) China, where forced disappearances, extrajudicial detentions, invasive and omnipresent surveillance, and lack of due process in judicial proceedings remain troublesome.

(6) according to the National Security Strategy, the United States—

(A) will "support, with our words and actions, those who live under oppressive regimes and who seek freedom, individual dignity, and the rule of law";

(B) "may use diplomacy, sanctions, and other tools to isolate states and leaders who threaten our interests and whose actions run contrary to our values"; and

(C) "will support efforts to advance women's equality, protect the rights of women and girls, and promote women and youth empowerment programs".

SEC. 402. TRAFFICKING-IN-PERSONS.

The President is encouraged to pursue additional efforts to combat trafficking in persons and human slavery in the Indo-Pacific region.

SEC. 403. FREEDOM OF THE PRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) United States Government officials should lead by example—

(A) by continuing to advocate for freedom of the press in the Indo-Pacific region; and

(B) by engaging with the press corps at every appropriate opportunity; and

(2) the United States should advocate and support a Ministerial to Advance Press Freedom in the Indo-Pacific to convene government and civil society, including journalists, to discuss and address the challenges facing press freedom in the Indo-Pacific region.

SEC. 404. DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND LABOR PERSONNEL.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) United States embassies and consulates in the Indo-Pacific region should have personnel, as appropriate, who are dedicated to reporting on and advancing United States democracy, human rights, labor, anti-corruption, and good governance policy interests; and

(2) appropriate resources should be made available to carry out such activities.

SEC. 405. BILATERAL AND REGIONAL DIALOGUES; PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE ENGAGEMENT.

The Secretary of State should, as appropriate—

(1) establish high-level bilateral and regional dialogues with nations in the Indo-Pacific region regarding human rights and religious freedom violations;

(2) establish or support robust, people-to-people exchange programs in the Indo-Pacific region, particularly programs engaging young leaders; and

(3) establish educational exchanges and capacity-building programs emphasizing civil society development.

SEC. 406. ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS STRATEGY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should continue to work with ASEAN to improve the capacity of ASEAN to address human rights, democracy, and good governance issues in Southeast Asia.

(b) STRATEGY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, after consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit a strategy to the appropriate congressional committees to increase cooperation with ASEAN to promote human rights, democracy, and good governance in Southeast Asia.

(c) CONTENTS.—The strategy submitted under subsection (b) should include—

(1) an assessment of the types of United States Government resources available to support increased cooperation; and

(2) an assessment to identify entities within ASEAN that the United States could potentially support or partner with to promote human rights, democracy, and good governance in Southeast Asia.

SEC. 407. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION TO NORTH KOREA.

The President is encouraged to continue efforts to enhance freedom of information access with regard to North Korea.

SEC. 408. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS AND SUSPENSION OF UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE.

(a) SANCTIONS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should impose targeted financial penalties and visa ban sanctions, in accordance with applicable law and other relevant authorities, on any individual or entity that—

(1) violates human rights or religious freedoms; or

(2) engages in censorship activities.

(b) SUSPENSION OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should, in accordance with applicable law, terminate, suspend, or otherwise alter United States economic assistance to any country that has engaged in serious violations of human rights or religious freedoms.

SEC. 409. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) PROMOTION OF DEMOCRACY IN THE INDO-PACIFIC REGION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$210,000,000, for each of the fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to promote democracy, strengthen civil society, human rights, rule of law, transparency, and accountability in the Indo-Pacific region, including for universities, civil society, and multilateral institutions that are focusing

on education awareness, training, and capacity building.

(2) DEMOCRACY IN CHINA.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be made available for United States Government efforts, led by the Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, to promote democracy, the rule of law, and human rights in the People's Republic of China.

(3) TIBET.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be made available for nongovernmental organizations to support activities preserving cultural traditions and promoting sustainable development, education, and environmental conservation in Tibetan communities in the Tibet Autonomous Region and in other Tibetan communities in China, India, and Nepal.

SEC. 410. INDO-PACIFIC HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDERS.

(a) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term "human rights defenders" means individuals, working alone or in groups, who nonviolently advocate for the promotion and protection of universally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms if the advocacy of such issues may result in the risk of safety or life.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that human rights defenders in the Indo-Pacific region have been facing increased difficulties with the rise of unprecedented crackdowns and conflicts.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2019 through 2023 to provide critical assistance to human rights defenders through the Department of State's Human Rights Defenders Fund.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through 2023, the Secretary of State, in cooperation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit a report to Congress that includes—

(1) a list and evaluation of the Human Rights Defenders Fund activities since its inception;

(2) a strategy for any increased regional engagement and measures of success for the activities described in paragraph (1); and

(3) an accounting of funds used to execute the Human Rights Defender Fund activities.

SEC. 411. YOUNG LEADERS PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE INITIATIVES.

There are authorized to be appropriated \$25,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2019 through 2023 to support Indo-Pacific young leaders initiatives, including the Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative, the ASEAN Youth Volunteers Program, and other people-to-people exchange programs that focus on building the capacity of democracy, human rights, and good governance activists in the Indo-Pacific region.

SEC. 412. SAVINGS PROVISION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed as authorizing the use of military force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Indo-Pacific region is of critical importance to the United States. It is home to some of our most urgent security challenges, our closest people-to-people links, and our strongest commercial and economic ties. The administration has recognized this priority in both the National Security Strategy document and the subsequent free and open Indo-Pacific strategy.

The United States must adapt to new and emerging geostrategic realities and recognize the competitive nature of our relationship with China. The Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018, or ARIA, is a key component of this effort. It provides the administration with the direction and resources it needs for meaningful implementation of this free and open Indo-Pacific-Asia strategy.

ARIA cements U.S. leadership in the Indo-Pacific region by reassuring our allies and deterring our adversaries. It strengthens our security commitments with our allies and builds the capacity of our many partners in the region to combat terrorism and to stop aggressive actors.

The bill reaffirms longstanding treaty alliances in Asia with Australia, South Korea, and Japan, and it calls for building new regional security partnerships. It also expresses unequivocal support for Taiwan by authorizing new arms sales; supporting enhanced, high-level contacts with Taipei; and countering any efforts to forcibly change the status quo in the Taiwan Strait.

On security, ARIA commits the U.S. Government to the full implementation of sanctions on North Korea and its enablers. It enshrines a policy of regularly enforcing U.S. freedom of navigation and overflight rights in the East and South China Seas, where we are seeing increasingly aggressive activities by Chinese ships and aircraft.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, this bill also supports robust U.S. commercial presence in the region. It promotes U.S. exports and trade facilitation efforts, while also authorizing penalties against those who steal United States' intellectual property. This is essential for the growth of the U.S. economy and the success of American businesses operating in the region.

Unfortunately, there are also many challenges to human rights, non-proliferation, and democratic values in the Indo-Pacific. For that reason, this bill bolsters the critical work of the State Department and USAID to promote democracy, strong civil society, and the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased that we are taking up this bill, which earned unanimous bipartisan support in the

Senate. The Asia Reassurance Initiative Act demonstrates the strong, continuing commitment of the United States to Asia. It reaffirms American values, strengthens American commitments to our many partners and allies in the region, and makes clear our enduring pursuit of peace and mutual prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. The Asia Reassurance Initiative is an extremely important and timely piece of legislation. I am glad that we will be able to bring it forward today in a bipartisan manner. And that is no small feat. This legislation is so comprehensive and far reaching, it was referred to six different committees.

I cannot overstate the strategic importance of this bill before us today. In Washington, we all too often focus on immediate crises and fail to focus on the broader but slower moving challenges of our time. This legislation focuses on that bigger strategic picture.

Over the next 100 years, the most significant issue facing American foreign policy will be the rise of the Indo-Pacific. The region will be the most significant driver of economic and demographic growth. Its environmental policies will have immense impact on global health and climate change, and China's rise will have extraordinary geopolitical implications for the future of American leadership in the world.

The Asia Reassurance Initiative Act is an important piece of legislation in directing Congress' attention to its vital foreign policy. The bill states that the United States will develop and commit to a long-term, comprehensive strategic policy for the Indo-Pacific region that secures our and our allies' interests; advances American influence, including through the promotion of human rights; and supports the rule of law and international norms.

This bill also authorizes \$1.5 billion in funds to State and USAID, so we can start to put our money where our mouth is on this Indo-Pacific policy.

Passing this legislation is critical, especially at this time, as China's assertive behavior in the Asia region threatens the regional balance of power—as this administration takes unorthodox positions and chooses to carry them out in ways that are of concern—and as much of the world sees the United States in retreat from the international stage, this bill sends a clear and resounding message to the region: American commitment remains steadfast.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this measure and urge all Members to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as we approve this Asia Reassurance Initiative Act, it is also very important that we provide reassurance to Americans that our values are not being abandoned. With one deranged tweet after another, many people, both here and in Asia, view the United States as having lost its way.

As approved by the Senate, this particular resolution responds very appropriately to the vacillation and confusion of the Trump administration's foreign policy, including its trade agenda.

In today's important House amendment to section 302 of the bill, we commit not only to support continued engagement and friendship in the Asia-Pacific region, but to advance, through our trade negotiations, the values for which America has long been recognized as a beacon of hope to the world. That is a beacon that should leave no corner of this globe, including Asia, in the dark, and it must include human rights as a universal concept for all the people of the world.

Our economic relations must be rooted in our shared values, our respect for human rights, and our adherence to the rule of law. It takes more than simply an opportunity to have more exports to justify a new agreement with a trading partner.

A previous administration looked the other way on Malaysian human trafficking in pursuit of more commerce, and it found itself in this House short of votes. We must not make that mistake again.

With this new, improved section 302, Congress rejects support for just any trade agreement and indicates its support for those agreements with partners that actually respect, promote, and adhere to the rule of law.

By its very terms, when section 302, as amended, is tied with title IV as it came over from the Senate, we would not, for example, be justified in new trade agreements with Myanmar, formerly Burma, after its murderous ethnic cleansing of its Rohingya population. Nor does it offer any support to the Trump administration's July 26 declaration of intent to reward the tyrant of the Philippines, Rodrigo Duterte.

Every Democratic member of the House Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee, on which I serve, has advised this administration that “we strongly oppose President Duterte's Philippines as a trade agreement partner.”

All of us noted that “Duterte's fiery rhetoric has been linked to a surge of extrajudicial killings of citizens by police and gunmen.”

Duterte's shocking human rights abuses is not all. Child labor is persistent and serious. Safety is not prioritized, as indicated by the 72 workers who were killed in a garment factory fire.

These anti-worker policies mean that the Philippines is a low-wage country

that markets itself to American companies looking to further outsource American jobs. Yet Duterte's rule has been marked by abusive, arbitrary actions against international investors who have turned to the Philippines.

We all said on the Trade Subcommittee that "we strongly oppose Duterte as a trade partner," and I hope the Administration is listening.

Though Trump's hug-a-thug approach around the world has repeatedly preferred foreign tyrants over dependable, long-term American allies, I believe that human rights is not a luxury. It is central to American values. It is central to the security of every American family.

Amending this bill today helps us to achieve that objective and to send a strong message to the administration about the trade policies that we will consider in the coming year.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I will close because there are no other speakers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to again express my same strong support for the bill before us today. The Asia Reassurance Initiative Act is an important piece of legislation. It articulates a bipartisan policy towards the Indo-Pacific, authorizes funding to support American engagement in the region, highlights the importance of coordinating our development, diplomacy, and security interests to create effective foreign policy, and it sends a message to Asia and the world that the United States is investing in our allies and our strategic priorities.

I hope all Members will join me in supporting this bill.

Before I yield the balance of my time, I know I said this the other day, but it looks like it is really coming true now: This may be the last time those of us in the Foreign Affairs Committee get to speak on the House floor for this Congress, and since my good friend and partner, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, the gentlewoman from Florida, is here, I want to just say, for everyone to know, what a pleasure it has been to be by her side for all these years and work closely with her on so many important pieces of legislation that I lost count years ago.

But one of the things with ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, you can always count on her to work hard, to do the right thing, to be on the right side. It is really just a pleasure to be her colleague and an even bigger pleasure to be her friend.

So I hope she will come back and visit us. If not, I am going to Florida to visit her. And I will always cherish the gentlewoman's wonderful tenure in the House of Representatives and particularly on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee, under the leadership of

Chairman ROYCE, who also has been as bipartisan as you can get, has done a lot of work this year, this Congress. I am really proud of the work that we have done in this Congress, and I look forward to doing even more work in the next Congress.

So I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must continue to reassure the nations of the Asia-Pacific region of the enduring commitment of the United States to being a peaceful presence in the region, dedicated to universal values and mutual prosperity.

Senate bill 2736 provides the United States with a long-term and whole-of-government strategy for the Indo-Pacific region that advances American national security interests, prosperity, and promotes the values of freedom and human rights. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this measure.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, soon to be the chairman of our committee, for his friendship and for his kind words. I look forward to treating him to a nice cafe con leche in Miami. So come on down—the weather is fine—rather than me going to New York.

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 Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2736, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING IRAN'S STATE-SPONSORED PERSECUTION OF ITS BAHAI MINORITY

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 274) condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 274

Whereas in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2013,

2015, and 2016, Congress declared that it deplored the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha'i community and would hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, including members of the Baha'i Faith;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2016 Annual Report states—

(1) "The Baha'i community, the largest non-Muslim religious minority in Iran, long has been subject to particularly severe religious freedom violations. The government views Baha'is, who number at least 300,000, as 'heretics' and consequently they face repression on the grounds of apostasy.'";

(2) "Since 1979, authorities have killed or executed more than 200 Baha'i leaders, and more than 10,000 have been dismissed from government and university jobs.'"; and

(3) "Over the past 10 years, approximately 850 Baha'is have been arbitrarily arrested.'";

Whereas the Department of State 2015 International Religious Freedom Report states—

(1) religious minorities in Iran "continued to face societal discrimination, especially the Baha'i community, which reported continuing problems at different levels of society, including personal harassment.'";

(2) the Government of Iran "continued to prohibit Bahais from officially assembling or maintaining administrative institutions, actively closed such institutions, harassed Bahais, and disregarded their property rights.'";

(3) in Iran, "Bahai blood may be spilled with impunity, and Bahai families are not entitled to restitution" and "Bahais cannot receive compensation for injury or crimes committed against them and cannot inherit property.'";

(4) the Government of Iran "requires universities to exclude Bahais from access to higher education or expel them if their religious affiliation becomes known.'"; and

(5) in Iran, "Bahais are banned from government employment" and "[t]here were reports of non-Bahais being pressured to refuse employment to Bahais or dismissing Bahais from their private sector jobs.'";

Whereas, on June 8, 2016, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran and the United Nations Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief issued a joint statement condemning the "wave of incitement of hatred of the Baha'i community reflected in speeches made by religious, judiciary and political officials in the Islamic Republic of Iran";

Whereas, on September 6, 2016, the United Nations Secretary-General issued a report on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran (A/71/374), which stated that "human rights violations have continued at an alarming rate";

Whereas, on December 17, 2016, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution (A/RES/70/179), which "[e]xpress[ed] serious concern about ongoing severe limitations and restrictions on the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief and restrictions on the establishment of places of worship, as well as attacks against places of worship and burial, as well as other human rights violations, including but not limited to harassment, persecution and incitement to hatred that lead to violence against persons belonging to recognized and unrecognized religious minorities, including Christians, Jews, Sufi Muslims, Sunni Muslims, Zoroastrians and members of the Baha'i Faith and their defenders";

Whereas since May 2008, the Government of Iran has imprisoned the 7 members of the former ad hoc leadership group of the Baha'i community in Iran, known as the Yaran-i-

Iran, or “friends of Iran”—Mrs. Fariba Kamalabadi, Mr. Jamaloddin Khanjani, Mr. Afif Naeimi, Mr. Saeid Rezaie, Mr. Behrouz Tavakkoli, Mrs. Mahvash Sabet, and Mr. Vahid Tizfahm—and these individuals were convicted of charges including “spying for Israel, insulting religious sanctities, propaganda against the regime and spreading corruption on earth” and sentenced to 20-year prison terms, the longest sentences given to any prisoner of conscience in Iran at that time, now reportedly reduced to 10 years;

Whereas beginning in May 2011, officials of the Government of Iran in 4 cities conducted sweeping raids on the homes of dozens of individuals associated with the Baha’i Institute for Higher Education (referred to in this Resolution as “BIHE”) and arrested and detained several educators associated with BIHE, with 16 BIHE educators ultimately sentenced to 4- or 5-year prison terms, 7 of whom remain in prison;

Whereas scores of Baha’i cemeteries have been attacked, and in 2014, Revolutionary Guards began excavating a Baha’i cemetery in Shiraz, which is the site of 950 graves, and built a cultural and sport center on the cemetery site;

Whereas the Baha’i International Community reported that there has been a recent surge in anti-Baha’i hate propaganda in Iranian state-sponsored media outlets, noting that—

(1) in 2010 and 2011, approximately 22 anti-Baha’i articles were appearing every month;

(2) in 2014, the number of anti-Baha’i articles rose to approximately 400 per month; and

(3) by 2016, the number of anti-Baha’i articles rose to approximately 1,500 per month;

Whereas there are currently 90 Baha’is in prison in Iran;

Whereas the Government of Iran is party to the International Covenants on Human Rights and is in violation of its obligations under such Covenants;

Whereas section 105 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8514) authorizes the President to impose sanctions on individuals “responsible for or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Iran or their family members on or after June 12, 2009”; and

Whereas the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-158) amends and expands the authorities established under the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-195) to sanction Iranian human rights abusers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the Government of Iran’s state-sponsored persecution of its Baha’i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights;

(2) calls on the Government of Iran to immediately release the 7 imprisoned Baha’i leaders, the 7 imprisoned Baha’i educators, and all other prisoners held solely on account of their religion;

(3) calls on the President and the Secretary of State, in cooperation with responsible nations, to immediately condemn the Government of Iran’s continued violation of human rights and demand the immediate release of prisoners held solely on account of their religion; and

(4) urges the President and the Secretary of State to utilize available authorities to impose sanctions on officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals directly responsible for serious human rights abuses,

including abuses against the Baha’i community of Iran.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ROS-LEHTINEN OF FLORIDA

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the text at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the Government of Iran’s state-sponsored persecution of its Baha’i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights;

(2) calls on the Government of Iran to immediately release the imprisoned Baha’i leader, the 4 imprisoned Baha’i educators, and all other prisoners held solely on account of their religion;

(3) calls on the President and the Secretary of State, in cooperation with responsible nations, to immediately condemn the Government of Iran’s continued violation of human rights and demand the immediate release of prisoners held solely on account of their religion; and

(4) urges the President and the Secretary of State to utilize available authorities to impose sanctions on officials of the Government of Iran and other individuals directly responsible for serious human rights abuses, including abuses against the Baha’i community of Iran.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MS. ROS-LEHTINEN OF FLORIDA

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2013, 2015, and 2016, Congress declared that it deplored the religious persecution by the Government of Iran of the Baha’i community and would hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all Iranian nationals, including members of the Baha’i Faith;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom 2016 Annual Report states—

(1) “The Baha’i community, the largest non-Muslim religious minority in Iran, long has been subject to particularly severe religious freedom violations. The government views Baha’is, who number at least 300,000, as ‘heretics’ and consequently they face repression on the grounds of apostasy.”;

(2) “Since 1979, authorities have killed or executed more than 200 Baha’i leaders, and more than 10,000 have been dismissed from government and university jobs.”; and

(3) “Over the past 10 years, approximately 850 Baha’is have been arbitrarily arrested.”;

Whereas the Department of State 2015 International Religious Freedom Report states—

(1) religious minorities in Iran “continued to face societal discrimination, especially the Baha’i community, which reported continuing problems at different levels of society, including personal harassment.”;

(2) the Government of Iran “continued to prohibit Bahais from officially assembling or maintaining administrative institutions, actively closed such institutions, harassed Bahais, and disregarded their property rights.”;

(3) in Iran, “Baha’i blood may be spilled with impunity, and Baha’i families are not entitled to restitution” and “Bahais cannot receive compensation for injury or crimes committed against them and cannot inherit property.”;

(4) the Government of Iran “requires universities to exclude Bahais from access to higher education or expel them if their religious affiliation becomes known.”; and

(5) in Iran, “Bahais are banned from government employment” and “[t]here were reports of non-Bahais being pressured to refuse employment to Bahais or dismissing Bahais from their private sector jobs.”;

Whereas, on June 8, 2016, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran and the United Nations Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief issued a joint statement condemning the “wave of incitement of hatred of the Baha’i community reflected in speeches made by religious, judiciary and political officials in the Islamic Republic of Iran”;

Whereas, on September 6, 2016, the United Nations Secretary-General issued a report on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran (A/71/374), which stated that “human rights violations have continued at an alarming rate”;

Whereas, on December 19, 2016, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution (A/RES/71/204), which “[e]xpress[ed] serious concern about ongoing severe limitations and restrictions on the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief and restrictions on the establishment of places of worship, as well as attacks against places of worship and burial, as well as other human rights violations, including but not limited to harassment, persecution and incitement to hatred that lead to violence against persons belonging to recognized and unrecognized religious minorities, including Christians, Jews, Sufi Muslims, Sunni Muslims, Zoroastrians and members of the Baha’i Faith and their defenders”;

Whereas in May 2008, the Government of Iran imprisoned the 7 members of the former ad hoc leadership group of the Baha’i community in Iran, known as the Yaran-i-Iran, or “friends of Iran”—Mrs. Fariba Kamalabadi, Mr. Jamaloddin Khanjani, Mr. Afif Naeimi, Mr. Saeid Rezaie, Mr. Behrouz Tavakkoli, Mrs. Mahvash Sabet, and Mr. Vahid Tizfahm—and these individuals were convicted of charges including “spying for Israel, insulting religious sanctities, propaganda against the regime and spreading corruption on earth” and sentenced to 20-year prison terms, the longest sentences given to any prisoner of conscience in Iran at that time and one remains imprisoned;

Whereas beginning in May 2011, officials of the Government of Iran in 4 cities conducted sweeping raids on the homes of dozens of individuals associated with the Baha’i Institute for Higher Education (referred to in this Resolution as “BIHE”) and arrested and detained several educators associated with BIHE, with 16 BIHE educators ultimately sentenced to 4- or 5-year prison terms, 4 of whom remain in prison;

Whereas scores of Baha’i cemeteries have been attacked, and in 2014, Revolutionary Guards began excavating a Baha’i cemetery in Shiraz, which is the site of 950 graves, and

built a cultural and sport center on the cemetery site;

Whereas the Baha'i International Community reported that there has been a recent surge in anti-Baha'i hate propaganda in Iranian state-sponsored media outlets, noting that—

(1) in 2010 and 2011, approximately 22 anti-Baha'i articles were appearing every month;

(2) in 2014, the number of anti-Baha'i articles rose to approximately 400 per month; and

(3) by 2016, the number of anti-Baha'i articles rose to approximately 1,500 per month;

Whereas there are currently 82 Baha'is in prison in Iran;

Whereas the Government of Iran is party to the International Covenants on Human Rights and is in violation of its obligations under such Covenants;

Whereas section 105 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8514) authorizes the President to impose sanctions on individuals "responsible for or complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing, the commission of serious human rights abuses against citizens of Iran or their family members on or after June 12, 2009"; and

Whereas the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-158) amends and expands the authorities established under the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-195) to sanction Iranian human rights abusers: Now, therefore, be it

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGIA SUPPORT ACT

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6219) to support the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Georgia, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6219

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Georgia Support Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.

Sec. 2. United States policy.

TITLE I—ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. United States-Georgia security assistance.

Sec. 102. United States cybersecurity cooperation with Georgia.

Sec. 103. Enhanced assistance to combat Russian disinformation and propaganda.

Sec. 104. Sense of Congress on free trade agreement with Georgia.

TITLE II—SANCTIONS PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Imposition of sanctions on persons complicit in or responsible for serious human rights abuses, including right to life in Georgian regions of Abkhazia and Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia occupied by Russia.

SEC. 2. UNITED STATES POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) support Georgia's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity within its internationally recognized borders;

(2) support the right of the people of Georgia to freely determine their future and make independent and sovereign choices on foreign and security policy, including regarding their country's relationship with other nations and international organizations, without interference, intimidation, or coercion by other countries;

(3) support Georgia's Euro-Atlantic and European integration;

(4) not recognize territorial changes effected by force, including the illegal invasions and occupations of Georgian regions of Abkhazia and Tskhinvali Region/South Ossetia by the Russian Federation;

(5) condemn ongoing detentions, kidnappings, and other human rights violations committed in the Georgian regions of Abkhazia and Tskhinvali Region/South Ossetia forcibly occupied by the Russian Federation, including the recent killings of Georgian citizens Archil Tatunashvili, Giga Otkhozoria, and Davit Bashariuli;

(6) support peaceful conflict resolution in Georgia, including by urging the Russian Federation to fully implement the European Union-mediated ceasefire agreement of August 12, 2008, and supporting the establishment of international security mechanisms in the Georgian regions of Abkhazia and Tskhinvali region/South Ossetia and the safe and dignified return of internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees, all of which are important for lasting peace and security on the ground; and

(7) support continued development of democratic values in Georgia, including public sector transparency and accountability, as well as anticorruption efforts.

TITLE I—ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. UNITED STATES-GEORGIA SECURITY ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In fiscal year 2018, the United States provided Georgia with \$2,200,000 in assistance under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2347 et seq.; relating to international military education and training) and \$35,000,000 in assistance under section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2763; relating to the Foreign Military Financing Program).

(2) Georgia has been a longstanding NATO-aspirant country.

(3) Georgia has contributed substantially to the Euro-Atlantic peace and security through participation in the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) and Resolute Support Missions in Afghanistan as one of the largest troop contributors.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that United States assistance to Georgia under chapter 5 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act should be increased.

(c) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States, in consultation with the Government of Georgia, to enhance Georgia's deterrence, resilience, and self-defense, including through appropriate assistance to improve the capabilities of Georgia's armed forces.

(d) REVIEW OF SECURITY ASSISTANCE TO GEORGIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate United States departments and agencies, shall submit to Congress a report reviewing United States security assistance to the Government of Georgia.

(2) COMPONENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed review of all United States security assistance programs to the Government of Georgia from fiscal year 2008 to the present.

(B) An assessment of threats to Georgian independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity.

(C) An assessment of Georgia's capabilities to defend itself, including a five-year strategy to enhance the country's deterrence, resilience, and self-defense capabilities.

(3) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 102. UNITED STATES CYBERSECURITY COOPERATION WITH GEORGIA.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should take the following actions, commensurate with United States interests, to assist Georgia to improve its cybersecurity:

(1) Provide Georgia such support as may be necessary to secure government computer networks from malicious cyber intrusions, particularly such networks that defend the critical infrastructure of Georgia.

(2) Provide Georgia support in reducing reliance on Russian information and communications technology.

(3) Assist Georgia to build its capacity, expand cybersecurity information sharing, and cooperate on international cyberspace efforts.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on United States cybersecurity cooperation with Georgia. Such report shall also include information relating to the following:

(1) United States efforts to strengthen Georgia's ability to prevent, mitigate, and respond to cyber incidents, including through training, education, technical assistance, capacity building, and cybersecurity risk management strategies.

(2) The potential for new areas of collaboration and mutual assistance between the United States and Georgia in addressing shared cyber challenges, including cybercrime, critical infrastructure protection, and resilience against automated, distributed threats.

(3) NATO's efforts to help Georgia develop technical capabilities to counter cyber threats.

SEC. 103. ENHANCED ASSISTANCE TO COMBAT RUSSIAN DISINFORMATION AND PROPAGANDA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the United States to enhance the capabilities of Georgia to combat Russian disinformation and propaganda campaigns intended to undermine the sovereignty and democratic institutions of the country, while promoting the freedom of the press.

(b) REQUIRED STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the heads of other appropriate United States departments and agencies, shall submit to Congress a report outlining a strategy to implement the policy described in subsection (a).

(2) COMPONENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A detailed assessment of Russian disinformation and propaganda efforts across all media platforms targeting Georgia.

(B) An assessment of the Government of Georgia's capabilities to deter and combat such Russian efforts and to support the freedom of the press.

(C) A detailed strategy coordinated across all relevant United States departments and agencies to enhance the Government of Georgia's capabilities to deter and combat such Russian efforts.

(3) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 104. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FREE TRADE AGREEMENT WITH GEORGIA.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States Trade Representative should make progress toward negotiations with the Government of Georgia to enter a bilateral free trade agreement with Georgia.

TITLE II—SANCTIONS PROVISIONS**SEC. 201. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS ON PERSONS COMPLICIT IN OR RESPONSIBLE FOR SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES, INCLUDING RIGHT TO LIFE IN GEORGIAN REGIONS OF ABKHAZIA AND TSKHINVALI REGION/SOUTH OSSETIA OCCUPIED BY RUSSIA.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose with respect to a foreign person the sanctions described in subsection (b) if the President determines, based on credible information, that such foreign person, on or after the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) is responsible for, complicit in, or responsible for ordering, controlling, or otherwise directing the commission of serious human rights abuses in Georgian regions of Abkhazia and Tskhinvali Region/South Ossetia forcibly occupied by the Russian Federation;

(2) is materially assisting, sponsoring, or providing significant financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to, a foreign person described in paragraph (1); or

(3) is owned or controlled by a foreign person, or is acting on behalf of a foreign person described in paragraph (1).

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) ASSET BLOCKING.—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a person determined by the President to be a person described in subsection (a) 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, including by taking any of the actions described in paragraph (1) of section 203(a) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1702(a)) with respect to regions of Abkhazia and Tskhinvali Region/South Ossetia forcibly occupied by the Russian Federation.

(2) EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an alien determined by the President to be a person described in subsection (a), denial of a visa to, and exclusion from the United States of, such alien, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of such alien.

(B) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT AND LAW ENFORCEMENT OBJECTIVES.—Sanctions under subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an individual if admitting the individual into the United States would further important law enforcement objectives or is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations of the United States.

(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under subsection (b) with respect to a person if the President determines that such a waiver is important to the national interests of the United States.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.—

(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out subsection (b)(1).

(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 such subsection shall be subject to the penalties specified 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 such section.

(e) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and at least once every 180 days thereafter for a period not to exceed two years, the President, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall transmit to Congress a detailed report with respect to persons that have been determined to have engaged in activities described in subsection (a).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1445

PERMISSION TO INCLUDE EXCHANGE OF LETTERS ON H.R. 6219

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include in the RECORD an exchange of letters with the other committees of jurisdiction on H.R. 6219.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an exchange of letters.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

Washington, DC, December 12, 2018.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing with respect to H.R. 6219, a bill "To support the

independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Georgia, and for other purposes," on which the Committee on Ways and Means was granted an additional referral.

As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 6219 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I agree to waive formal consideration of this bill so that it may move expeditiously to the floor. The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 6219.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, December 12, 2018.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 6219, the Georgia Support Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this measure or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 6219 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, December 12, 2018.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee and agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 6219, the Georgia Support Act, so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of your committee, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this measure or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your committee to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 6219 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work together as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 6219.

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

There was no objection.

REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROMOTE FREE, FAIR, TRANSPARENT AND CREDIBLE ELECTIONS IN BANGLADESH

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H. Res. 1169, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1169

Whereas Bangladesh achieved independence in 1971 and established a secular democratic state, which is home to Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists, Christians, and atheists;

Whereas Bangladesh is the eighth most populous country with nearly 160,000,000 people;

Whereas according to the United States Agency for International Development maternal and child mortality rates in Bangladesh have declined by more than 60 percent, production of rice has tripled, and growth in gross domestic product has averaged more than 6 percent annually for over a decade;

Whereas Bangladesh has fulfilled the criteria to initiate graduation from the United Nations "Least Developed Country" status and could become a middle-income country within the next 3 years;

Whereas in 2017, the generous people of Bangladesh welcomed more than 700,000 Rohingya refugees following the Burmese military and security force's crimes against humanity and genocide against the Rohingya in Northern Rakhine State;

Whereas in recent years, Bangladesh's democratic system has faced challenges, including political violence, environmental strain, Islamist militancy, a refugee crisis, and challenges to freedom of speech and press;

Whereas free, fair, transparent, and credible elections are the cornerstone of every democracy;

Whereas legitimate elections that respect fundamental freedoms are characterized by transparency, accountability, security, and accessibility for all voters;

Whereas strong democracies worldwide make for better trading partners, provide new market opportunities, improve global health outcomes, and promote economic freedom and regional security;

Whereas attacks on democracy and democratic institutions undermine the sacrifices of the Bangladeshi people and the country's commitment to human rights and the rule of law;

Whereas one of Bangladesh's main political parties boycotted the 2014 general election due to concerns about the impartiality of the electoral process;

Whereas Bangladesh is scheduled to hold general elections on December 30, 2018;

Whereas democratic stability, regional security, and economic prosperity in Bangladesh and South Asia are vital to the national security interests of the United States;

Whereas the United States-Bangladesh relationship is built on a foundation of shared values and cooperation on issues including economic growth and development, labor rights, peacekeeping, counterterrorism, and the environment and climate;

Whereas the United States should more actively engage with the Government of Bangladesh with respect to their shared interests in safeguarding human rights, religious freedom, and secular democracy in Bangladesh, while preventing the growth of religious extremism and militancy; and

Whereas repeated attacks on religious minorities, expanding religious intolerance, and growing destabilization caused by radical groups undermine United States economic and strategic interests in Bangladesh: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to promote free, fair, transparent and credible elections in Bangladesh;

(2) calls on the Government of Bangladesh to respect the freedom of speech and of the press and to heed the Bangladesh Election Commission's request to ensure security for minorities and maintain communal harmony for a peaceful election;

(3) urges political leaders and judicial authorities in Bangladesh to respect the will of voters and ensure that all Bangladeshis will be able to participate freely in the upcoming elections, and that the elections will be impartial and inclusive; and

(4) commends the government and people of Bangladesh for their generosity in hosting Rohingya refugees despite the hardships associated with responding to this man-made humanitarian disaster created by the Burmese military and security force's crimes against humanity and genocide against the Rohingya in Northern Rakhine State.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2, AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1176, I call up

the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purpose, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1176, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 10, 2018, Book II at page H9823.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 2, the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018.

It is fitting that the House today consider that farm bill because, 28 years ago, another proud Texan, President George H.W. Bush, signed into law the 1990 farm bill.

For the first time since 1990, Congress is poised to pass a new farm bill in the same year that the legislation was first introduced.

In many ways, the 1990 farm bill laid the groundwork for today's U.S. farm policy. The U.S. farm policy is no longer the old command and control policies of the New Deal, but, rather, a market-oriented, risk management approach that helps America's farmers and ranchers survive natural disasters and the predatory trade practices of foreign countries like China.

Our Nation's farmers and ranchers are the very best in the world, but they cannot compete alone against a sea of high and rising foreign subsidies, tariffs, and nontariff trade barriers, nor can they survive alone in the face of record droughts, hurricanes, wildfires, and other natural disasters. That is why we have a farm bill.

Mr. Speaker, not since the early 2000s has a farm bill been more desperately needed than it is today. Our farmers and ranchers are going through a very difficult recession right now. Net farm income is down 50 percent from where it stood just 5 years ago, the largest drop since the Great Depression. And farm bankruptcies are more up by more than 30 percent.

We have all seen the devastation of recent wildfires and hurricanes. Less noticed, but no less destructive, is the severe drought that has gripped many parts of the country, perhaps none more so than the one I get to represent.

Even less noticed is the rampant cheating going on in the global trade that hurts our farmers and ranchers every single day. China recently oversubsidized just three crops by more than \$100 billion in a single year.

Put in perspective, China spent more on excess illegal subsidies in a year than the entire U.S. safety net covering all commodities will cost in roughly two farm bills. That is why passage of this farm bill is so important.

The farm bill is never easy to pass. The needs of our farmers and ranchers are greater than they have ever been in a long time, but we have operated under a flat budget.

For my colleagues who are concerned about the deficit spending, please note that this farm bill is budget neutral. This follows on the heels of the 2014 farm bill that has come in significantly under budget also.

Mr. Speaker, here are some specifics of the 2018 farm bill:

First, the farm bill honors the request of nearly every farmer and rancher that we do no harm to Federal crop insurance.

Second, we strengthen the farm bill safety net for all farmers and ranchers. Believe it or not, there was actually pressure from some in the other Chamber to cut the farm safety net at a time when the whole point of a farm bill is to help our farm and ranch families.

Third, we strengthened key conservation initiatives, especially the Environmental Quality Incentives Program. These highly successful conservation initiatives serve as a prime example of how voluntary, incentive-based conservation beats burdensome, arbitrary, and costly Washington regulations every single time.

Fourth, we honored the requests of farmers and ranchers to fully fund our trade promotion initiatives, which could not be more important than they are right now. This includes fully funding the Market Access Program and the Foreign Market Development Program.

We also succeeded in maintaining the vital link between America's farmers and ranchers and U.S. food aid by preserving the in-kind food assistance to our neighbors in need from around the world.

Fifth, we make some extremely important investments elsewhere in this farm bill: We increase individual Farm Service Agency loan limits, which have not been updated in 16 years; we increase agriculture research funding at a time when we are dangerously lagging behind China.

We also provide Secretary Perdue with the tools he requested to effectively combat the opioid epidemic and also to expand high-quality broadband service in all of rural America.

We increase investment in new crop uses and in specialty crops, including fruits and vegetables, and we increase investments in the Nation's livestock sector by strengthening our Nation's animal disease prevention and management efforts, including the stockpiling of foot-and-mouth disease vaccine.

Finally, it is fair to say that there has been philosophical differences in this conference committee. Achieving

commonsense SNAP reforms, preventing wildfires, and providing regulatory relief are just three of the examples.

Despite this, we made commonsense reforms and improved the program integrity and work requirements under SNAP, including involving Governors in the work requirement waivers so that there is political accountability and by reducing State allowances for able-bodied adults without dependents.

We required States to adopt case management practices to help move SNAP beneficiaries from welfare to work, and we eliminate \$480 million in bonuses we pay to States for simply doing their jobs. These and other reforms will build on the success we have had in moving more than 9 million people off of SNAP rolls and into the workforce over the past 5 years.

The farm bill will also reduce the forest fuel loads to reduce the incidence and intensity of wildfires. This is achieved by expanding the insect and disease categorical exclusion to remove hazardous fuel loads and empowering State, local, and Tribal authorities to remove timber.

Nobody deserves more credit for working to improve our Nation's forest management than my friend BRUCE WESTERMAN from Arkansas, whom I am proud to have as a signatory on this conference report.

These reforms are important, and they are only a start in what we need to be done. Ultimately, we had to make a decision between making as many inroads on reform in these areas as we could or allow farmers and ranchers to be held hostage. Faced with that choice, I chose the route of getting this farm bill done.

We made important inroads wherever we could on these reforms. We worked to provide the strongest safety net possible for our Nation's farmers and ranchers.

In closing, I thank Ranking Member PETERSON and our counterparts in the other Chamber for bringing this conference report to final consideration. I extend my sincere gratitude to President Trump and Secretary Perdue for their unwavering support of our farmers and ranchers, and I greatly appreciate the support and hard work of House leadership and members of my Conference, especially my fellow conferees, for all they have done to stand by rural America and those families who feed and clothe us.

For the sake of rural America and our struggling farmers and ranchers, I urge my colleagues to support this farm bill so the President can sign this measure into law.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 2, the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018. The conference report we are considering today would reauthorize farm bill programs for 5 years.

The 2014 farm bill expired on September 30, and while the road to get here has had a few bumps along the way, I am glad that we are finally able to reach an agreement, and now it is time to get this done.

During a time when rural America is facing a downturn in the farm economy and a trade war that is taking a toll on crop, livestock, and dairy producers from coast to coast, this bill will provide needed certainty to farmers and ranchers.

The bill continues a variety of commodity, conservation, trade, nutrition, credit, rural development, research, energy, and specialty crop programs. It also provides permanent mandatory funding for several of the programs that first got mandatory funding in the 2008 farm bill when I was last chairman. These include the Local Food and Farmers Market Promotion Program, the Value-Added Producer Grant Program, the BFRDP, Organic Research, and the Section 2501 Outreach Program.

One of the most important pieces in this bill, however, is the improvement that it makes for our dairy farmers. The economic downturn in farm country has hit the dairy industry probably the hardest of all, and in my home State of Minnesota and neighboring Wisconsin, an average of two dairies are going out of business every day. The provisions in this bill will provide expanded, affordable coverage options and more flexibility for dairy farmers, and I am proud to put my name on this program.

We are also providing \$300 million in mandatory funding for animal disease programs at a time when our U.S. livestock industry is facing a continued danger from unchecked threats from different areas. That money will go to increasing our ability to prevent and respond to animal pests and diseases that harm our animals and threaten the viability of our livestock operations.

There are folks who would have liked to have seen different directions taken on several issues in this bill, but this is a conference report where the House and Senate figure out where the common ground is.

I am very appreciative of the hard work of the majority and its staff, as well as my staff under the direction of Anne Simmons and Troy Phillips. My staff put their whole selves into this bill, and I want to thank and commend them: Lisa Shelton, Keith Jones, Prescott Martin, Katie Zenk, Patrick Delaney, and special thanks to my former staffers who worked on the bill, Mary Knigge, Liz Friedlander, and Evan Jurkovich, and to Clark Ogilvie, who missed the farm bill so much that he came to the committee to help us finish it.

Thank you also to Patti Ross in the leader's office and Tom Mahr in the whip's office for their help, and all the folks at USDA and CBO for their hard work in getting us to this point; also,

the House and Senate legislative counsels who helped us put this bill together.

So I think we have a good bill, a good compromise. I would encourage my colleagues to support this effort, and I look forward to continuing the discussion on many of these issues into the next Congress.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the former chairman of the committee and current chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation and Forestry.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank our ranking member and our chairman. When you consider what it takes to pass a farm bill, when you consider how difficult the challenges are, think of the last three in total, Chairman PETERSON had to overcome two Presidential vetoes to get the bill on the books, and I supported him.

In the 2014 farm bill, it took my friends here and me 2½ years to get a farm bill on the books. And now, Chairman CONAWAY, he shouldn't have had to go through some of the challenges that Collin and I went through, but he did it, and he did it for the best interests of America.

But what is a farm bill all about? Set the nuances of various policies aside, it is to make sure that we have the safety net to enable us, in this country, to raise the food and fiber we need at an affordable, safe, and cost-effective rate to meet our needs and the world's needs.

□ 1500

And what is the other part of the farm bill? It is making sure our fellow citizens who have difficulty in overcoming their challenges have access to enough of those calories.

Plain and simple, that is what farm bills have been about since 1933, making sure we all eat cheap, well, and safe.

But they have gotten harder and harder because the tendency of this body is for some folks on one side of the room to press for a particular perspective, and other folks on the other side of the room to press for the diametrically opposite perspective.

But ultimately, on the Agriculture Committee, under the leadership of these fine gentlemen and their wonderful staffs and all of our colleagues on the committee, we still do the right thing. We do policy every 5 years that works. We do policy that meets the needs of our fellow citizens and, for that matter, helps make sure the world has enough to eat.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member. Let's pass this bill with the overwhelming intensity it deserves, because that is what our neighbors back home deserve.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), one of our subcommittee ranking members.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a great farm bill. There is so much in it, so many great things. But in this farm bill is perhaps the absolute best example of bipartisanship at its best, to have Democrats and Republicans working together to give \$80 million to African American, 1890s land grant colleges and universities.

I just want to say a big thank you. I thank our Ranking Member PETERSON. And I thank Mike Conaway, who started with me on this journey. God bless you, Mike. Thank you so much for your help.

I thank our friends over on the Senate side. I thank Senator DAVID PERDUE, who took the reins over there and helped put the money back in. I also thank Senator ROBERTS, the chairman of the Senate committee.

I thank my staffer, Ashley Smith, my legislative director who worked night and day with me on this bill.

And I thank God Almighty. Mr. Speaker, God had His hand in this, to pull Democrats and Republicans together, to give \$80 million to badly needed African American land grant colleges and universities. Only God could pull this together, and we thank God for this blessing and for touching the hearts and the souls and the spirits of all of my colleagues who will vote for this historic bill.

I thank, also, the staff of the Senate Agriculture Committee, as well as the House Agriculture Committee. Thank you all for the work that you all did in this bill. I thank you for all the people in America who are grateful for this, but especially the African American community thanks you for opening up these opportunities for their light to shine as well.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank Chairman CONAWAY and Ranking Member PETERSON for their leadership during this process.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the conference report to the 2018 farm bill to provide the first major reforms of our Nation's agriculture policy in nearly 5 years.

For the last several years, Members of both sides of the aisle have worked to make sure that our Nation's primary agricultural policy works for American producers.

This year, I was honored to, once again, be chosen to serve on the farm bill conference committee to fight for the good people of middle and south Georgia who dedicate their lives to agriculture. I am confident that this bill delivers the reforms that our farmers and industry stakeholders desperately need to keep our producers in rural communities growing and innovating for the 21st century.

This bill strengthens the farm safety net and provides certainty and flexibility that our producers need. It also

ensures that our farmers can provide the food, nutrition, and fiber, not only for America, but the rest of the world.

In this legislation, we have laid the groundwork for expanding quality broadband access to rural America by giving the USDA the tools and resources to bridge the digital divide that is leaving millions of rural Americans behind and hindering our communities from thriving.

I am very glad that two amendments that I offered were included in the final agreement, which will bring modernization and accountability to broadband services and spur broadband infrastructure investment in rural America. Bridging the digital divide is something I have been fighting for, for years now, and I look forward to seeing the growth in network service and infrastructure development through the provisions of this bill.

In this conference report, we also found some common ground to make improvements to SNAP. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), one of our subcommittee ranking members.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking my good friend and the ranking member, COLLIN PETERSON, as well as my fellow conferees and the staff for their leadership in negotiating this conference report.

The farm bill conference report is a good bill. It is not a perfect bill, but certainly worthy of our support. I am pleased Members on both sides of the aisle and across the Chamber were able to reach consensus on how to show the American people that Congress can work together.

This agreement protects SNAP by rejecting proposals in the House farm bill that would have severely weakened the program and taken food assistance away from nearly 2 million people.

This agreement increases access to healthy foods in underserved communities and takes steps to tackle food waste, which we know is a major problem.

This agreement builds new opportunities to improve soil health and water quality in the Great Lakes.

This agreement provides beginning and minority farmers and ranchers additional tools and resources needed to own and operate successful businesses.

This agreement authorizes \$350 million per year for rural broadband coverage.

This agreement expands investment in low-income, urban, and rural communities.

Finally, this agreement provides certainty and sound agricultural policies for America's producers and consumers. I encourage my colleagues to join me and vote "yes" on the final conference report.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, it has been a long road of debate to reach an agreement on the 2018 farm bill. This bill benefits all of rural America, our farmers, producers, and consumers. The agreement we have reached on this year's bill includes many important provisions that will help farm country during tough economic times, fully protecting crop insurance and providing certainty to farmers.

I am particularly glad to see industrial hemp de-scheduled from the controlled substances list, a key provision I worked with Leader MCCONNELL on to ensure unnecessary government restrictions are lifted from this valuable agricultural commodity.

I thank Leader MCCONNELL for his collaboration and attention to legalizing industrial hemp, and I appreciate all of my colleagues who supported this issue and helped bring it to the table.

I was proud to represent the interests of Kentucky farmers during this process, and I look forward to a new year of growth and prosperity for farmers and producers across rural America.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), another one of our subcommittee ranking members.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. PETERSON, for yielding the time, and I thank him for his work, along with Chairman CONAWAY. And I thank the committee staffs on both sides who have worked so hard and diligently over the last year.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the farm conference committee, I am proud to support this bipartisan farm bill.

As a third generation farmer, I have the honor and the privilege of representing one of the largest and most diverse agricultural regions in the country and in the world. California grows about half of our Nation's fruits and vegetables, the largest ag State in the Nation. We are number one in dairy producing, number one in citrus production, grapes and wine products. We are also the largest producer of tree nuts in the world. With over 300 crops, the list goes on and on and on.

We are truly blessed in California, so this agricultural legislation is so important.

The dairy title, the changes made in it are very helpful. With increased research funding, risk management tools like crop insurance, and trade promotion programs, this bill is not only good for the San Joaquin Valley that I represent in California, but the entire Nation.

So we must understand that the conservation programs are also an improvement to help with groundwater sustainability and air quality, which are critical in California. The forest management improvements will make a difference in Western States like California, where we have had horrific and devastating forest fires.

The vital SNAP benefits are maintained, and voluntary employment and training programs that I fought for are

strengthened. The 10 pilot projects in the 10 States, I find, will provide better ways for us to get people on their feet who are in need.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I support this farm bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. It is a good work product. It is good on behalf of American agriculture and all of the interests that put, every day, America's food on America's dinner table.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), a former member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for this farm bill conference report. Given the ongoing challenges in the agriculture economy, it is very important our producers have policy certainty as they make their spring planting decisions.

I held a series of listening sessions around Nebraska's Third District, our Nation's number one producing district for agriculture, last year to hear producers' thoughts about the farm bill. The number one item on producers' minds was the continuation of strong crop insurance. This bill accomplishes this objective.

The bill also recognizes the challenges and threats facing our livestock producers by creating a disease prevention program and vaccine bank to help contain the potential future outbreak of disease within the livestock industry across our country.

This bill, and continued positive progress on trade, will go a long way toward increasing producers' peace of mind. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation, and I appreciate the support of the administration in bringing this legislation to a successful conclusion.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on the bill. I commend Mr. PETERSON, in particular, for guiding this important piece of legislation that actually includes many provisions that I have been working with for over 12 years.

He has been successful in protecting key Democratic priorities, especially nutrition, and avoiding damaging, poison-pill provisions. Near and dear to my heart are the reforms for hemp.

But, I am concerned that it does not adequately address the growing crisis in American agriculture. I spent 3 years going around Oregon talking to people, putting together our little "Fight for Food" booklet and legislation.

We are not dealing with the chemical welfare inspired by Monsanto/Bayer. We have the Trump tariffs and climate devastation that is getting more serious by the month. We have a crop insurance program that is not just wasteful, but fails most farmers and ranch-

ers that I represent and, indeed, in most States.

While I appreciate the legislative accomplishment that are represented here, I look forward to starting the next Congress with then-Chairman PETERSON to see if we can build on this foundation to narrow differences, broaden areas of agreement, do better for our farmers and ranchers, better for the environment, better for taxpayers and everyone who eats.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report to H.R. 2, but also strong commendation toward our chairman, Mr. CONAWAY, for having the many, many hearings about all aspects of the farm bill and the condition of the ag economy in this country.

□ 1515

This does represent a strong compromise response to the needs of rural America, where stability is needed; certainty to the farmers and ranchers weathering a 50 percent drop in farm income in recent years. A positive step for rural America and its ag economy where stability, again, is greatly needed.

Much of these resources are to remote, rural towns to improve broadband connectivity, which is critical for telehealth and further rural development.

It acknowledges the challenges faced by many California farmers, including prioritizing mechanization research to help address the continued ag labor shortage.

It maintains an accessible food supply for families in need, especially in rural, poor districts like mine, while also bringing an increment of accountability to the food stamp SNAP program.

It strengthens our rural development title to boost jobs in rural America, such as water conservation improvements and incentives as well.

I wish we could have done more on forestry. The town of Paradise and the surrounding area that suffered so much is a prime example of why we need to have better forest management in that State, in this whole country, but I think that continuing to have these conversations is extremely important.

So with the worst fires in State history, I am really, really hoping for that improvement.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman CONAWAY for fighting for policies that support American agriculture.

We are in tough times right now, with 5 years of lower incomes. And the consistency and stability that farmers

need, all Americans need in the rural economy, this farm bill will make a significant impact in helping on that.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 19½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER), a member of the committee.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, friend, and ranking member, COLLIN PETERSON, for his wisdom and steadfast leadership through the farm bill reauthorization process, Chairman CONAWAY, and to all of the staff, who worked tirelessly.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 2018 farm bill and to commend my colleagues on the farm bill conference committee for a truly bipartisan and bicameral product. I stand confident that the bill will move Delaware and our Nation forward.

It gives Delaware poultry growers the vital conservation resources they need when they need them. It shores up an already strong crop insurance program that protects our farmers against catastrophic loss. It provides additional sustainable resources for 1890 land-grant institutions, ensuring schools like Delaware State University continue their crucially important research while preparing the next generation in the ag economy.

And it also ensures nutrition benefits are maintained and protected for our children, seniors, individuals with disabilities, and families who rely on the social safety net to navigate difficult times.

All of these accomplishments were made possible by cooperation and compromise, which drew me to the Agriculture Committee in the first place.

We came together, we got something done, and that is what the American people want to see. This is a farm bill we can all be proud of, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report to H.R. 2, the Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018.

Facing a nearly 50 percent decline in net farm income over the past 5 years, our Nation's farmers and ranchers have had their backs against the wall for far too long.

Today, we have an opportunity to right that ship, to secure a brighter future for our producers, rural communities, and American consumers.

As a member of the farm bill conference committee, I am confident that the agreement we have reached will strengthen the farm safety net and provide a sense of certainty and flexibility for those who feed and clothe our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we have been working on this legislation since I came to Congress, and I would like to thank Chairman CONAWAY and the entire House Agriculture Committee for their work.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2, to reinvigorate rural America.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), a member of the committee.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ranking Member PETERSON for yielding, also Chairman CONAWAY for all of his support.

I am proud today to speak on behalf of the 2018 farm bill. This bill is a strong, bipartisan piece of legislation. It works for families, for farmers, and for all communities.

The farm bill now avoids disastrous cuts to SNAP, a program which helps put food on the table for 44,000 people in Mecklenburg County alone, many of whom are children.

Additionally, the bill now avoids the mean-hearted, unreasonable work requirements that had been in the previous version of the House farm bill.

As founder and cochair of the bipartisan HBCU Caucus, I am particularly proud to have helped secure key resources for 1890 land-grant universities in this bill. The farm bill authorizes \$50 million to create three centers of excellence at 1890s and it ensures equity between land grants by removing provisions that strip away unspent extension funds for 1890 schools, and mandating a report that outlines research and extension funds for all land-grant institutions. This is a major legislative win for our land-grant HBCUs.

These are the reasons why I founded the HBCU Caucus, to bring together a coalition of Republicans and Democrats to fight together for greater funding and equity for all of our schools.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of my colleagues on the conference committee, and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill later today.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN).

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for allowing me, even when I am opposed to one of the provisions, to speak about it.

As you may know, this bill has a lot of good things and good provisions for all the States and for the territories as well, but there is one provision that we are not allowed to even discuss in a public hearing, and that is the prohibition, or ban, to cockfights in the territories.

The current farm bill allowed territories to have and regulate that industry. In the case of Puerto Rico, that represents more than \$18 million in revenues and taxes. We are on the brink of a lot of financial situations, and now this regulation will put another burden on the people of the island.

So I am against that prohibition, mostly because the people of Puerto Rico have regulated the industry of cockfighting since 1933. So this is something that is not only affecting Puerto Rico, but the rest of the territories, as we have been facing this kind of industry and sport.

We don't have the votes in the Senate. We can't vote on the floor of the House. So our people are not fiscally represented, and as well Congress is taking an action that would put another burden on our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my opposition, and the people of Puerto Rico, against that provision, but in favor of the rest of the bill.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), a member of the committee.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman CONAWAY and Ranking Member PETERSON for their leadership during my time on the Agriculture Committee, during our time putting this farm bill together.

As a proud member of the Agriculture Committee, as a proud member who represents the salad bowl of the world, I am very proud to support H.R. 2, this farm bill, in 2018.

In my district on the central coast of California, this farm bill will benefit our specialty crop industry by investing in mechanization technology and expanding research opportunities.

It will help our organics industry with the certification process and research by incorporating the OREI Act.

This bill invests in our future farmers, our young ranchers, and veterans getting into agriculture.

It doesn't make any changes to SNAP without any evidence supporting such changes for the people who need food the most.

Mr. Speaker, I am at the end of my first term in Congress, and I can tell you this is the best job I have ever had, mainly because of the Members of Congress I work with, mainly because of the Democrats and Republicans I have worked with on this Agriculture Committee, including its excellent staff.

So despite the fact that there were differences over this farm bill at the beginning, and even though we are on the verge of a possible shutdown, what gives me confidence in this job, what gives me confidence in this body is this final version of this farm bill.

This is a bill that, although it started as a partisan product, it ended as a bipartisan bill. It is a bill that is not based on ideology and emotion; it is based on evidence. This is a bill that is not based on party politics; it is based on people, not just people in agriculture, but all of the people of this Nation.

That is why we all should be proud to support the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 and vote "yes" on the final conference report.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO).

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership and I thank the ranking member for his leadership on this legislation.

The conference report provides much needed resources that will help farmers cope with a 5-year, 50 percent collapse in the farm economy, the largest such drop since the Great Depression.

During this process, we have acted in a bipartisan fashion to fix broken government programs that have not worked as intended and left farmers with nowhere to turn.

In upstate New York, perhaps none are hurting more than our local dairy farmers. New York is the third largest dairy State, and our farmers are hurting. The current dairy programs do not work, and improvements to the farm bill combined with those in the bipartisan Budget Act from earlier this year will help our farmers weather the storm.

We have made the dairy safety net more flexible by increasing coverage options, more affordable by reducing premiums, and more enticing for participation by bringing more incentives for those farmers to participate.

We have also worked to protect the SNAP program and laid the groundwork for future Congresses to make additional changes. By incentivizing work through better local workforce consultation and reducing the number of waivers that States can bring, we can bring more recipients into the workforce during a time of record low unemployment.

Additionally, changes like the National Accuracy Clearing House and minimum standards for participant tracking will help enhance program integrity and ensure that benefits are available to those that need them most.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the farm bill. Upstate New York and our farmers have waited long enough. I am proud to support this legislation.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS), a member of the committee.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank both chairmen for their leadership in this opportunity of bringing us all together.

I chose to be a member of the Agriculture Committee because this committee has jurisdiction over some of the most critical issues facing our community, that is food and nutrition.

Even back in Pennsylvania, one issue that has been central to my work is ensuring that people in every neighborhood in Philadelphia, between west Philadelphia and north Philadelphia, south Philadelphia, had access to safe, healthy, and reasonably priced food.

In Philadelphia, 20 percent of our population is food insecure, meaning one in five Philadelphians don't know where their next meal will come from.

I am pleased to see that this bill maintains SNAP and does not weigh down poor and hungry Pennsylvanians with onerous work rules.

But let's be clear: this is just a beginning. No child should go to bed hungry. No parent should have to make the choice between putting food on the table or keeping the lights on.

In times of peace and in times of war, our soldiers must always have a food source in order to provide the necessary safety and security our democracies depend on for survival.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I had the opportunity to meet with members of the ag community at all levels, from farmers to consumers. I have come to better understand the needs of Pennsylvania's hardworking farmers and others in the broad agriculture community through events such as the Pennsylvania Farm Show and the Ag Progress Days.

And over time, through meetings with advocates, the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau, The Food Trust, the National Young Farmers Coalition, Philabundance, Central Pennsylvania Food Bank, and National Farmers Union, I am happy to say that this bill does a lot of work for them.

In addition to SNAP, this bill addresses hunger by increasing funding for everyone.

This bill also provides greater flexibility in coverage and tools for Pennsylvania dairy farmers, investing in rural infrastructure, supports research of 1890 land-grant universities, and maintains fundamental conservation programs.

Food unites us. Food is medicine. Food is foreign policy. And I say this: this bill is a starting point. We have to work together, and I look forward to working on this bill to make it stronger.

Mr. Speaker, I thank both chairmen and I thank the staff for all their collective work together.

Yes, we should vote a resounding "yes."

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

□ 1530

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, last year, in Hurricane Harvey, many in my community became food insecure. I cannot tell you how important maintaining the current SNAP benefits are.

I thank the chairman from Texas and my good friend, to-be chairman from Minnesota, for their coming together.

The importance of funding going to my land grant colleges is enormous in training new farmers.

The work that is being added—as a member of the Homeland Security Committee—on adding broadband in the rural communities is something that is so dearly needed and has been promised for many, many years.

The fact that we are expanding access to FSA farm loans for veterans, but, more importantly, for beginning farmers, creates a new pathway for

those who are providing for us as the breadbasket of the world.

And then, in the rural areas of my district, rural economic development is crucial, and the rural development funds are vital. So many things have been able to occur because of this funding.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill because this is a perfect coming together. As former Congresswoman Shirley Chisolm said: A tree grows in Brooklyn. It is a good coming together of urban and rural supporting a dynamic bill and providing so that Americans are not food insecure and our children have the nutrition that they need.

Let us vote for this bill.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is left on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 11 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO), a member of the committee.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, it has been a long road, but it looks like we are bringing it in for a landing, and America is thankful for a farm bill that we can all be proud of. That includes central Florida.

We saw huge issues included to help out our orange growers in central Florida facing citrus greening, which is really hurting our local growers and hurting that iconic orange juice coming from Florida.

We saw the inclusion of the National Animal Health Vaccine Bank, which helps out ranchers both in central Florida and throughout the United States.

We saw a SNAP program that will continue to help out needy families.

We saw prioritizing conservation, which is a win for both farmers and conservationists alike in an ever more crowded Florida.

We also saw four bills that we crafted and put forward included, and I thank the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Minnesota for their help with that.

The veterans with disabilities language that provides technical training, that was something that I got an idea of when I was out in Midland speaking to one of the gentleman from Texas' constituents.

The bill that allowed for authorization of agricultural research between the United States and Israel is a program that needed a long time to be authorized, and we are excited to have it.

Algae-based research to look at biofuels is helpful.

And just to conclude, we are also developing high-tech sensors in central Florida for agriculture.

I thank all of the people on the committee for their good work.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LAWSON), a member of the committee.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years, serving on the Agriculture Committee, we worked on the farm bill. But also, in my district, which is so important and critical, we have had two hurricanes. The resources that we have had from previous farm bills were very significant. We just got over Hurricane Michael, which has caused a lot of damage throughout my district.

But the most important issue, even the other things that we are doing for farmers in this, is about food insecurity. When I talk about food insecurity, I talk about going into my area where 100 percent of students are on free and reduced lunch, and the farm bill takes care of that.

I congratulate my leader and my chairman over here for their work and the hard work they put in to make this a reality.

Also in this farm bill is money for HBCUs, historically African American universities, to do more research and to get more involved so that we can feed America.

I am so proud and ask all of my colleagues to vote positively for this farm bill, because one great President said: "The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here."

I can tell you that when we vote for this bill, people in need—farmers, all those people in this bill, the Forest Service and everything—will never forget what we did here, and I encourage you.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I thank everybody who was involved in this, the committee members and their staff. It was a bumpy road, but we figured out how to get through it and came to a bipartisan conclusion. That is the important thing.

This is a good bill for my district. I think it is a good bill for agriculture, in general, around the country, and it is a good bill for America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I finish, I would like to also add my thanks to the majority staff and the minority staff in the House, as well as the minority and the majority staff in the Senate. Untold hours were spent getting us to this place by these hardworking men and women who labor in relative anonymity. COLLIN and I get all the gratitude, pats on the back, hugs, and smooches, and they do all of the hard work.

I would like to recognize Matt Schertz, my staff director; Bart Fisch-

er, deputy staff director and chief economist; Patricia Straughn; Nicole Scott; Rachel Millard; Josh Maxwell; Jennifer Tiller; Paul Balzano; Trevor White; Callie McAdams; Caleb Crosswhite; Carly Reedholm; Mollie Wilken; Mindi Brookhart; John Weber; Jeremy Witte; Ashton Johnston; Yasmin Rey; Darryl Blakey; Abigail Camp; Ricki Schroeder; Margaret Wetherald; John Konya; Maggie Mullins; Faisal Siddiqui; Brian Martin-Haynes; Kevin Norton; Brandon Reeves; and Nicole Bayne for all of their hard work and all of the time spent away from their families over the last year-plus getting to this point.

Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes, there are going to be red and green lights go up behind your head. Pressure that is facing America's farmers and ranchers and their families is just unimaginable to those of us who aren't directly in the business: pressures of 5 years of reduced income; 5 years of burning through savings and capital; 5 years of really difficult circumstances; commodity prices low with no real relief on the horizon; trade turmoil across the world; lots of things going bad; as I mentioned earlier in my conversation, a 30 percent increase in bankruptcies. But, Mr. Speaker, the one thought that troubles me the most is the increase in suicides. The pressures of losing a multigenerational farm and ranch operation must be incredible to cause men and women to decide to make an awful decision as a result of those pressures.

This bill will help alleviate that. This bill takes a look at those pressures, takes a look at the stresses and strains across all of rural America—economic development issues, the issues within just the practice of farming and ranching—and says here are Federal resources that we want to put against those problems, against the issues of farmers going out of business, and continuing to provide to the American consumer the most abundant, safest, and affordable food supply of any developed nation in the world.

Across these last 2 years, with President Trump in office, you have seen an awful lot of comments about "buy America" and "let's produce things in America." There is nothing more American than food produced in our Nation, and this bill will keep us in that vein. It will keep those farmers and ranchers taking those risks, risks that none of us could imagine, year in and year out: worrying about Mother Nature, too much rain, too little rain, rain at the wrong time, too hot, not hot enough, all of those things that they have no control over. They will fight that fight day in and day out, and they are the best in the world at doing it.

What they can't do, though, is fight against the cheating in the trade world that is out there, fight against commodity prices that they can't control. They can't control their input costs. They are takers of those costs, and they are takers of prices. They are at

the mercy of an awful lot of pressures and stresses and strains that this bill tends to address.

So, Mr. Speaker, the green lights, in my view, when they start lighting up, will be the Members who have taken a look at all these things, all these issues that are facing rural America and our farmers and ranchers, and will say, yes, this bill does, in fact, address those; it does get at those issues; it does offer 5 years of stability for these folks, 5 years of lenders being able to know what the safety net will look like and being able to lend against next year's crop, 5 years of certainty.

We all work better under certainty, and knowing what this farm bill looks like, wrong or different, is far better than the option of us rolling this over to next year and starting this process over. Those green lights will be Members who have looked at all of that and said, yes, this bill is worthy of my support, worthy of my vote.

Mr. Speaker, the red lights will say something entirely different. It will say that we looked at those exact same issues, we looked at these solutions, these Federal resources, and said either they are too much, not enough, they want it to go somewhere else, or, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there will be some who will say, well, there just weren't things in there that we would like to have happen.

Mr. Speaker, the House version that we passed back in June took some mighty bold steps toward reforming SNAP and moving in a direction that most of us believe was supported by the American people. Asking SNAP recipients to work 20 hours a week in order to maintain that public benefit, that public effort, we believe was the right way to go. That was not supported broadly by the body across the building, and we made the compromises necessary to get us to this place.

In spite of that, though, Mr. Speaker, we made good reforms toward the SNAP process, toward program integrity, and making the program work better for folks who need these programs.

The House version never intended to touch, nor did it touch, the folks we will always take care of: the elderly, the mentally and physically disabled, those who are temporarily out of whack. It never touched that.

What it did, Mr. Speaker, was go after those folks who are able-bodied, should be working and should be in the workforce. We have 7 million unfilled jobs today, and there is work ahead of us to make this happen.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I thank COLLIN PETERSON for his hard work on the conference committee. I thank our Senate colleagues who took a different view, but we are here today. Mr. Speaker, I pray that when the lights go up behind your head that there are more green lights than red lights, we can get this to the President's desk, and get that certainty for rural America that is necessary.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, the conference report for the 2018 Farm Bill continues our safety net for farmers and maintains a safety net for struggling Americans. I would like to share with my colleagues a little bit more about how the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, also known as the 2018 Farm Bill, makes key improvements to protect the integrity of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or SNAP, while still preserving critical food access for millions of families.

The bill does not accomplish everything on this front that I and many of my democratic colleagues might have wanted. Many of us would have been looking for ways to make needed investments in this vital food benefit for tens of millions of Americans. But, the provisions related to SNAP, the nation's most effective nutrition program, make modest and useful improvements in this essential weapon in the fight against hunger in our nation. Just as important, the bill protects SNAP by rejecting proposals in the House Farm Bill that would have severely weakened the program and taken food assistance away from nearly 2 million people.

First, I would like to talk about the SNAP improvements in the bill, one of which will help people who are experiencing homelessness to get better food assistance. SNAP's benefit formula assumes that families will spend 30 percent of their net income for food. In determining their net income, households can deduct certain expenses that limit the funds they have available to pay for food, including housing.

Like other individuals and families, those who are homeless often face housing costs, like paying for a motel room or reimbursing friends or family for a temporary home. Congress created the homeless shelter deduction to give them access to additional SNAP benefits by allowing them to deduct their shelter costs. The 2002 Farm Bill improved the deduction by allowing states to set it at a flat \$143 rather than requiring them to collect and submit the paperwork needed to verify their shelter costs. My own state of Ohio adopted this option years ago. I cannot understand why all states haven't taken this easy step to assist homeless households obtain food assistance that reflects their actual out of pocket costs. I am pleased the conference report requires all states to adopt the deduction and raise the \$143 figure each year to reflect inflation, so the deduction keeps its value over time.

In setting the homeless shelter deduction as a standard part of the program, the Farm Bill also maintains its key features. States will have flexibility to decide what kinds of documentation they will accept from clients claiming shelter costs, including the client's statement of what they have been spending. And, states must continue to help homeless households claim the regular shelter deduction rather than the homeless deduction if that would get them more SNAP benefits.

Another SNAP improvement in the conference report will set the stage for future, much-needed improvements in the basic SNAP benefit. The bill includes a House Farm Bill provision requiring USDA to revise its Thrifty Food Plan—which reflects the cost of a basic, nutritionally adequate diet—on a regular basis to reflect the latest information on food

costs, actual consumption, and dietary guidelines. This is an important step because SNAP benefit amounts are based on the Thrifty Food Plan.

When USDA updates the Thrifty Food Plan to reflect current consumer choices and newer healthy food guidelines, the Administration has always required that USDA's new Thrifty Food Plan food basket cost the same as the old basket. That means that USDA has had to make unrealistic assumptions about what a typical household can actually do to buy and prepare food. Academics, including the National Academy of Sciences, have noted how distorted the current package is relative to what is realistic about what households typically buy, how much time it takes them and how much food that meets the dietary guidelines actually costs—even when it is a very bare bones diet. I want to make clear that our provision does not have that cost limitation and we fully expect the Administration to report out to us what the cost of a modern Thrifty Food Plan would costs. I expect that means that the cost will increase and as a result that SNAP's maximum allotment will also increase, an adjustment that is long overdue.

The conference report also has provisions to help more food retailers support SNAP. Nearly 9,700 Ohio food stores participate in SNAP. In my own district, the 11th District, it is just over 800 stores, ranging from large superstores to local farmers' markets. The new bill will enable retailers to offer incentives for SNAP participants. Stores will still have to treat SNAP participants like other customers, but with one exception. Stores will now have the option of offering them modest incentives, such as targeted coupons.

As I mentioned earlier, the conference report is as important for what it does not do regarding SNAP as for what it does do. The Conference Committee rejected all the harsh benefit and eligibility changes in the House bill, which means SNAP will still be available to the tens of millions of Americans who use it to help them afford a decent diet.

Most notably, the conference report rejects the House approach of taking away SNAP benefits from those who struggle to work. Instead, it seeks to improve clients' job outcomes by focusing on job training. It encourages states to work more directly with local employers, expands the options that states have over the types of programs they can offer through their SNAP employment and training programs, and reallocates funds to states with existing pilot programs and states with programs that target specific populations with barriers to work, such as the formerly incarcerated. While job search will no longer be allowed as an allowable stand-alone activity, states will be able to continue supervised job search programs as they see fit, including online job search that meets state supervision requirements and definitions.

The Conference Committee also rejected House provisions that would shorten SNAP's three-month time limit to one month and expand the population subject to the rule to a broader group of recipients. We also rejected the House's proposal to limit states' flexibility to waive high-unemployment areas from the three-month limit. Contrary to statements by some House members, governors are aware of the waivers their state SNAP agencies seek, but the conference report clarifies current practice by stating that states seek should

waivers with the authority provided to them by their chief executive. We specifically directed USDA that this clarification should have no impact on the current waiver process and that the agency may not add additional steps or clearances to the application process.

We also rejected the House's proposal to undo a long-standing state option called categorical eligibility. Under this option, states can import the gross income or asset tests from a TANF-funded program into SNAP. States can simplify and streamline SNAP eligibility and enrollment processes but easing these rules and they can expand who is eligible for the program including more working poor, recently unemployed with modest savings and more senior households with savings above the federal limits. This House proposal would have eliminated benefits for some 2 million people in nearly 1 million households. I appreciate Senator Stabenow's leadership in fighting back against this proposal.

Another House proposal the conference report wisely rejected would force all states to require SNAP participants to cooperate with child support enforcement—something that's now a state option as a condition of SNAP eligibility. Given the deep concerns about the current option we heard from community groups representing grandparents and victims of domestic violence in states that have adopted it, we could not mandate the option. In fact, we included a study on this option to better understand its impact. USDA can help us gather more information about the damage this option is causing particularly by gathering the perspective of those individuals who avoid SNAP out of fear of having to cooperate with child support enforcement.

In contrast to the issues I have discussed above, strengthening SNAP's payment accuracy and reducing fraud is not a partisan question, and the conference report reflects that fact. For example, it requires all states to implement a pilot program called the National Accuracy Clearinghouse, which uses data matching to ensure an individual or household doesn't receive SNAP from two different states simultaneously. This is relatively rare and can occur due to state error or deliberate fraud. It usually is not due to fraud—instead, it generally happens when SNAP participants move to a new state and apply for benefits there, after notifying their former state that they were leaving, but the former state does not expeditiously take them off the program. Nevertheless, it is a problem that needs addressing, and this new interstate data matching will help states do that by making their processes for disenrolling families more efficient and accurate. This will only be an improvement to the program if USDA ensures that this process happens seamlessly for applicants, including resolving any issues with a state that shows the clients remain enrolled. SNAP participants are by their very nature struggling to afford food and life's necessities. They cannot afford time of work, long distance phone calls or attorneys to settle bureaucratic nuances. The sensible approach would be simply to disenroll the client from the state claiming dual enrollment and let it end there. Without evidence the client was trying to commit a crime by enrolling twice, USDA and states should assume innocent error and leave it at that.

One change that might surprise my colleagues is that we discovered that by dropping a Senate pilot program on income verification

we might actually advance state efforts to streamline verification. The Senate bill included a provision to test using third party data sources, mostly run by private companies to verify income. Large employers like big box stores or fast food chains employ many workers who are also eligible for benefits. They often use a third-party vendor to verify income for programs like SNAP and Medicaid. You would think we would have been anxious to sort how best to move forward with helping states to use this type of verification. The Conference Committee came to understand that many states are already using these private vendors to verify income. As it happens, states are paying for these services for SNAP with a federal match, and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) is also paying the same vendor for the same data to assist states with verifying income for health benefit determinations. States have access to the HHS data for Medicaid but cannot use it for SNAP under the limits of the contract. Fortunately, HHS can elect an option under the contract to share the same income verification data they provide to Medicaid with SNAP. This would be an extraordinary advancement in simplification and accuracy and it ought to provide the federal government monetary savings. This type of economy of scale in procurement would be a real windfall in contract payment and improve benefit accuracy.

Also, to explore new ways SNAP can help low-income populations, the conference report authorizes USDA to work with states to set up longitudinal data sets using SNAP administrative data and other sources that would allow states, USDA, and researchers to study caseload dynamics and other issues over time. While our preference would be to capture states' entire caseload for the dataset, perfection should not be the enemy of the good. The goal is to pursue research, not to build a perfect dataset. States can decide what will work best for them with respect to how to construct the dataset—whether they want to use a sample of their caseload or some other approach. By contrast, there must be consistent federal rules ensuring the highest degree of data privacy and security for clients. This data is meant to be available to researchers and the public to use, so all personal identifying information must be removed from the records.

That brings me to the issue of quality control. The conference report includes several changes designed to create more consistency among states in how they measure payment accuracy. In the past, FNS has not evenly applied the rules in this area across states; the conference report changes largely codify steps USDA is taking to help address this problem. Going forward, FNS and the states must work together to improve consistency in measuring payment accuracy. For its part, FNS must strengthen federal review of state quality control procedures.

On a related issue, the final conference report eliminates bonuses to states for high and improved performance in key aspects of program operations. States are always expected to deliver high quality services through SNAP to participants. This is required by law and is expected by Congress and taxpayers. Quality, timely and accurate delivery of benefits to eligible households is the basic standard. Eliminating bonuses does not change that. Nor should it change USDA's scrutiny of state performance on these fronts. Payment accuracy,

including improper denials, program access and timeliness are all standards against which states must be measured, and when states do not perform to expected standards, USDA must and will continue to take corrective actions.

In sum, while this legislation is necessarily a compromise, overall it will make SNAP stronger and better able to help millions of Americans put food on the table—including families with children, persons with disabilities, and seniors. SNAP is more important to our nation's seniors than many realize.

The typical SNAP household with an elderly member includes a single elderly person with income of about \$11,000 a year, or a little below the poverty line. In fact, nearly 3 in 4 SNAP households with an elderly member live in poverty. SNAP households with an elderly member receive an average of about \$1,500 a year in benefits.

The House Farm Bill would have cut SNAP eligibility for seniors, made it harder for grandparents informally caring for their grandchildren to participate in SNAP, and subjected older workers to work requirements despite the difficulty they face in the labor market. One of the main strengths of the conference report is that it does not include these and other negative House proposals. That rejection, along with the conference report's modest positive changes, will help SNAP continue to fulfill its role of supporting needy families in our nation.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the efforts of my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee, which have resulted in this bipartisan bill. I am particularly pleased that the conference report rejects controversial provisions from the House bill, which would have increased hunger and hardship for millions of Americans, who are struggling to work. The House-passed cuts would have harmed many children, seniors, and working parents in my home state of Massachusetts, where about one in nine residents currently relies on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance program (SNAP) to put food on the table.

I would like to comment in more detail about one specific cut that the Conference Committee rejected. It was titled "Update to Categorical Eligibility", but the proposal was largely a repeal of a decades-old state option in SNAP that allows states to liberalize the SNAP gross income and asset test by providing them or providing access to a TANF-funded benefit. Repealing this option would have terminated food assistance to close to 2 million low-income people across the country, including families in Massachusetts. The Conference Committee was wise to reject the cut.

As a member of the Ways and Means Committee since 1993 and as a member who was actively engaged in our debates and supported final passage of the 1996 law, I'd like to remind my colleagues of this option in SNAP to use TANF income and asset tests to simplify administration and access to benefits families need.

Under categorical eligibility, states can raise SNAP income eligibility cutoffs and asset limits and align SNAP's rules with those that states set for benefits funded through TANF. With this option, 32 states have lifted SNAP's income limits, extending the program to more working families. Over 40 states have used the option to adopt less restrictive asset tests, that is, the amount of financial assets, such as

in a savings account, that a household may own and remain eligible for SNAP. Making the safety net more flexible and allowing states to be more responsive to the needs of working families was a key design feature of the welfare law. This option to expand what was then called food stamps and the option to expand Medicaid were key elements of that purpose. President Clinton set up the guidelines that govern the option which are very much in keeping with how TANF benefits work.

Unfortunately, it would appear that the Trump Administration may attempt to make the policy change Congress specifically rejected, without our authorization. The Administration has signaled that it plans to re-regulate the rules governing categorical eligibility. Let me be clear, the Administration has no authority to roll back or curb the option. The law is straightforward. Households that receive a TANF-funded benefit are categorically eligible for SNAP. And, TANF law is clear that funds under the block grant can go for purposes and populations that cover all SNAP eligible households. This decades-old policy option is not up for debate or reinterpretation. In converting the Aid for Dependent Families entitlement program into a block grant, Congress understood the tremendous flexibility it was giving states to use funds for a wide range of purposes, including both assistance and benefit programs. How states use the funds can be inspirational or frustrating. Many of us wish they would focus more on serving poor children. Nevertheless, the legal flexibility conferred to states under the TANF block grant funding stream to create benefit programs and services with many different purposes and with less restrictive eligibility rules than SNAP also means that states can use these programs to confer categorical eligibility, and provide SNAP for all those determined eligible for such programs. This includes programs and services created solely to leverage this option.

The Trump Administration would be wise not to attempt an unlawful rollback of this option. It would run counter to the law and harm families in need.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, American agriculture is a dynamic part of our national economy and a significant part of our local communities. Agriculture impacts the life of every American, and it is important that this industry can continue to meet the needs of our nation.

This Farm Bill Conference Report strikes a strong balance of reforms while providing the stability that our nation's farmers and rural communities need. Over the past five years rural America has endured some of the toughest economic times seen in generations. These hardworking men and women get up every day to put food not only on their table, but yours and mine as well.

This Farm Bill provides the stability they need to run a successful business and take care of their families. It strengthens rural development initiatives and makes significant investments in rural broadband.

Additionally, while promoting sound agriculture policy this legislation legalizes the production of hemp as an agricultural commodity and removes it from the list of controlled substances. In 2017, the sale of hemp products totaled an estimated 800 million dollars in the United States, however the majority of those products were imported from China and Canada. American farmers will now be able to

take advantage of this untapped market and begin growing hemp to capitalize on its many commercial uses.

In closing, I would like to commend Chairman Conaway and his staff for their unrelenting work on this Farm Bill. It has been a privilege to fight alongside you on the House Agriculture Committee to ensure prosperity for rural America. I am proud to support this important legislation and it has been a true privilege to represent the interests of farmers from Virginia's Sixth District. I urge a yes vote.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his tremendous leadership on this bill and so many other issues. It is because of democratic leadership that this bill rejected all of the harmful changes to nutrition, so I thank him for that.

I rise today in support of the Farm Bill conference report (H.R. 2). This bill reauthorizes SNAP—our nation's first line of defense against hunger. This bill also rejects the dangerous and immoral work requirements, which would have pushed 2 million people further into hunger and poverty.

Mr. Speaker, nutrition assistance helps 40 million people put food on the table. And the vast majority of families who receive food stamps are working.

In fact, more than 80 percent of SNAP households work the year before or after receiving aid. This program helps the working poor, children, the disabled and seniors. It's a necessary lifeline to our fellow Americans who otherwise would go hungry.

And I know how important this program is, Mr. Speaker, when I was a young, single mom raising two little boys, I relied on food stamps to help my family during a very difficult time in my life. It was a bridge over troubled waters. And quite frankly I would not be where I am today without that assistance.

All families should have this bridge over troubled waters when they need it.

And Mr. Speaker, while this bill is a step in the right direction for our anti-poverty work, we must do more to ensure that all families have nutritious and regular meals every day. No one in the richest nation on earth should go hungry but unfortunately 40 million do. 40 million.

So, I urge my colleagues support this bill and to redouble our efforts to end poverty and hunger in our nation.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1176, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. CONAWAY. 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.

□ 1545

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings

will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Adoption of the conference report on H.R. 2; and

The motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2454, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2 AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on adoption of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 369, nays 47, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

YEAS—369

Abraham	Clark (MA)	Esty (CT)
Adams	Clarke (NY)	Evans
Aderholt	Clay	Faso
Aguilar	Cleaver	Ferguson
Allen	Cloud	Fitzpatrick
Amodei	Clyburn	Fleischmann
Arrington	Cohen	Flores
Babin	Cole	Fortenberry
Bacon	Collins (GA)	Foster
Balderson	Collins (NY)	Frankel (FL)
Banks (IN)	Comer	Fudge
Barr	Comstock	Gabbard
Barragán	Conaway	Gallego
Bass	Connolly	Garamendi
Beatty	Cook	Gianforte
Bera	Cooper	Gibbs
Bergman	Correa	Gomez
Beyer	Costa	Gonzalez (TX)
Bilirakis	Costello (PA)	Goodlatte
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Gottheimer
Bishop (MI)	Cramer	Gowdy
Bishop (UT)	Crawford	Granger
Black	Crist	Graves (GA)
Blackburn	Crowley	Graves (LA)
Blum	Cuellar	Graves (MO)
Blunt	Culberson	Green, Al
Bonamici	Cummings	Green, Gene
Bost	Curbelo (FL)	Griffith
Boyle, Brendan F.	Curtis	Grijalva
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Grothman
Brady (TX)	Davis, Danny	Guthrie
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Gutiérrez
Brooks (IN)	DeFazio	Hanabusa
Brown (MD)	DeGette	Handel
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Harper
Bucshon	DeLauro	Hastings
Burgess	DelBene	Heck
Bustos	Demings	Hern
Butterfield	Denham	Herrera Beutler
Byrne	DeSaulnier	Higgins (LA)
Calvert	DesJarlais	Higgins (NY)
Capuano	Deutch	Hill
Carbajal	Diaz-Balart	Himes
Cárdenas	Dingell	Hollingsworth
Carson (IN)	Doyle, Michael F.	Hoyer
Carter (TX)	Duffy	Hudson
Cartwright	Dunn	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Emmer	Huizenga
Castro (TX)	Engel	Hultgren
Cheney	Eshoo	Hunter
Chu, Judy	Españolat	Hurd
Ciulline	Estes (KS)	Issa
		Jackson Lee

Jayapal	Moolenaar	Scott, David
Jeffries	Morelle	Serrano
Jenkins (KS)	Moulton	Sessions
Johnson (GA)	Mullin	Sewell (AL)
Johnson (LA)	Murphy (FL)	Shea-Porter
Johnson (OH)	Nadler	Sherman
Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Shimkus
Jones (MI)	Neal	Shuster
Joyce (OH)	Newhouse	Simpson
Kaptur	Noem	Sinema
Katko	Nolan	Sires
Kelly (IL)	Norcross	Smith (MO)
Kelly (MS)	Nunes	Smith (NE)
Kelly (PA)	O'Halleran	Smith (NJ)
Kennedy	O'Rourke	Smith (TX)
Khanna	Olson	Smith (WA)
Kihuen	Palazzo	Smucker
Kildee	Pallone	Soto
Kilmer	Palmer	Speier
King (IA)	Panetta	Stefanik
King (NY)	Pascrell	Stivers
Kinzinger	Paulsen	Suozi
Krishnamoorthi	Pearce	Swalwell (CA)
Kuster (NH)	Pelosi	Takano
Kustoff (TN)	Perlmutter	Taylor
LaHood	Peters	Tenney
LaMalfa	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
Lamb	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
Langevin	Pittenger	Thompson (PA)
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Thornberry
Larson (CT)	Poe (TX)	Tipton
Latta	Poliquin	Titus
Lawrence	Price (NC)	Tonko
Lawson (FL)	Quigley	Torres
Lee	Raskin	Trott
Levin	Reed	Tsongas
Lewis (GA)	Reichert	Turner
Lieu, Ted	Renacci	Upton
Lipinski	Rice (NY)	Valadao
LoBiondo	Rice (SC)	Vargas
Loeback	Richmond	Veasey
Lofgren	Roby	Vela
Long	Roe (TN)	Velázquez
Love	Rogers (AL)	Visclosky
Lowenthal	Rogers (KY)	Wagner
Lowey	Rohrabacher	Walberg
Lucas	Rokita	Walden
Luetkemeyer	Rooney, Thomas J.	Walker
Lujan, Ben Ray	Ros-Lehtinen	Walorski
Lynch	Rosen	Walters, Mimi
MacArthur	Roskam	Wasserman
Maloney,	Ross	Schultz
Carolyn B.	Rouzer	Waters, Maxine
Maloney, Sean	Roybal-Allard	Watson Coleman
Marchant	Royce (CA)	Weber (TX)
Marino	Ruiz	Webster (FL)
Marshall	Ruppersberger	Welch
Matsui	Rush	Wenstrup
McCarthy	Russell	Westerman
McCaul	Rutherford	Wild
McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Williams
McEachin	Sánchez	Wilson (FL)
McGovern	Sarbanes	Wilson (SC)
McHenry	Scalise	Wittman
McKinley	Scanlon	Womack
McMorris	Schakowsky	Woodall
Rodgers	Schiff	Yarmuth
McNerney	Schneider	Yoder
Meeks	Schrader	Yoho
Meng	Scott (VA)	Young (AK)
Messer	Scott, Austin	Young (IA)
Mitchell		Zeldin

NAYS—47

Amash	Gallagher	Massie
Biggs	Garrett	Mast
Blumenauer	Gohmert	McClintock
Brat	Gosar	McSally
Buck	Harris	Meadows
Budd	Hensarling	Mooney (WV)
Carter (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Norman
Chabot	Holding	Perry
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Posey
Davidson	Jordan	Ratcliffe
Doggett	Kind	Rooney, Francis
Duncan (SC)	Lamborn	Rothfus
Duncan (TN)	Lance	Sanford
Fox	Lesko	Schweikert
Frelinghuysen	Lewis (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Gaetz	Loudermilk	

NOT VOTING—16

Barletta	Jones (NC)	Moore
Barton	Keating	Payne
Buchanan	Knight	Polis
Donovan	Labrador	Stewart
Ellison	Lujan Grisham, M.	Walz
Hartzler		

□ 1613

Messrs. SENSENBRENNER and NORMAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. RICE of South Carolina and COOPER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 434.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I was in Senate Chamber trying to prevent a hold on H.R. 7217. I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 434.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY DATA FRAMEWORK ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2454) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a data framework to provide access for appropriate personnel to law enforcement and other information of the Department, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE RELATING TO AUTOMATED EXTERNAL DEFIBRILLATOR TRAINING

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Energy and Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 35) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives relating to automated external defibrillator (AED) training in the Nation's schools, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 35

Whereas the American Red Cross advocates that improved training and access to auto-

mated external defibrillators (AEDs) could save 50,000 lives each year;

Whereas the average response time to a 911 call is 8 to 12 minutes;

Whereas the likelihood of survival is reduced approximately 10 percent for each minute defibrillation is delayed; and

Whereas sudden cardiac arrest is most effectively treated by combining CPR and defibrillation: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) public schools in possession of one or more AEDs should schedule annual AED training for all school personnel, for which staff meetings or in-service days allocated under State law for training programs in emergency first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) may be used;

(2) such public schools should consider including in such annual AED training instruction on the use of AEDs and information for school personnel relating to the locations of AEDs, the school's response plan, and the members of the school response team;

(3) each public school in possession of one or more AEDs should conduct an annual CPR and AED drill for school personnel to practice the use of these life-saving measures and to evaluate the school's preparedness in the event of a sudden cardiac arrest; and

(4) when planning the training and drills, local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools should coordinate with other schools operating training programs, any State-issued recommendations as to the development or usage of appropriate programs, and the American Heart Association Guidelines for Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and Emergency Cardiovascular Care.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF MINNESOTA

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. I have an amendment to the text at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike “training” and insert “education”.

Page 2, line 6, strike “training” and insert “professional development”.

Page 2, line 10, strike “training” and insert “education”.

Page 2, line 21, strike “training” and insert “education”.

Page 2, line 23, strike “training” and insert “education”.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF MINNESOTA

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

In the first whereas clause of the preamble, strike “training” and insert “education”.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: “Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Rep-

resentatives relating to automated external defibrillator (AED) education in the Nation's schools.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING OF POSTHUMOUS CITIZENSHIP TO OTHERWISE QUALIFIED NONCITIZENS WHO ENLISTED IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 887) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend honorary citizenship to otherwise qualified noncitizens who enlisted in the Philippines and died while serving on active duty with the United States Armed Forces during certain periods of hostilities, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 887

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. GRANTING OF POSTHUMOUS CITIZENSHIP TO OTHERWISE QUALIFIED NONCITIZENS WHO ENLISTED IN THE PHILIPPINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 329A(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1440-1(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) NONCITIZENS ELIGIBLE FOR POSTHUMOUS CITIZENSHIP.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A person referred to in subsection (a) is a person who, while an alien or a noncitizen national of the United States—

“(A) served honorably in an active-duty status in the military, air, or naval forces of the United States during any period described in the first sentence of section 329(a);

“(B) died as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by that service; and

“(C) either—

“(i) satisfied the requirements of clause (1) or (2) of the first sentence of section 329(a); or

“(ii) enlisted, reenlisted, extended enlistment, or was inducted in the Philippines and died during the period beginning September 1, 1939, and ending December 31, 1946.

“(2) DETERMINATION OF SATISFACTION OF REQUIREMENTS.—The executive department under which a person described in paragraph (1) served shall determine whether the person satisfied the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C)(ii) of paragraph (1).

“(3) POSTHUMOUS BENEFITS.—In the case of a person to which paragraph (1)(C)(ii) applies—

“(A) section 319(d) shall not apply; and

“(B) section 1703 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136; 117 Stat. 1693; 8 U.S.C. 1151 note) shall not apply.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 329A(c)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1440-1(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(i), by inserting “(or, in the case of an individual to which clause (ii) of subsection (b)(1)(C) applies, the date of the enactment of such clause (ii))”

after “the date of enactment of this section”;

(2) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(B) the request is accompanied by a duly authenticated certificate from the executive department under which the person served which states that the person satisfied the requirements of—

“(i) subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(1); and

“(ii) if applicable, subparagraph (C)(ii) of subsection (b)(1); and”;

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking “of subsection (b)(3)” and inserting “of subsection (b)(1)(C)(i)”.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CYBERTIPLINE MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2018

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 3170) to amend title 18, United States Code, to make certain changes to the reporting requirement of certain service providers regarding child sexual exploitation visual depictions, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3170

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 “CyberTipline Modernization Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. ALTERATIONS TO REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR ELECTRONIC SERVICE PROVIDERS AND REMOTE COMPUTING SERVICE PROVIDERS.

Section 2258A of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “**electronic communication service providers and remote computing service providers**” and inserting “**providers**”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) DUTY.—In order to reduce the proliferation of online child sexual exploitation and to prevent the online sexual exploitation of children, a provider—

“(i) shall, as soon as reasonably possible after obtaining actual knowledge of any facts or circumstances described in paragraph (2)(A), take the actions described in subparagraph (B); and

“(ii) may, after obtaining actual knowledge of any facts or circumstances described in paragraph (2)(B), take the actions described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) ACTIONS DESCRIBED.—The actions described in this subparagraph are—

“(i) providing to the CyberTipline of NCMEC, or any successor to the CyberTipline operated by NCMEC, the mailing address, telephone number, facsimile number, electronic mailing address of, and individual point of contact for, such provider; and

“(ii) making a report of such facts or circumstances to the CyberTipline, or any successor to the CyberTipline operated by NCMEC.”; and

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) FACTS OR CIRCUMSTANCES.—

“(A) APPARENT VIOLATIONS.—The facts or circumstances described in this subparagraph are any facts or circumstances from which there is an apparent violation of section 2251, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, 2252B, or 2260 that involves child pornography.

“(B) IMMINENT VIOLATIONS.—The facts or circumstances described in this subparagraph are any facts or circumstances which indicate a violation of any of the sections described in subparagraph (A) involving child pornography may be planned or imminent.”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “To the extent” and inserting “In an effort to prevent the future sexual victimization of children, and to the extent”;

(ii) by striking “an electronic communication service provider or a remote computing service provider” and inserting “a provider”; and

(iii) by striking “may include” and inserting “may, at the sole discretion of the provider, include”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “or plans to violate” after “who appears to have violated”; and

(ii) by inserting “payment information (excluding personally identifiable information),” after “uniform resource locator,”;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “an electronic communication service or a remote computing service” and inserting “a provider”;

(ii) by striking “apparent child pornography” each place it appears and inserting “content relating to the report”; and

(iii) by striking “the electronic communication service provider or remote computing service provider” and inserting “the provider”;

(D) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION INFORMATION.—Information relating to the geographic location of the involved individual or website, which may include the Internet Protocol address or verified address, or, if not reasonably available, at least one form of geographic identifying information, including area code or zip code, provided by the customer or subscriber, or stored or obtained by the provider.”;

(E) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the heading by striking “IMAGES” and inserting “VISUAL DEPICTIONS”;

(ii) by striking “image” and inserting “visual depiction”; and

(iii) by inserting “or other content” after “apparent child pornography”; and

(F) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking “image” and inserting “visual depiction”;

(ii) by inserting “or other content” after “apparent child pornography”; and

(iii) by striking “images” and inserting “visual depictions”;

(4) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

“(c) FORWARDING OF REPORT TO LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Pursuant to its clearinghouse role as a private, nonprofit organization, and at the conclusion of its review in furtherance of its nonprofit mission, NCMEC shall make available each report made under subsection (a)(1) to one or more of the following law enforcement agencies:

“(1) Any Federal law enforcement agency that is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation, kidnapping, or enticement crimes.

“(2) Any State or local law enforcement agency that is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation.

“(3) A foreign law enforcement agency designated by the Attorney General under subsection (d)(3) or a foreign law enforcement agency that has an established relationship with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or INTERPOL, and is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation, kidnapping, or enticement crimes.”;

(5) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “shall designate promptly the” and inserting “may designate a”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “shall promptly” and inserting “may”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “designate the” and inserting “designate”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “shall” and inserting “may”;

(ii) by striking “the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “NCMEC”; and

(iii) by striking “electronic communication service providers, remote computing service providers” and inserting “providers”;

(D) by striking paragraph (5);

(E) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (5); and

(F) by amending paragraph (5), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

“(5) NOTIFICATION TO PROVIDERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—NCMEC may notify a provider of the information described in subparagraph (B), if—

“(i) a provider notifies NCMEC that the provider is making a report under this section as the result of a request by a foreign law enforcement agency; and

“(ii) NCMEC forwards the report described in clause (i) to—

“(I) the requesting foreign law enforcement agency; or

“(II) another agency in the same country designated by the Attorney General under paragraph (3) or that has an established relationship with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or INTERPOL and is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation, kidnapping, or enticement crimes.

“(B) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this subparagraph is—

“(i) the identity of the foreign law enforcement agency to which the report was forwarded; and

“(ii) the date on which the report was forwarded.

“(C) NOTIFICATION OF INABILITY TO FORWARD REPORT.—If a provider notifies NCMEC that the provider is making a report under this section as the result of a request by a foreign law enforcement agency and NCMEC is unable to forward the report as described in subparagraph (A)(ii), NCMEC shall notify the provider that NCMEC was unable to forward the report.”;

(6) in subsection (e), by striking “An electronic communication service provider or remote computing service provider” and inserting “A provider”;

(7) in subsection (f)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “an electronic communication service provider or a remote computing service provider” and inserting “a provider”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “seek” and inserting “search, screen, or scan for”;

(8) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(vi), by striking “an electronic communication service provider

or remote computing service provider” and inserting “a provider”; and

(ii) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) LIMITATION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A)(vi) authorizes a law enforcement agency to provide visual depictions of apparent child pornography to a provider.”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(II) by inserting after “may disclose” the following: “by mail, electronic transmission, or other reasonable means.”; and

(III) by striking “only” and inserting “only to”;

(iii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “to any Federal law enforcement agency” and inserting “any Federal law enforcement agency”; and

(II) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: “or that is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation, kidnapping, or enticement crimes”;

(iv) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “to any State” and inserting “any State”; and

(II) by striking “child pornography, child exploitation” and inserting “child sexual exploitation”;

(v) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by striking “to any foreign law enforcement agency” and inserting “any foreign law enforcement agency”; and

(II) by striking “; and” and inserting “or that has an established relationship with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or INTERPOL, and is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation, kidnapping, or enticement crimes.”;

(vi) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking “to an electronic communication service provider or remote computing service provider” and inserting “a provider”; and

(II) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(vii) by adding after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(E) respond to legal process, as necessary.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) PERMITTED DISCLOSURE BY A PROVIDER.—A provider that submits a report under subsection (a)(1) may disclose by mail, electronic transmission, or other reasonable means, information, including visual depictions contained in the report, in a manner consistent with permitted disclosures under paragraphs (3) through (8) of section 2702(b) only to a law enforcement agency described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (3), to NCMEC, or as necessary to respond to legal process.”; and

(9) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “the notification to an electronic communication service provider or a remote computing service provider by the CyberTipline of receipt of a report” and inserting “a completed submission by a provider of a report to the CyberTipline”; and

(ii) by striking “, as if such request was made pursuant to section 2703(f)” and inserting “the contents provided in the report for 90 days after the submission to the CyberTipline”;

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (4), respectively;

(D) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(i) in the heading, by striking “IMAGES” and inserting “CONTENT”;

(ii) by striking “an electronic communication service provider or a remote computing service” and inserting “a provider”;

(iii) by striking “images” and inserting “visual depictions”; and

(iv) by striking “commingled or interspersed among the images of apparent child pornography within a particular communication or user created folder or directory” and inserting “reasonably accessible and may provide context or additional information about the reported material or person”; and

(E) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking “An electronic communication service or remote computing service” and inserting “A provider”.

SEC. 3. LIMITED LIABILITY FOR PROVIDERS OR DOMAIN NAME REGISTRARS.

Section 2258B of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading—

(A) by striking “electronic communication service providers, remote computing service providers,” and inserting “providers”; and

(B) by striking “registrar” and inserting “registrars”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “an electronic communication service provider, a remote computing service provider,” and inserting “a provider”; and

(B) by striking “such electronic communication service provider, remote computing service provider,” each place it appears and inserting “provider”;

(3) in subsection (b), by striking “electronic communication service provider, remote computing service provider,” each place it appears and inserting “provider”; and

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “image” each place it appears and inserting “visual depiction”; and

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “An electronic communication service provider, a remote computing service provider,” and inserting “A provider”.

SEC. 4. USE TO COMBAT CHILD PORNOGRAPHY OF TECHNICAL ELEMENTS RELATING TO REPORTS MADE TO CYBERTIPLINE.

Section 2258C of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “to images reported to” and inserting “to reports made to”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(ii) by striking “apparent child pornography image of an identified child” and inserting “CyberTipline report”;

(iii) by striking “an electronic communication service provider or a remote computing service provider” and inserting “a provider”;

(iv) by striking “that electronic communication service provider or remote computing service provider” and inserting “that provider”; and

(v) by striking “further transmission of images” and inserting “online sexual exploitation of children”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “specific image, Internet location of images, and other technological elements that can be used to identify and stop the transmission of child pornography” and inserting “specific visual depiction, including an Internet location and any other elements provided in a CyberTipline report that can be used to identify, prevent, curtail, or stop the transmission of child pornography and prevent

the online sexual exploitation of children”; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking “actual images” and inserting “actual visual depictions of apparent child pornography”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION SERVICE PROVIDERS AND REMOTE COMPUTING SERVICE PROVIDERS” and inserting “PROVIDERS”;

(B) by striking “electronic communication service provider or remote computing service provider” each place it appears and inserting “provider”;

(C) by striking “apparent child pornography image of an identified child from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “CyberTipline report from NCMEC”;

(D) by striking “shall not relieve that” and inserting “shall not relieve the”; and

(E) by striking “its reporting obligations” and inserting “reporting”;

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “electronic communication service providers or remote computing service providers” and inserting “providers”;

(B) by striking “apparent child pornography image of an identified child from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “CyberTipline report from NCMEC”; and

(C) by striking “further transmission of the images” and inserting “online sexual exploitation of children”;

(5) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking “The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children shall” and inserting “NCMEC may”;

(B) by inserting after “local law enforcement” the following: “, and to foreign law enforcement agencies described in section 2258A(c)(3).”;

(C) by striking “investigation of child pornography” and inserting “investigation of child sexual exploitation”;

(D) by striking “image of an identified child” and inserting “visual depiction”; and

(E) by striking “reported to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “reported to the CyberTipline”; and

(6) in subsection (e)—

(A) by inserting before “Federal” the following: “foreign.”;

(B) by striking “image of an identified child from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children under section (d)” and inserting “visual depiction from NCMEC under subsection (d)”;

(C) by striking “child pornography crimes” and inserting “child sexual exploitation crimes.”; and

(D) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and prevent future sexual victimization of children”.

SEC. 5. LIMITED LIABILITY FOR NCMEC.

Section 2258D of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “Except as provided” and inserting “Pursuant to its clearinghouse role as a private, nonprofit organization and its mission to help find missing children, reduce online sexual exploitation of children and prevent future victimization, and except as provided”;

(B) by striking “the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(C) by striking “(42 U.S.C. 5773)” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 11293)”;

(D) by striking “such center” each place it appears and inserting “NCMEC”; and

(E) by striking “from the effort” and inserting “from the efforts”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “NCMEC”;

(B) by striking “such center” and inserting “NCMEC”; and

(C) by striking “(42 U.S.C. 5773)” and inserting “(34 U.S.C. 11293)”; and

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children” and inserting “NCMEC”; and

(B) by striking “image” each place it appears and inserting “visual depiction”.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

Section 2258E of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “2258D” and inserting “2258E”;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(3) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (8); and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

“(6) the term ‘provider’ means an electronic communication service provider or remote computing service;

“(7) the term ‘NCMEC’ means the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children; and”.

SEC. 7. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

The table of sections for chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the items relating to sections 2258A, 2258B, 2258C, and 2258D and inserting the following:

“2258A. Reporting requirements of providers.
“2258B. Limited liability for providers or domain name registrars.

“2258C. Use to combat child pornography of technical elements relating to reports made to the CyberTipline.

“2258D. Limited liability for NCMEC.”.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTHUMOUSLY AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO GLEN DOHERTY, TYRONE WOODS, J. CHRISTOPHER STEVENS, AND SEAN SMITH

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Financial Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2315) to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal to each of Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith in recognition of their contributions to the Nation, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2315

Be it enacted 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) On September 11, 2012, the United States consulate, and its personnel in Benghazi, Libya, were attacked by militants.

(2) Four Americans were killed in the attack, including Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens, Sean Smith, Glen Doherty, and Tyrone Woods.

(3) Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods were former Navy SEALs who served as security personnel in Libya. As the attack unfolded, they bravely attempted to defend American property and protect United States diplomatic personnel. In so doing, they selflessly sacrificed their own lives.

(4) Glen Doherty was a Navy SEAL for 12 years and served in Iraq and Afghanistan. He attained the rank of Petty Officer First Class and earned the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal. After leaving the Navy, Glen Doherty worked with the Department of State to protect American diplomats.

(5) Tyrone Woods served for 20 years as a Navy SEAL including tours in Iraq and Afghanistan. In Iraq he led multiple raids and reconnaissance missions and earned the Bronze Star. After retiring from the Navy as a Senior Chief Petty Officer, Tyrone Woods worked with the Department of State to protect American diplomats.

(6) J. Christopher Stevens served for 21 years in the U.S. Foreign Service. He was serving as U.S. Ambassador to Libya and previously served twice in the country, as both Special Representative to the Libyan Transitional National Council and as the Deputy Chief of Mission. Earlier in his life, he also served as a Peace Corps volunteer teaching English in Morocco.

(7) Sean Smith served for 6 years in the U.S. Air Force. He attained the rank of Staff Sergeant and was awarded the Air Force Commendation Medal. After leaving the Air Force, Sean Smith served for 10 years in the State Department on various assignments, which took him to places such as Baghdad, Brussels, Pretoria, and The Hague.

(8) As their careers attest, all four men served their country honorably.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the posthumous award, on behalf of the Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design in commemoration of Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the awards referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the “Secretary”) shall strike the gold medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medals struck under section 2, at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medals.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL MEDALS.

Medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund, such amounts as may be necessary to pay for the cost of the medals struck pursuant to this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals under section 3 shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARR

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On September 11, 2012, the United States consulate, and its personnel in Benghazi, Libya, were attacked by militants.

(2) Four Americans were killed in the attack, including Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens, Sean Smith, Glen Doherty, and Tyrone Woods.

(3) Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods were former Navy SEALs who served as security personnel in Libya. As the attack unfolded, they bravely attempted to defend American property and protect United States diplomatic personnel. In so doing, they selflessly sacrificed their own lives.

(4) Glen Doherty was a Navy SEAL for 12 years and served in Iraq and Afghanistan. He attained the rank of Petty Officer First Class and earned the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal. After leaving the Navy, Glen Doherty worked with the Department of State to protect American diplomats.

(5) Tyrone Woods served for 20 years as a Navy SEAL including tours in Iraq and Afghanistan. In Iraq he led multiple raids and reconnaissance missions and earned the Bronze Star. After retiring from the Navy as a Senior Chief Petty Officer, Tyrone Woods worked with the Department of State to protect American diplomats.

(6) J. Christopher Stevens served for 21 years in the U.S. Foreign Service. He was serving as U.S. Ambassador to Libya and previously served twice in the country, as both Special Representative to the Libyan Transitional National Council and as the Deputy Chief of Mission. Earlier in his life, he also served as a Peace Corps volunteer teaching English in Morocco.

(7) Sean Smith served for 6 years in the U.S. Air Force. He attained the rank of Staff Sergeant and was awarded the Air Force Commendation Medal. After leaving the Air Force, Sean Smith served for 10 years in the State Department on various assignments, which took him to places such as Baghdad, Brussels, Pretoria, and The Hague.

(8) As their careers attest, all four men served their country honorably.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the posthumous award, on behalf of the Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design collectively in commemoration of Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the “Secretary”) shall strike the gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY MUSEUM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal under subsection (a), the gold

medal shall be given to the Central Intelligence Agency Museum, where it will be displayed as appropriate and made for research.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Central Intelligence Agency Museum should make the gold medal received under paragraph (1) available for display elsewhere, particularly at other appropriate locations associated with Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under section 2, at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL MEDALS.

Medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

Mr. BARR (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHINESE-AMERICAN WORLD WAR II VETERAN CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1050) to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1050

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 "Chinese-American World War II Veteran Congressional Gold Medal Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Chinese Americans served the United States in every conflict since the Civil War, and distinguished themselves in World War II, serving in every theater of war and every

branch of service, earning citations for their heroism and honorable service, including the Medal of Honor;

(2) Chinese nationals and Chinese Americans faced institutional discrimination in the United States since before World War II, limiting the size of their population and their ability to build thriving communities in the United States;

(3) the Act entitled "An Act to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese", approved May 6, 1882 (commonly known as the "Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882") (22 Stat. 58, chapter 126), was the first Federal law that broadly restricted immigration and a specific nationality, making it illegal for Chinese laborers to immigrate to the United States and limiting the Chinese population in the United States for over 60 years;

(4) major court decisions such as the decisions in *Lum v. Rice*, 275 U.S. 78 (1927), and *People v. Hall*, 4 Cal. 399 (1854), found "yellow" races to be equal to African Americans with regard to "separate but equal" school facilities, and prohibited Chinese Americans, along with "Black, mulatto, or Indian" persons, from testifying against White men;

(5) Chinese Americans were harassed, beaten, and murdered because of their ethnicity, including the Chinese Massacre of 1871, where 17 Chinese immigrants in Los Angeles, California, were tortured and murdered, the Rock Springs Massacre of 1885 where White rioters killed 28 Chinese miners and burned 75 of their homes in Rock Springs, Wyoming, and the Hells Canyon Massacre of 1887 where 34 Chinese gold miners were ambushed and murdered in Hells Canyon, Oregon;

(6) there were only 78,000 Chinese Americans living on the United States mainland, with 29,000 living in Hawaii, at the start of World War II as result of Federal and State legislation and judicial decisions;

(7) despite the anti-Chinese discrimination at the time, as many as 20,000 Chinese Americans served in the Armed Forces during World War II, of whom, approximately 40 percent were not United States citizens due to the laws that denied citizenship to persons of Chinese descent;

(8) Chinese Americans, although small in numbers, made important contributions to the World War II effort;

(9) of the total Chinese Americans serving, approximately 25 percent served in the United States Army Air Force, with some sent to the China-Burma-India Theater with the 14th Air Service Group;

(10) the remainder of Chinese Americans who served in World War II served in all branches of the Armed Forces in all 4 theaters of war;

(11) the first all Chinese-American group was the 14th Air Service Group in the China-Burma-India Theater which enabled extensive and effective operations against the Japanese military in China;

(12) Chinese Americans are widely acknowledged for their role in the 14th Air Force, widely known as the Flying Tigers;

(13) Chinese Americans assigned to the China-Burma-India Theater made trans-oceanic journeys through hostile territories and were subject to enemy attack while at sea and in the air;

(14) in the Pacific Theater, Chinese Americans were in ground, air, and ocean combat and support roles throughout the Pacific including New Guinea, Guadalcanal, Solomon Islands, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, Philippines, Mariana Islands, and Aleutian Islands;

(15) throughout the Pacific and China-Burma-India theaters, Chinese Americans performed vital functions in translating, coordinating Nationalist Chinese and United States combat operations, servicing and repairing aircraft and armaments, training Nationalist Chinese troops and sailors, deliv-

ering medical care, providing signal and communication support, gathering and analyzing intelligence, participating in ground and air combat, and securing and delivering supplies;

(16) Chinese Americans also served in combat and support roles in the European and African theaters, serving in North Africa, Sicily, Italy, the Normandy D-Day invasion, which liberated Western Europe, and the Battle of the Bulge, occupying Western Germany while helping to liberate Central Europe;

(17) Chinese Americans flew bomber missions, served in infantry units and combat ships in the Battle of the Atlantic, including aboard Merchant Marines convoys vulnerable to submarine and air attacks;

(18) many Chinese-American women served in the Women's Army Corps, the Army Air Forces, and the United States Naval Reserve Women's Reserve, and some became pilots, air traffic controllers, flight trainers, weather forecasters, occupational therapists, and nurses;

(19) Captain Francis B. Wai is the only Chinese American who served in World War II to have been awarded the Medal of Honor, the highest military award given by the United States

(20) Chinese Americans also earned Combat Infantry Badges, Purple Hearts, Bronze Stars, Silver Stars, Distinguished Service Cross, and Distinguished Flying Cross;

(21) units of the Armed Forces with Chinese Americans were also awarded unit citations for valor and bravery;

(22) the United States remains forever indebted to the bravery, valor, and dedication that the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II displayed; and

(23) the commitment and sacrifice of Chinese Americans demonstrates a highly uncommon and commendable sense of patriotism and honor in the face of discrimination.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term "Chinese-American Veterans of World II" includes individuals of Chinese ancestry who served—

(A) honorably at any time during the period December 7, 1941, and ending December 31, 1946; and

(B) in an active duty status under the command of the Armed Forces; and

(2) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 4. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall make appropriate arrangements for the award, on behalf of Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary shall strike the gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal in honor of the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, the gold medal shall be given to the Smithsonian Institution, where it shall be available for display as appropriate and made available for research.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Smithsonian Institution should make the gold medal received under paragraph (1) available for display elsewhere, particularly at other locations associated with the Chinese-American Veterans of World II or with World War II.

(d) **DUPLICATE MEDALS.**—Under regulations that the Secretary may promulgate, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under this Act, at a price sufficient to cover the cost of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDAL.

(a) **NATIONAL MEDAL.**—The gold medal struck under this Act shall be a national medal for the purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) **NUMISMATIC ITEMS.**—For purpose of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USS INDIANAPOLIS CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Financial Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 2101) to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the crew of the USS *Indianapolis*, in recognition of their perseverance, bravery, and service to the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2101

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 “USS Indianapolis Congressional Gold Medal Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Portland-class heavy cruiser USS *Indianapolis* received 10 battle stars between February 1942 and April 1945 while participating in major battles of World War II from the Aleutian Islands to Okinawa.

(2) The USS *Indianapolis*, commanded by Captain Charles Butler McVay III, carried 1,195 personnel when it set sail for the island of Tinian on July 16, 1945, to deliver components of the atomic bomb “Little Boy”. The USS *Indianapolis* set a speed record during the portion of the trip from California to Pearl Harbor and successfully delivered the cargo on July 26, 1945. The USS *Indianapolis* then traveled to Guam and received further orders to join Task Group 95.7 in the Leyte Gulf in the Philippines for training. During the length of the trip, the USS *Indianapolis* went unescorted.

(3) On July 30, 1945, minutes after midnight, the USS *Indianapolis* was hit by 2 torpedoes fired by the I-58, a Japanese submarine. The resulting explosions severed the bow of the ship, sinking the ship in about 12 minutes. Of 1,195 personnel, about 900 made it into the water. While a few life rafts were deployed, most men were stranded in the water with only a kapok life jacket.

(4) At 10:25 a.m. on August 2, 1945, 4 days after the sinking of the USS *Indianapolis*, Lieutenant Wilbur Gwinn was piloting a PV-1 Ventura bomber and accidentally noticed men in the water who were later determined to be survivors of the sinking of the USS *In-*

dianapolis. Lieutenant Gwinn alerted a PBY aircraft, under the command of Lieutenant Adrian Marks, about the disaster. Lieutenant Marks made a dangerous open-sea landing to begin rescuing the men before any surface vessels arrived. The USS *Cecil J. Doyle* was the first surface ship to arrive on the scene and took considerable risk in using a searchlight as a beacon, which gave hope to survivors in the water and encouraged them to make it through another night. The rescue mission continued well into August 3, 1945, and was well-coordinated and responsive once launched. The individuals who participated in the rescue mission conducted a thorough search, saved lives, and undertook the difficult job of identifying the remains of, and providing a proper burial for, those individuals who had died.

(5) Only 316 men survived the ordeal and the survivors had to deal with severe burns, exposure to the elements, extreme dehydration, and shark attacks.

(6) During World War II, the USS *Indianapolis* frequently served as the flagship for the commander of the Fifth Fleet, Admiral Raymond Spruance, survived a bomb released during a kamikaze attack (which badly damaged the ship and killed 9 members of the crew), earned a total of 10 battle stars, and accomplished a top secret mission that was critical to ending the war. The sacrifice, perseverance, and bravery of the crew of the USS *Indianapolis* should never be forgotten.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) **AWARD AUTHORIZED.**—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the award, on behalf of Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design to the crew of the USS *Indianapolis*, in recognition of their perseverance, bravery, and service to the United States.

(b) **DESIGN AND STRIKING.**—For the purposes of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the “Secretary”) shall strike the gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) **INDIANA WAR MEMORIAL MUSEUM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Following the award of the gold medal referred to in subsection (a), the gold medal shall be given to the Indiana War Memorial Museum in Indianapolis, Indiana, where it will be displayed as appropriate and made available for research.

(2) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Indiana War Memorial Museum should make the gold medal received under this Act available for display elsewhere, particularly at other locations and events associated with the USS *Indianapolis*.

SEC. 4. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under section 3, at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) **NATIONAL MEDALS.**—Medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) **NUMISMATIC ITEMS.**—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mention a few words in honor of my dear friend and colleague ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, the first Hispanic woman elected to the Florida House in 1982, the Florida Senate in 1986, and to this body in 1989.

It has been a privilege working with her on issues that are important to our south Florida community and to our country, as well as on foreign policy issues, Mr. Speaker, where she fought on behalf of those struggling for democracy around the planet in places such as Communist China, North Korea, Iran, Venezuela, Nicaragua, and Cuba.

She worked to combat anti-Semitism and protect the rights of Holocaust victims, while ensuring that those complicit were held accountable.

I will miss her exuberant presence in this Chamber. There will never be another Member to serve with her joyful dedication, wit, and contagious enthusiasm.

Chairwoman Emeritus ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN and her husband, Dexter, have served our community and our country with honor and distinction. While we will miss her here in Congress, I am blessed to know that I will still always be able to rely on her counsel, her support, her love, and her friendship.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

My legislative sister, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, thank you for everything that you have done for our community, for our country, and for our cause, Ileana, we love you.

Mi hermana legislativa, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, gracias por todo que has hecho por nuestra comunidad, por nuestro país, y por nuestra causa. Ileana, te queremos.

HONORING RUDY D'AMICO AND CABVI

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my longtime dear friend Rudy D'Amico, who will be retiring next year as the president and CEO of the Central Association for the Blind and Visually Impaired, also known as CABVI.

Rudy and his team at CABVI have touched the lives of so many. Their resources and services have improved the

quality of life for so many in our region, including my father, who spent the last 7 years of his life legally blind and confined to a wheelchair. CABVI and their compassionate staff enabled him to continue to serve as a full-time member of the New York State Supreme Court, despite his disabilities.

Rudy, a veteran of the New York Army National Guard, began his tenure with CABVI in 2003 as vice president of operations before moving up to president and CEO in May of 2008. He has overseen significant expansion and growth at CABVI, including expanding employment services into Onondaga County, the addition of more than 100 employees, and opening four base supply centers in Northeastern States.

Along with this work at CABVI, Rudy has also remained deeply involved in our community. He has served on the board of directors for the National Association for the Employment of People Who Are Blind, the New York Vision Rehabilitation Association, and the Community Foundation of and Oneida Counties.

To my dear friend Rudy D'Amico, thank you for your many years of service. From a grateful community, we wish you the best of luck in your retirement. Please sharpen up your golf game.

□ 1630

HONORING THE CALIFORNIA DELEGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

RECOGNIZING PARKER POLING

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time, as a Member, I have given a speech like this. I have to say, in this body, Members understand that an essential ingredient for a successful Member of Congress and for this institution to function is our staff.

With good, talented staff, Members can be successful, the legislative process can work, and we can serve our country.

We have many faithful public servants here in the House of Representatives, and I rise today to recognize one of them.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize my chief of staff of 12 years, Parker Hamilton Poling. She has served this House of Representatives in many different capacities, but for the last 12 years, she has been my personal office chief and my leadership office chief.

She sits behind me today, and she is easily embarrassed. But if she looks at the gallery, her husband, Todd, and her

two beautiful daughters, Barrett and Eliza, are here to recognize her service and the hard work she has put in for this country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because my chief of staff, Parker, has been an essential ingredient to my success as a Member of Congress, to serving the people of North Carolina's 10th District as a Member of Congress, to being a successful member of the House Financial Services Committee.

She has been an essential ingredient for House Republicans on getting the key votes over the last 4½ years for our agenda. She has worked tirelessly to count the votes on the House floor to get our agenda passed. She has worked tirelessly to build relationships with other chiefs of staff and Members, as well as other staff, to further this operation in the House of Representatives.

Eight years ago, Parker got a group of female chiefs of staff, Republican chiefs of staff, who were mothers together and said: We need to actually have an organization so we help each other and coach each other along the way through mentoring.

She has developed that into a very solid group that exchanges information and helps each other.

What I want to say here on the House floor and publicly is that my success in the last 12 years is as a direct result of Parker's work.

I met her 22 years ago through an organization called College Republicans. We both cut our teeth in the rough and tumble of that political operation. I was a student at NC State, and she was a student at Brown University. She grew up in upstate New York and took this sort of different background and perspective, and I realized her ingenuity, her creativity, her strength, and her passion for the cause. And I learned so much from her.

Then, 10 years after that, as a Member of Congress, I invited her in, between her law school classes. She thought I was trying to ask for free legal advice. She had, with coaching from her husband, a really set answer on how she could not, because she had not passed the bar yet, give me legal advice, much less free legal advice.

She came in, sat down. She put her book bag down, wearing a pair of jeans. I said: Well, I would like to hire you as my chief of staff. And she says: I didn't interview for it, and I am not sure I want it.

After she had a conversation with her husband, and some, you know, negotiation, she became my chief of staff, and my world as a Member of Congress changed much for the better.

But I am not the only one that Parker has had an impact on as a Member of Congress.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California, KEVIN MCCARTHY, our Republican leader, our majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to agree with my friend that all the

success that he has is because of Parker. I say that kind of jokingly but seriously as well.

I am pleased to be here to take a moment to recognize Parker Poling, the chief of staff to my dear friend PATRICK MCHENRY. PATRICK is the deputy whip.

Many of you know, being a part of Congress, you have to make tough decisions; you have to get the votes to pass any bills; and you have to make things happen. Really, the staff that is around you says a lot about you.

I could think of no finer staff member in all this service than Parker. What I admire most about Parker: There were times when PATRICK and STEVE and I would be together, and we would come up with a really good idea. We thought it was brilliant. We would go back to our offices, and soon I would get a text or a call from PATRICK, who would say: That is a dumb idea.

I would say: Why do you think it is a dumb idea?

Because Parker told me so.

But that was what Parker would do. She understood the Members. She understood the policy. But she understood, really, what we had to have happen.

History is going to be very kind to this Congress, what we have been able to achieve: the lowest unemployment in more than 50 years; being able to pass the tax bill when people on the other side, even though they had come to us personally and said they wanted to vote for it, but the leadership would not let them, so that meant it was resting on one side.

The person who put the work together, the majority of that, was Parker. Yes, she would explain the bill, but she was tough at the same time. There were many times she told me no, and I understood why.

But there is more to Parker than just all that knowledge in legal.

One of the reasons why I am not sad is because she is not going far. She has a new job, and I want her to be as successful in the new job as she was in this job.

But Parker is more than just a great mind. She is also a wife to Todd and a mother to Barrett and Eliza. I think they are with us today, are they not? We thank them for sharing their wife and mother with us. It has meant a great deal. From a very grateful Nation, we want to say thank you.

To Parker, we want to wish her well in her new work. We want her to be successful, because her success means our success. If I go on her past behavior, I am looking forward to a very bright future.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be recognized and to be here today to honor my dear friend, Parker Poling, as she leaves Congressman PATRICK MCHENRY's leadership office to take over as executive director

of the National Republican Congressional Committee.

Parker has been a friend, a mentor, and a counselor to me and countless others over the years, none more significantly than PATRICK MCHENRY. It has been a real pleasure to watch him evolve and develop as a legislator under her very good tutelage.

We met when we were both chiefs of staff, me coming to Washington out of North Carolina, and Parker starting out as chief of staff for one of my best friends, PATRICK MCHENRY.

Parker is intelligent; she is poised; she is wise beyond her years; and she is a heck of a great person. She is just a pleasure to spend time with. She has helped me more times than I can count over the years, including when I decided to run for Congress myself.

She is as well respected as anyone on Capitol Hill, and I couldn't be more proud of her as she moves on to her new role.

I do feel badly for my friends across the aisle, though, because Parker will now be steering the ship for House Republicans for the next 2 years, so you had better look out.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in thanking Parker Poling for her years of service to the House of Representatives and the people of this country, and in wishing her, Todd, Barrett, and Eliza well in their future endeavors. Thank you, and God bless you.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, and I thank KEVIN and RICHARD for their kind comments regarding the counsel they have received from Parker and the relationship they have with her.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Parker's favorite Member of Congress, notwithstanding that that includes the majority leader and my friend, Mr. HUDSON, and I on that list. We may be friends with Parker, and she may like and respect us, but her favorite Member of Congress is BRUCE POLIQUIN from Maine.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I must tell everybody who is listening today that there is a reason that I am Parker's favorite Member of Congress: Because I have earned that respect and that right. With that said, I am delighted to speak up about Parker Poling.

I notice that her two wonderful daughters, Eliza and Barrett, are up here in the gallery, along with her handsome husband, Todd. This is a very special day for Parker, her family, and for this Chamber.

There were and are a number of us, Mr. Speaker, who come to the House from different backgrounds. We come here to do what is right and to help our country and, in my case, to help our great State of Maine and my constitu-

ents. This is a big place. Washington is a confusing place. Many people call Washington a mess. At times, I would agree with that. Most of the time, I would agree with that.

But when you have an opportunity to find someone who is smart, tough, fair, gracious, patient, and listens to new Members, you gravitate toward that person. That is Parker Poling.

I met Parker, actually, before I was elected to Congress in 2014 and immediately took to her, like so many folks have before. Over the years, when there were tough decisions to be made in the parliamentary process here, which is very foreign to businesspeople like myself, there is only one person I would go to. And God bless Mr. MCHENRY, but it was not him; it was Parker.

Parker is the person I always call. And I will continue to call her as time goes forward because I know I will get very sound advice from someone who is incredibly knowledgeable and incredibly passionate.

Parker Poling is a strong American woman. I am sure she is a tremendous role model, not only to her two wonderful young ladies, young children, young girls, but also to countless other American women across this land.

We have more freedom in this country; we have more opportunities; we have a stronger economy; we have a better education system that is closer to home because of the good counsel that Parker Poling has given to many of us.

We are blessed to have Parker with us. I am blessed to have known Parker and will continue to enjoy the time that we spend together on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I could talk about Parker Poling all evening.

God bless.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, if I may close. I want to thank Congressmen POLIQUIN and HUDSON, and the majority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, for their kind comments. I just want to close with that.

Parker grew up in upstate New York but has done a fantastic job for the last 12 years working for the people of North Carolina's 10th District. She is a New Yorker but gets the South.

She is a Republican who has friends across the aisle. She is a Republican through and through and committed to our party, our ideology, and the work that we are trying to achieve. While she could be a partisan in her role here counting votes for Republicans, she never lost sight of those relationships across the aisle that could make this place work.

While I will miss her counsel on a daily basis, while I will miss her words of encouragement and also the tough words when you need them, when Members need them—and I have certainly needed them over the last decade—I am grateful for her service. I am grateful

for what she has done for this institution, for me, and for the countless staff that she has mentored along the way. I wish her well.

I say to her two daughters watching that they have a fantastic example in their mother. While she may be tough with us at work, I know she cares about them and loves them dearly.

The life that Parker and Todd have built together is a great example of a loving family, while also both being professionals who have quite challenging careers.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the indulgence of my colleagues and the kind comments for Parker, and I encourage folks to wish her well in her new endeavors.

□ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Members are reminded not to recognize people in the gallery unless they are family and friends of very capable staff on a day like today.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) to continue.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight, along with my California delegation colleagues, to express our thanks and appreciation for those Members who are departing the House at the end of the session.

Collectively, these Californians have served for decades here in the House of Representatives. During that time, they have made many contributions that have benefitted their districts, our State, and certainly this country. I am proud to join them on the House floor this evening and pay tribute to their dedication to this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be here tonight with my colleagues from California and recognize our friends who this Congress for some may be their last, others may be coming back.

I recognize Congressman JEFF DENHAM, Congressman DARRELL ISSA, Congressman STEVE KNIGHT, Congressman DANA ROHRBACHER, Congressman ED ROYCE, Congressman DAVID VALADAO, and Congresswoman MIMI WALTERS.

What makes this delegation unique is our bond with each other. In a State with 53 members, a class of 14 gets pretty tight pretty quick. But it isn't simply a matter of proximity that strengthens our ties. You see, it is our bond and belief in our Nation to be a more perfect union, to strive to continue to improve.

Being from California does not mean it is easy to get to Washington. But I will tell you every single week I would see the same faces getting on that plane going home because they understood who they represented. They understood who they had to listen to.

They also understood who they fought for. But they would get on that plane again and fly back the 8 or 9 hours to be the voice of those that they listen to. It is amazing—the accomplishments.

You know, for people who walk around this building, at times they will see these paintings of members of the past, and, I will admit, portraits last a long time, but a legacy of change lasts much longer. It is like compound interest or a snowball rolling down a hill. When I think about the legacy of change of my colleagues, it is tremendous.

When I think about from Transportation and Infrastructure to Veterans' Affairs, what a better way of life they have today because JEFF DENHAM served in this body.

I think of Oversight and Government Reform, the battles and the fearlessness of DARRELL ISSA.

When I think of the new programs for veterans getting service after hours, it wasn't because a bill passed. It was because a man fought, STEVE KNIGHT, because he was a veteran and the work that he has done that will continue to live.

Or the decades that DANA has served, from every aspect in Science, Space, and Technology to beyond, that his voice transferred and made a difference.

ED ROYCE, when it comes to foreign policy and what has been accomplished in this Congress, his name was on the title of many of those bills, even when he allowed someone else to run it.

And when I look to California, and the statement out there is: "Whiskey's for drinking. Water's for fightin'", it is one of the most difficult issues. This entire body got together strong to make a difference that hadn't been done in a quarter century. And the person really behind it was DAVID VALADAO. He is kind of that quiet leader that made a major difference, that he would continue to make things happen.

And it is a unique—but everybody serves a little different. My friend, JEFF DENHAM, has a voice as strong as his passion, that he can be heard without a mic because of what he wanted to fight for.

But when I look to someone who I consider like my sister, MIMI WALTERS, she was the one female in our group, but I think we would all admit, she was tougher than any one of us. To serve on Energy and Commerce, when you think of California, and the forefront of the world of the technology of what we have in our State, it continues to lead because of MIMI's voice.

But they all had something very unique, and we have been friends for a long time. They put this country first, and they were willing to sacrifice. Some of us know more of the sacrifice they made than others.

But I want to say: Thank you. I want to say: Thank you for your service. But I also want to say: Thank you for the

fight. You were willing to go beyond. Yes, your family missed you some days, but you were doing it for a bigger cause. You were putting people before yourself.

I know history is going to be kind. But history is going to be kind because the Nation is better off that you were willing to take that risk. And I want to thank you for your friendship.

One thing about family, you might not be here every day, but we will always be together and friends. From a very sincere heart, thank you.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), the Dean of the California delegation.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in singing the praise of our staff. But let me just note—and, of course, I have had great staff as well, Rick Dykema and Kathleen Staunton, who have been with me the entire 30 years that I have been a Member of this body.

But staff, as well as the Members, we quite often take for granted what does really enable us to conduct ourselves in this way. It is very easy to overlook. The American people overlook it. We all overlook this. And, that is, we take for granted the safety and security that we operate in. No matter how good our staff is, no matter how great we are, if we were not safe, we could not be conducting this business of our democratic country.

Let us note that Officers Jacob Chestnut and Detective John Gibson were two law enforcement officers who gave their lives while I have been here in order to secure the safety we need to do the public business. So as I leave this body, I would like to make sure they know—I am sure they are listening from above and maybe their families will hear—that there are Members who are grateful to the sacrifice that they made. They gave their lives to keep a terrorist out of this building that would have done damage or murdered Members.

So with that said, I have been here 30 years. I am overwhelmed with gratitude toward the voters who sent me here and to God that gave me the opportunity to live life that permitted the voters to elect me as their representative in Washington.

I spent 7½ years in the Reagan White House with President Reagan, and after that, from 1981 to 1988, I came directly into combat—political combat of running for the House and was elected in 1988, and I have served here since 1989.

It has been one of the most wonderful, glorious times. It is the best life I could ever, ever have imagined. And I know a lot of people, they gripe about the hours and sometimes some of the friction that happens among debates over important issues, but I am so grateful to have this chance.

And, again, there are so many people who are serving their country who are not anywhere nearer to having the

wondrous life that we have. My father was a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps. He joined up after Pearl Harbor to protect our country.

Again, a lot of people, when they see this happening, they don't quite understand. This is what was given to us. There is sacrifice behind us. There is sacrifice in the air of all these people who sacrificed over our country's history, and especially my father's generation, the great generation that gave us this freedom that is all around us that you can feel it.

Thank God that I had a personal chance to participate in this wondrous, wondrous gift that, yes, God, our Founding Fathers, and, yes, our parents, in the greatest generation, gave us, and the other people who now are overseas to this very day defending our right to conduct ourselves this way.

So what a wonderful life I have had in these 30 years. I have had a chance to participate and help shape America's space program, and I have helped bring in commercial space so that we have private investment to keep our space program operating at the high levels it should be, actually leading mankind into space.

I was able to also work with the Democrats—and don't let people think that there isn't cooperation here, because there is. Working on the space program I worked with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

And on the issue of cannabis, which I consider to be an important issue today, because people are finally beginning to realize that the idea of expending enormous resources and our time with our jails and our own security in terms of police, locally and nationally and at the State level, what a waste of those resources aimed at trying to prevent an adult from consuming a weed. And at least I have been able to work then—and also we now find that there are medical reasons that cannabis should be legal. And I have worked with Members on the other side of aisle to achieve a certain degree of progress in that area.

So with that said, let me just note that as people talk about the lack of civility that we have now, there has always been fighting in a free society. People have different ideas, and they are struggling, but whenever we get tough in this body, whenever things would get tense and people would be fighting on an issue and coming to grips with these differences that free people can have, I would always look up. I always say: "The answer is looking up."

And if you look up in this wonderful room that we do our business in here, what do you see? You see an American Eagle and you see the slogan of our country, "e pluribus unum," which means all of us—we may be different, we may have different ideas, different races, different religions, different backgrounds, but we are one people and that freedom of the one people comes together here on this floor, and I have

been so proud to be a part of that great debate to direct the future of this country.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for scheduling this time for all of us to address each other, as well as address our country.

I rise to express my gratitude to the men and women of California's 10th Congressional District for allowing me the honor of serving them and representing them here in our Nation's Capitol for the last 8 years.

Together, we were able to accomplish incredible things for the Central Valley. The recent passage of the farm bill ensures greater prioritization of the Central Valley and will help our farmers, our farmland to keep the valley productive for future generations. The bill includes my VET-2-FARMS Act; crop insurance, dairy, and specialty crop protections; and several key animal welfare provisions.

We also advanced the debate on immigration reform. I am proud to have stood with my friend, PETE AGUILAR, as we fought to protect our Nation's Dreamers and secure our borders in a bipartisan manner.

My Veteran Skills to Jobs Act, which passed in 2012, has helped many veterans find employment using the skills that they learned while serving their country. There is no greater way to show respect to our men and women in uniform than allowing them to use the credentials and the service and the expertise that they had on Active Duty to gain gainful employment once they depart service.

We passed the Civilian Property Realignment Act, which allows us to sell off the properties we don't need so we can reduce our debt, including the first property, which was the Trump hotel, the old post office.

The Passenger Railway Authorization bill, which forced Amtrak to run more like a business, actually having pets on trains for the first time, which allows them to create a new profit center.

The Sandy Recovery Act, which allowed us to not only serve in FEMA reform, but actually allowed us to build smart policies across the entire country so that we are building stronger communities resistant to some of these natural disasters.

□ 1700

Additionally, in our own area, I am proud to have secured the funding and authorization for the French Camp veterans healthcare facility, which will start construction early next year.

We made real progress on the issue of human trafficking as well. In our community, we have fought to make sure that we were working with all levels of law enforcement, utilizing the best techniques to stop the human trafficking, which has much larger impacts even in California.

But to have Uber as a partner, now for the first time, the 10th Congressional District has the technology available to align our law enforcement with the victims that could be stuck in harm's way in an Uber or some other type of transportation.

Through my work on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, we secured big wins for the 10th District: two different highways, \$29 million in TIGER grants and BUILD grants for local roadways to improve safety and ease congestion.

Last but certainly not least, for years now, for decades, we have talked about water. It is the lifeblood of the Central Valley. If you shut off our water, you shut off our farms, you shut off our economy. We made big strides, securing funding, making sure that, with the WIN Act, we also passed the New WATER Act, allowing for the first time to have an infrastructure bank so we can borrow money with a guaranteed payback to build new water storage and new reservoirs.

You want green energy? Hydro is the greenest, most renewable energy that we have. This is our opportunity to build Shasta with the \$20 million upfront, and the new grant for \$450 million for Sites Reservoir. We need four to five million new acre feet of water. We have the ability now to move that forward.

So some great progress as we move forward on Los Vaqueros, Shasta Dam, Temperance Flat, and many of our irrigation districts that are looking to expand, create green hydro energy, new recreation, new water, and the future of the valley as well.

It has been my greatest honor to bring these achievements home for the valley. Thank you, again, to my constituents and to all of my colleagues, especially in the California delegation. We have come together on many different issues to fight for our State. It has been a big honor.

Let me end with saying this: I started my public service career wearing the cloth of this great Nation, and I have been blessed, once again, to serve this country in a new capacity. There is no greater honor than being able to serve this body and fight for and represent the American Dream that we have in our communities, and it is with great respect and honor that I move into the next chapter of my life.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, my friend from California, for the opportunity to have this time.

Representing the Central Valley in Congress has been an honor of a lifetime. There are truly no words to express how grateful I am to my supporters, neighbors, and all those who make the Central Valley such an amazing place.

If you would have told me or my parents 10 years ago that I would be here

standing on the House floor, none of us would have believed you.

I have so many people to thank. First off, most importantly, my wife, Terra, she has been an amazing supporter and, from the day I met her, she has always just found ways to make my life better and make me a better person.

My children—Conner, who is 16; Madeline, who is 12; and Lucas, who is 8—have weathered the storm and been a part of this life for the last 8 years, 2 years in the State Legislature and 6 years here, traveling back and forth, many times away from home, not able to attend soccer games. So it has been tough on them, and I think they are looking forward to things being a little bit better with me having the opportunity to be there for them more than I have had the opportunity in the past. I am grateful for that.

I am also grateful for my team, the staff in my office, back home in Hanford and Bakersfield, and especially here in Washington, D.C. I have had an amazing team around me that has helped me be successful here in Washington and at home, and I am very proud to have had them as part of my team.

Interns throughout the years, that is something that a lot of folks don't pay attention to, but those are all people who, even today, I still see them walking around the halls of Congress and sometimes around the valley, working in different industries and taking their careers to new levels and new heights. To know that I played a small role in their lives is something that I take a lot of pride in.

My fellow Members, the California delegation, others outside of the delegation, I have made a lot of friends here, people that I didn't know before, I had only seen on TV in the past and have now become good friends, trusted, good friends, and people that I trust with so much of my life today. I am so proud to have had that opportunity.

While I am sad to be leaving, we can take pride in knowing that we brought about real, tangible change. We have reduced taxes for the middle class, made huge strides in our battle for water, reformed the dairy industry for thousands of California farmers, improved access for healthcare to families throughout the valley, and given our troops the support they deserve.

I am proud of all the work that we have done. I wouldn't change a second of it. I just had a great opportunity.

So the Central Valley has always been and will always be my home, and I am beyond grateful for the opportunity to have served in this place, representing them.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight for the final time as a Member of Congress to say thank you.

Thank you to California's 45th Congressional District for the faith and

trust you have placed in me to represent you and your families in the people's House.

I first entered this Chamber three decades ago as a young intern for Representative Bill Thomas. I remember well the sense of wonder I felt and the goose bumps on my arm. You would think that those youthful emotions would fade once I became a Member myself, but they did not. When I exit for the final time, I will still be in awe of the wonders of those hallowed halls, and I will still have goose bumps.

It has been the honor of a lifetime to represent my home of Orange County and the communities of Tustin, North Tustin, Orange, Irvine, Mission Viejo, Laguna Woods, Laguna Hills, Rancho Santa Margarita, Lake Forest, Anaheim Hills, Villa Park, and Coto de Caza.

Every step of the way during this journey of service, I have been flanked by my husband, David, and my four children: Kate, Caroline, DJ, and Tristan. They have been my rock, my reality check, my most clever social media commenters, and the loves of my life. I thank God each and every day that He has blessed me with them.

To my staff, both in Washington and Orange County, thank you for making me and every Member of Congress better at our jobs. You are the unsung heroes of government. Together, we have accomplished a lot: the historic Sexual Assault Survivors' Bill of Rights, major tax and regulatory reform, and landmark opioid legislation. And we helped advance the conversation on paid family leave.

My staff helped me stay true to the promises I made to my constituents, and I can't thank them enough for that.

I am blessed to have grown up and live in Orange County, and those of us privileged to serve our community in Congress can only hope to have left it in better shape than we have found it.

One small bit of advice I will impart to all those who succeed me in this office, and that is: Bring your brain to Washington, but leave your heart in Orange County. The people of the 45th District will teach you a lot, and I am wiser from their tutelage.

The House of Representatives can be a loud and hectic place sometimes, but that is why we love it. Keep your eye on the ball and remain faithful to the institution.

As then-Congressman Abraham Lincoln of Illinois told this very House when it was facing turbulent times: "Determine that the thing can and shall be done, and then we shall find the way."

My home State of California and our Nation are fortunate to have such a dedicated group of citizen legislators working to make both a better place. I thank them for their guidance and their support over the years. While we didn't always agree, I seldom have come across a colleague who I didn't think had his or her constituents' best

interests at heart or cared deeply about our country.

Now, as I close this chapter of my life and leave the people's House for the final time, I remain as confident as ever in the future of the House and the Union. I remain forever in debt to the people of Orange County and the 45th District for bestowing upon me the honor to serve.

May God bless America and the Golden State of California. I will see y'all back home soon.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who have had the honor and privilege of working with our departing colleagues in the California Republican Congressional delegation, this is a very sad day.

For us, yes, we are losing friends and colleagues whose good judgment we have often relied upon and whose friendship we will always treasure. But far more importantly, it is a sad day for our State and our Nation, for they are losing the service of experienced leaders dedicated to restoring freedom as the cornerstone of our public policy.

DAVID VALADAO and JEFF DENHAM ably represented communities in the Central Valley of California, in highly competitive districts where Republican voters have always been a distinct minority. And yet, their sincere engagement with their constituencies and their pragmatic approach to their local challenges and problems saw them elected and re-elected in the House.

When we served together in the State Senate, JEFF DENHAM refused to vote for an irresponsible State budget. Public employee unions tried to recall him for it, but the voters stood by him.

No one doubts that, but for the hyper-partisan tone of these unique times, they would have both been handily re-elected.

I first met ED ROYCE 37 years ago when we served together in the California Legislature. When he was already a recognized leader in the State Senate, one Saturday afternoon, I found him, to my stunned surprise, wearing an apron and working behind the counter at a coffeehouse he had just acquired. That work ethic, combined with his quiet and unassuming nature and keen ability to cut through rhetoric to reach bedrock reality, has made him one of the most effective Members of the House and someone I greatly admire.

I met DANA ROHRBACHER a few years later when he first ran for Congress in 1988. It has been said that if you look up Orange County in the dictionary, you will find his picture. For three decades, he has been an icon in Southern California, representing the conservative ideals, the libertarian leanings, and the casual lifestyle that define the big OC of that era, an era that now closes with his departure from Congress.

In 1993, I met DARRELL ISSA when he became a driving force on the board of

directors at the Claremont Institute, a think tank devoted to putting American founding principles back into the public policy debate. That same driving belief in freedom and free markets had already made him a titan of industry and would soon make him an effective and tireless advocate for these principles in Congress.

More recently, I have had the honor to serve with MIMI WALTERS and STEVE KNIGHT.

I can tell you that when MIMI sets her mind on something, she is terrifying. She pursues her objectives with all of the subtlety and nuance of a heat-seeking missile. Her constituents had an advocate who pulled out all the stops on their behalf, something I think they will come to appreciate in retrospect.

I served with STEVE KNIGHT's dad in the State Senate and, at that time, represented the adjoining district. I have sat with STEVE every day on this floor during votes, and I can say with some authority that he is the full measure of his father and then some. Never have I known a colleague to agonize more in order to weigh his votes for the betterment of his community and his country. He is a man of quiet and firm principle, a voice that I predict his constituents will also come to sorely miss.

You know, Churchill once observed that politics are just as interesting as war, and much more exciting, for in war, you can be shot dead only once, but in politics, many times.

I have found that to be true over my political career, and it is from that fact that springs my hope that we will see all these heroes back in new and more influential roles in the years ahead.

□ 1715

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. CALVERT, for organizing this tonight. Indeed, it isn't pleasant, because we are losing some great colleagues here.

The people have spoken, it is their will in the election, and we all know that this is a fleeting time and opportunity to be here. It just really is a reality check when you have plans and you are going along, and an election happens, and all of a sudden those plans change for some of your colleagues or even yourself. Who knows?

But indeed, it has been a great pleasure for me to serve several of my years here overlapping with DAVID VALADAO, ED ROYCE, DANA ROHRBACHER, DARRELL ISSA, STEVE KNIGHT, JEFF DENHAM, and MIMI WALTERS.

It is a fleeting moment, but also one you will always remember. The friendships are the most important things. I am not going to list bills we have passed or this or that, because indeed what I take away are the friendships.

Having come up in the legislature with MIMI, JEFF, STEVE, and DAVID, we

came in together, we formed our early competitive political lives together in that crucible in Sacramento. I think when I think back on this, I am not going to remember a lot about the bills or a lot about that, and I don't think any of us really will so much. It is the friendships. It is the relationships. And I count MIMI, JEFF, and DAVID as my closest friends in this place.

So when you go around the hallways here and you see that the bronze plaques have been ripped off the offices there, indeed it is like having a part of it ripped off your heart, you know? But we soldier on, because the people have spoken. It is the will of the voters.

I know I have been proud to always stand with them. Whether fighting for water, for agriculture, for fiscal responsibility, for the right direction for our Nation, I have always counted on these friends to help keep all of us moving on the right track, thinking about the right things.

So indeed in these relationships, the fun that comes along with it, like with my friend "Cowadao." And JEFFREY, who we always refer to each other as our full formal first names. And M-I-M-I. We have had a lot of fun in this. And I think we have all fought hard in the trenches to advance not only our State at that level, but our country as well.

We are all better off for it. I am better off for having known them. And it is not going to be as fun, it is not going to be as fulfilling to be around here without friends like that, but, again, it is the will of the voters. It is how things go.

We will see each other in many other capacities as we move through this life together.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the invaluable contributions made by my California Republican delegation colleagues who are departing at the conclusion of this term.

I consider these individuals more than colleagues. I consider them my friends, and I am deeply disappointed they will not be joining us in the next session of Congress.

Every one of them has served in the House with distinction, making this institution better for having them a part of it. They have represented their constituents and our State well by understanding the unique challenges they faced and effectively fighting for solutions.

The booming voice from JEFF DENHAM is as unmistakable as it is effective advocating for California's Central Valley. He knows it is pretty difficult to farm without a reliable water supply, so he helped lead the charge for many sensible water policies that help our Nation's fruit and vegetable farmers keep American-grown produce on the dining room tables around the country.

DARRELL ISSA made a name for himself in the car alarm industry before he came to Congress, where he sounded the alarm on the executive branch mis-

conduct. As a leader on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, DARRELL held our fellow agencies to account for their actions and was a staunch defender of American taxpayers.

STEVE KNIGHT comes from a family well known for public service. STEVE proudly carried on that tradition by serving in the Army for 8 years, then the Los Angeles Police Department for 18 years. STEVE then came to Congress, bringing his tremendous experience to the House Armed Services Committee, where he has made a big impact.

The dean of the California Republican delegation, DANA ROHRBACHER, always brings a unique perspective to any conversation. Since his days in the Reagan White House, DANA has been a constant voice for the defense of liberty and freedom. He has also been a gnarly champion for California's legendary surfing community.

ED ROYCE and I were both members of the incoming freshman class of 1993. As a longtime member and now chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, ED has served as an effective advocate for American interests and allies around the globe. I have seen firsthand how especially tireless he is in being a voice for the safety and liberty of people so desperate for someone to come to their aid. And to cap it off, ED's tribute video featured Bono singing his praises.

DAVID VALADAO is a Member of the House who truly understands what it means to be a champion for his district. DAVID has never been interested in partisan politics. He just wants to deliver results for the Central Valley of California. Working with DAVID to solve California's water challenges and serving with him on the Appropriations Committee has been an absolute pleasure and honor.

Anyone who spends any time with MIMI WALTERS knows that she is the toughest member of the California Republican delegation. I think you have heard that a number of times. When our delegation needs to get something done, you can always count on MIMI to be front and center in the fight. Her tenacity in advancing worthwhile policies will be sorely missed by our delegation, our conference, and the House.

Time and time again, our California Republican delegation has come together to respond to the needs of our State, whether it was a serious drought, a disease threatening to wipe out our citrus farmers, horrific wildfires and the flooding and mudslides that follow them, there is no group of representatives I would rather lock arms with to fight for those solutions that our constituents need.

Mr. Speaker, Teddy Roosevelt so brilliantly said, "It is not the critic who counts; not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles, or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena."

The departing members of the California delegation all leave with pride of

knowing they served in the arena and spent themselves in a worthy cause.

Again, I am grateful for their service and especially for their friendship.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1872. An act to promote access for United States diplomats and other officials, journalists, and other citizens to Tibetan areas of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3996. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to permit other courts to transfer certain cases to United States Tax Court.

H.R. 5759. An act to improve executive agency digital services, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6964. An act to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1092. An act to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions.

S. 2961. An act to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990.

S.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Treasury relating to "Returns by Exempt Organizations and Returns by Certain Non-Exempt Organizations".

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUDD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the leadership on both sides of the aisle for according us this time. It is an honor to have the privilege of standing here in the House of Representatives to present a resolution tonight, and I am grateful that the time has been allowed.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored tonight to present this resolution, H. Res. 1166, honoring and praising the American Jewish Committee, known as AJC, on the occasion of its 112th anniversary.

I am honored to say that this resolution has other persons who are sponsors: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MENG, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROTHFUS. I am honored that

these Members have cosigned, if you will, in that they are cosponsors of this resolution.

I am honored to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this organization, the American Jewish Committee, has been around now for 112 years in the business of protecting Jews and other minorities from anti-Semitism, racism, bigotry, hatred, and human rights violations.

When these things occur, you can count on the American Jewish Committee standing up, speaking out, and making their position known.

The American Jewish Committee is currently fighting against the rising tide of hate and bigotry. And there is empirical, as well as anecdotal, evidence to support the fact that there is a rising tide.

Per the FBI, there were 6,121 hate crimes in 2016; in 2017, 7,125 hate crimes. A rising tide. Three of five hate crimes target ethnicity or race; one of five will target religion. Hate crimes in this country are being addressed by the American Jewish Committee. 2,013 hate crimes against African Americans in 2017, 938 hate crimes against Jewish Americans.

The American Jewish Committee is confronting hate and making a difference in the lives of people.

This organization was founded November 11, 1906, in New York City by a group of Jews who wanted to raise awareness about the persecution and targeting of Jews in Russia.

I might also add that this was around the time that the NAACP was founded. It was founded just some years later in 1909. And a good many members of the founding persons associated with the NAACP were Jewish people.

The NAACP and the AJC have had a partnership, a friendship, a relationship for many, many years in this battle against hate and bigotry.

The AJC supported the Civil Rights Act of 1964, supported the Voting Rights Act of 1965, supported the historic decision in the Supreme Court case of *Brown versus Board of Education of Topeka*. And I would add, not only did the AJC support it by filing various briefs and doing research, but also with money. Members supported this lawsuit with money.

Thurgood Marshall was the lead counsel for the NAACP in *Brown v. Board of Education*, but there were other persons who were not of African ancestry associated with this litigation who helped to fund it. It was a costly piece of litigation, and I am proud to say that AJC was supportive of the NAACP in *Brown versus Board of Education of Topeka*.

The AJC has been at the forefront of strengthening ties between Jews and Latinos. The AJC concerns itself with the human rights and human dignity of all people regardless of ethnicity.

The AJC's Muslim-Jewish Advisory Council is a group of some 50 persons, Muslims and Jews, who have as their aim protecting and expanding the

rights of religious minorities in the United States of America. Those who will divide us along religious lines are confronted by the AJC, the American Jewish Committee.

□ 1730

It has launched a global campaign encouraging people of conscience around the world to attend Jewish services, and especially this was made known after the attack at the Tree of Life congregation in Pittsburgh, where 11 worshippers were killed.

I was fortunate enough to attend a Shabbat service in Houston, Texas, where our mayor, the Honorable Sylvester Turner, spoke and where we, persons of goodwill, had the opportunity to express our desire and our belief that we should combine our efforts to make sure that we developed a symbiotic relationship as we moved forward with this global campaign to encourage people of conscience to get to know persons of different religions so that we could have together what we could never accomplish apart.

The AJC, in 2015, launched what is known as the Mayors United Against Anti-Semitism campaign to build a nationwide coalition of elected officials committed to fighting anti-Semitism, a nationwide coalition. I am proud to say that that continues to this day and that elected officials are responding to the clarion call to unite against bigotry, hatred, anti-Semitism, homophobia, xenophobia, Islamophobia, sexism, and nativism. The AJC is there to fight for the rights of people to live in dignity with peace and harmony.

The AJC is international in scope. It has 11 international offices, 22 in the United States, and 36 international Jewish community partnerships. In truth, it is international in scope. It is also an organization that has been there for the State of Israel.

It is a steadfast supporter of Israel, becoming the first American Jewish organization to open an office in Israel, and an effective advocate for Israel's security. The AJC has been and continues to be a strong partner for the State of Israel.

I am proud to tell you that I have a friend, who at one time was the head of AJC. At the time, I was the head of the NAACP. I share this brief vignette because I think it is important to explain how things can really work and how people can work together.

My friend, David Minberg, as I indicated, was the head of AJC, and I had the good fortune to be a leader of the NAACP in Houston, Texas. We had a city council person, whose name I need not mention, who made a racial slur, said a very ugly thing, and David and I had the opportunity to bring our organizations together.

Upon doing so, we concluded that we should talk to other persons of goodwill in the city so as to build a coalition to confront the council person who made the racial slur. With a strong coalition, the NAACP and the AJC were

able to call for the resignation of this council person.

These two organizations, taking the lead, were able to do something that, in my opinion, could not have been done but for the unity exhibited, and the coalition that was constructed could not have done it, and that was to have this city council person leave city council.

This is the kind of strength that the AJC brings to issues associated with hate and bigotry. The AJC does not tolerate hatred and bigotry. Much of what I express with reference to hatred and bigotry I acquired from associating with persons who are part of the AJC.

I have understood, as a result of working with my friends at the AJC, that we can never, ever tolerate hatred and bigotry, regardless of where it comes from, regardless as to what the source is. We have got to be bold. We have to show courage. We have to stand up together against hatred and bigotry.

These are some of the things that the AJC has exhibited over the years in my presence.

And I said my friends at AJC. I call people friends who are persons that I do more than have dinner with, persons whom I do more than associate with, persons whom I have more than a relationship with. I call friends persons whom I can disagree with and still maintain a relationship with them.

Over the years, these friends and I have stood together, and we continue to stand together.

So, tonight, Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of this august body H. Res. 1166, and I call to the attention of those who are within the sound of my voice, those who may be viewing at home, I call to their attention H. Res. 1166, a resolution that honors and praises the American Jewish Committee on the occasion of its 112th anniversary.

I suggest that it be resolved by the House of Representatives that the House of Representatives, itself, recognize the 112th anniversary of the historic founding of the American Jewish Committee, and that the House of Representatives should honor and praise the American Jewish Committee on the occasion of this anniversary for its efforts regarding human rights worldwide, for its interfaith dialogue, and for the promotion of Israel's security and its place in the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to have presented this resolution, and I would have the world know, and all of my friends know, that I look forward to returning to Houston, Texas, and meeting with my friends who are associated with the AJC, the American Jewish Committee, as we continue our struggle to end hatred and bigotry—not to manage it, not to make it less tolerable, but to eliminate it in its entirety wherever it exists.

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

THE CHRIST OF CHRISTMAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, we are told it is the most wonderful time of the year: Christmas. As a Nation, we have celebrated it with family, with breaks from work, and with a bit of pomp in our Nation's Capital. But why? It has not always been the case.

When Americans began to settle in the Colonies, they came with varied religious backgrounds. To the Pilgrims and Puritans, the idea of celebrating a holy day associated with the churches that had persecuted them in Europe was repulsive. But to those high churches long established—such as Anglican, Episcopal, and Catholic—Christmas was observed widespread.

In the fabric of our Nation, the low church settlers dwelt more in New England, where Christmas was not observed, and the high church settlers were more in the South, where it was. Still, it was not until 1837, when Louisiana made Christmas a State holiday, that Christmas was officially recognized.

In time, more States began official recognition. In 1870, Christmas became a national holiday. Its lack of recognition was not for a lack of understanding for the importance of the birth of Christ. Rather, it was out of respect to the various Christian beliefs making up our national fabric.

It was not until 1889 that a Christmas tree adorned the White House, and the first official Christmas tree lighting ceremony did not occur until 1923, under President Calvin Coolidge. The first White House Christmas card did not appear until 1953, under President Dwight Eisenhower.

Still, our Nation and our leaders have always made great effort to express the importance of the birth of Christ. Here is what a few of nearly all of our Presidents have said about the birth of Christ:

Calvin Coolidge: "For many generations, Christmas has been joyously observed . . . because on that day was born one who grew to be the only perfect man and became the Savior of the world. No other influence in human experience has compared with the birth and life of Christ."

Franklin Roosevelt: "Here, at home, we will celebrate this Christmas Day in our traditional American way—because of its deep spiritual meaning to us; because the teachings of Christ are fundamental in our lives; and because we want our youngest generation to grow up knowing the significance of this tradition and the story of the coming of the immortal Prince of Peace and Good Will. But, in perhaps every home in the United States, sad and anxious thoughts will be continually with the millions of our loved ones who are suffering hardships and misery, and who are risking their very lives to preserve

for us and for all mankind the fruits of His teachings and the foundations of civilization itself."

Harry Truman: "In love, which is the very essence of the message of the Prince of Peace, the world would find a solution for all its ills. I do not believe there is one problem in this country or in the world today which could not be settled if approached through the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount. . . .

"In the stillness of the eve of the Nativity when the hopes and mankind hang on the peace that was offered to the world 19 centuries ago, it is but natural, while we survey our destiny, that we give thought also to our past to some of the things which have gone into the making of our Nation. . . .

"In this day, whether it be far or near, the kingdoms of this world shall become, indeed, the kingdom of God, and He will reign forever and ever, Lord of Lords and King of Kings. . . .

"Since returning home, I have been reading again in our family Bible some of the passages which foretold this night. . . . We miss the spirit of Christmas if we consider the incarnation as an indistinct and doubtful, far-off event unrelated to our present problems. We miss the purport of Christ's birth if we do not accept it as a living link which joins us together in the spirit as children of the ever-living and true God. In love alone—the love of God and the love of man—will be found the solution of all the ills which afflict the world today."

Lyndon Johnson: "We were taught by Him whose birth we commemorate that after death, there is life. . . . In these last 200 years, we have guided the building of our Nation and our society by those principles and precepts brought to Earth nearly 2,000 years ago on that first Christmas.

"In a few days, we shall all celebrate the birth of His Holiness on Earth. . . . We shall acknowledge the kingdom of a child in a world of men. That child, we should remember, grew into manhood Himself, preached and moved men in many walks of life, and died in agony. But His death, so the Christian faith tells us, was not the end. For Him, and for millions of men and women ever since, it marked a time of triumph, when the spirit of life triumphed over death."

□ 1745

Gerald Ford: "In our 200 years, we Americans have always honored the spiritual testament of 2,000 years ago. We embrace the spirit of the Prince of Peace so that we might find peace in our own hearts and in our own land, and hopefully in the world as well."

Ronald Reagan: "The Nativity story of nearly 20 centuries ago is known by all faiths as a hymn to the brotherhood of man. For Christians, it is the fulfillment of age-old prophecies and the reaffirmation of God's great love for all of us. Through a generous Heavenly Father's gift of His Son, hope and com-

passion entered a world weary with fear and despair and changed it for all time."

Reagan continues. " . . . I have always believed that the message of Jesus is one of hope and joy. I know that there are those who recognize Christmas Day as the birthday of a great and good man, a wise teacher who gave us principles to live by. And then there are others of us who believe that He was the Son of God, that He was Divine. If we live our lives for truth, for love, and for God, we need never be afraid."

George H.W. Bush put it this way: "At Christmas, we, too, rejoice in the mystery of God's love for us—love revealed through the gift of Christ's birth. Born into a family of a young carpenter and his wife, in a stable shared by beasts of the field, our Savior came to live among ordinary men. Yet, in time, the miraculous nature of this simple event became clear. Christ's birth changed the course of history, bringing the light of hope to a world dwelling in the darkness of sin and death.

Today, nearly 2,000 years later, the shining promise of that first Christmas continues to give our lives a sense of peace and purpose. Our words and deeds, when guided by the example of Christ's life, can help others share in the joy of man's Redemption."

Bill Clinton: "The Christmas story is dear and familiar to us all—shepherds and angels, Wise Men and King Herod, Mary and Joseph, and, at the heart of it all, a Child. This Child was born into poverty in a city too crowded to offer Him shelter. He was sent to a region whose people had endured suffering, tyranny, and exile. And yet, this Child brought with Him riches so great that they continue to sustain the human spirit 2,000 years later: the assurance of God's love and presence in our lives and the promise of salvation."

Barack Obama: "More than 2,000 years ago, a child was born to two faithful travelers who could find rest only in a stable, among the cattle and the sheep. But this was not just any child. Christ's birth made the angels rejoice and attracted shepherds and kings from afar. He was a manifestation of God's love for us."

Even with all of their flaws, the political and party tensions, the times of national prosperity and crisis, our Presidents have been consistent in expressing publicly their belief on why Christ's birth matters. Bold Presidential statements: the only perfect man, Savior of the world, immortal Prince of Peace, Lord of Lords who will reign forever, His Holiness, Son of God, the light of Hope, God's love and presence in our lives, a manifestation of God's love for us.

No other human being has ever been accorded such accolade by our Presidents.

Indeed, even in our national Congress, well over 90 percent of elected officials associate themselves with the

Christian faith, and give similar words as to why Christ is important. But even all the words of Presidents and national leaders are not as important as the words of the man himself, whose birth created all the fuss. What did Christ claim about himself? We have bold statements by Jesus. Here are some pretty astounding ones:

John 6:35:

I am the bread of life. He who comes to Me shall never hunger.

John 8:12:

I am the light of the world. He who follows Me shall not walk in darkness, but have the light of life.

John 10:9–11:

I am the door. If anyone enters by Me, he will be saved, and he will go in and out and find pasture. The thief does not come except to steal, and to kill, and to destroy. I have come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd gives His life for the sheep.

John 10:14–17:

I am the good shepherd; and I know My sheep, and am known by My own. As the Father knows Me, even so I know the Father; and I lay down My life for the sheep. And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they will hear My voice and there will be one flock, and one shepherd. Therefore, My Father loves Me because I lay down My life that I may take it again.

John 11:25:

I am the resurrection and the life. He who believes in Me, though he may die, he shall live.

John 14:6:

I am the way, the truth and the life. No man comes to the Father except by Me.

John 15:5–13:

I am the vine, you are the branches. He who abides in Me, and I in him, bears much fruit; for without Me you can do nothing. If anyone does not abide in Me, he is cast out as a branch and is withered; and they gather them and throw them into the fire, and they are burned. If you abide in Me, and My words abide in you, you will ask what you desire, and it shall be done for you. By this My Father is glorified, that you bear much fruit; so you will be My disciples. As the Father loved Me, I also have loved you; abide in My love. If you keep My commandments, you will abide in My love, just as I have kept My Father's commandments and abide in His love. These things I have spoken to you, that My joy may remain in you, and that your joy may be full. This is My commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you. Greater love has no one than this, than to lay down one's life for his friends.

Ponder this. These are bold claims. The bread of life, the light of the world, the door, the good shepherd, the resurrection, the way, the truth, the life, the vine. Only God could make such claims.

John 3:16 explains it this way:

For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believes in Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life.

As human beings, we understand life because it is real to us. We live. We also understand complexity and order. We arrange our days, our clothes, our

homes, our diet. God has created us with a sense of order.

Created. One only has to look at the complexity of the human eye to see a design. One cannot fathom the circulatory system, and organs, and all the things that make up life and not see the hand of a master designer. One cannot look at the miracle of birth and not see a clear designed creation.

A junkyard full of car parts does not self-produce a new car in any amount of time any more than a jumble of proteins make life by accident.

We have been fearfully and wonderfully made. When one considers all of the world, how it works together, how it is perfectly placed in our solar system, we can see God's hand. With slight deviation of the Earth's axis, we would be dead.

With just a few more miles closer proximity to the Sun, we would be burned to death. With just a few more miles away from the Sun, we would freeze to death. We are not some accident, some purposeless blob of proteins that has no meaning. Nature speaks to God's hand. We see the grandeur of a designer all around us. The giver of life, God himself. But what of His Son, Jesus Christ? The Gospel of John explains:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things were made through Him, and without Him nothing was made that was made. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men. And the light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not comprehend it . . . That was the true Light which gives light to every man coming into the world.

He was in the world, and the world was made through Him, and the world did not know Him. He came to His own, and His own did not receive Him. But as many as received Him, to them He gave the right to become children of God, to those who believe in His name: who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.

But why? Why did God's Son have to come into the world? When God created man and woman, He created us with choices. He gave simple instruction, but the choice was still Adam's to make. God did not create a robot. He created a human soul. Adam, the first man, chose to disobey God in that simple but uneasy choice. That choice gave us sin, the knowledge of good and evil.

Paul tells us in Romans 5:12 that because of this choice:

Through one man sin entered the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men, because all sinned.

Sin perpetuated from that moment into all mankind. We see it ourselves if we take the time to consider it. We do not have to teach a child how to do wrong. It comes naturally, with the arching of the back, and the shouting of the word "no" as one of those first uttered.

As they mature, we labor to teach them to do what is right, guided by the

conscience that God has placed into us. Why do we feel guilty when we do things wrong? Romans tells us that God wrote that moral law into our hearts, a conscience. We were created with it. We are unique among living creatures in this way. We have a soul. We get a basic sense of God's moral right and wrong, yet, we fail that standard because of our sinful nature.

We fall short. We don't want to, but we do. We want to do what is right, but often, we make a different choice because of our sinful nature. Because of this failing to meet God's standard as He created us, we are unable, by ourselves, to fix it.

□ 1800

For a time, God communicated through His word and His prophets the need to make an atonement for our shortcomings, to cleanse our sins by sacrifices. Christ came to be the final and total sacrifice, erasing the sin in our lives, if we would receive it. Christ's birth was the fix. But how?

God, as the master programmer, if you think in modern vernacular, made us perfect. But we became corrupted with a sin virus that we voluntarily put in, ignoring the warnings. Once a perfect operating system, now we were destined to crash and eventually destroy ourselves. Jesus would become the fix, the patch, the update, to take away the sin virus and to make us whole again before God. But the fix would not be automatic. It has to be installed voluntarily in our hearts.

When Christ came into the world, He did not come by Adam's seed. Christ could not become the fix patched to a sinful, virus-corrupted operating system. Instead, God sent His Son to be born of a virgin—Mary—bypassing Adam's seed and the sinful nature that would come with it. Christ became flesh and dwelt among us. Fully God, yet becoming flesh, acquainted with all our frailties, but not corrupted through Adam's seed. If He could be obedient even unto death, ultimately embodied in a death on the cross, then His sacrifice would be available to all who would receive it as a new operating system for life.

Paul tells us in Romans 5:8 that God demonstrates His own love toward us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

Romans 5:18 says:

Therefore, as through one man's offense judgment came to all men, resulting in condemnation, even so through one Man's righteous act, the free gift came to all men, resulting in justification of life.

That is why Christ came.

Isaiah 9:6:

For unto us a Child is born,

Unto us a Son is given;

And the government will be upon His shoulder,

And His name will be called Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.

Of the increase of His government and peace there will be no end.

Christ tells us in John 3:

For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life. For God did not send His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. He who believes in Him is not condemned; but he who does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that the light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For everyone practicing evil hates the light and does not come to the light, lest his deeds shall be exposed. But he who does the truth comes to the light, that his deeds may be clearly seen, that they have been done in God.

Christ makes a direct appeal to us when He says: "Come to Me, all you who labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

We come by making a simple, voluntary confession. Paul tells us in Romans 10:9:

If you confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in your heart that God has raised Him from the dead, you will be saved.

Harry Truman was correct when he said that in the love of God and the love of man will be found the solution to all the ills that afflict the world today. As much as we may wish to make our Nation strong, it will never happen without observing the truth in Proverbs 14:36:

Righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.

In a world of strife, we could use some peace and encouragement. Christ said:

These things have I spoken to you, that in Me you may have peace. In the world you will have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.

In a world of hatred and suffering, we could use some love.

Jesus said: "This is My commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you."

In a world that tells us there is no hope, we can find it in Christ's commitment to us. Romans 5:3 through 6:

Tribulation produces perseverance; and perseverance, character; and character, hope. Now hope does not disappoint us, because the love of God has been poured out in our hearts by the Holy Spirit who was given to us. For when we were still without strength, in due time, Christ died for the ungodly.

It started 2,000 years ago in Bethlehem.

Luke 2:11: "For there is born to you this day in the city of David a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord."

As I close my service in Congress in what may perhaps be the last time I am privileged to speak in this august Chamber, I am grateful for the privilege to have done so and to the Oklahomans who made that possible. As I bring to a close more than three-and-one-half decades of military and public service to our Nation, I do it with a simple prayer that you may find the true meaning of Christmas: of hope, of salvation, and of celebration.

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

IN HONOR OF DR. JAMES BILLINGTON, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, when I learned of the death of my very close friend, Dr. James Billington, the 13th Librarian of Congress, it hit me pretty hard. That was about 3 weeks ago. Dr. Billington's passion for the institution that he led for 28 years, his scholarly nature, and his gentlemanly demeanor were a tremendous inspiration to me and to so many Members of this body. I so admired him.

First, I want to extend my heartfelt condolences to Marjorie and the entire family. May God grant him peace.

During his 28 years at the Library of Congress, from 1987 to 2015, Dr. James Billington led the institution in a remarkable period of accomplishment. He once referred to the Library of Congress—I like to call it America's Library—as the largest, most wide-ranging collection of world-recorded knowledge ever assembled on our planet. He strove mightily to preserve the Nation's cultural patrimony and open the Library's collections to the American people and to people around the world.

Dr. Billington doubled the size of the Library's holdings to more than 160 million items, including books, manuscripts, newspapers, maps, music and film recordings, and prints and photographs.

Simultaneously, he also created a massive online library, digitizing materials so that the historic and cultural resources of the Library—being historic and cultural resources of the world, I might add—which were once only available to persons visiting the Library now would be instantaneously accessible to anyone anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Billington also looked to the future, but he never lost sight of our connectedness and the treasures of the past. During his tenure, he acquired the only copy of the 1507 Waldseemüller world map, which is known as America's birth certificate. He reconstructed Thomas Jefferson's original library for permanent display, and he obtained the papers of hundreds of great Americans ranging from jurist Thurgood Marshall to the songwriter Irving Berlin.

Mr. Speaker, I can't emphasize enough that he was a remarkable man—a Russian scholar with a brilliant mind. He accompanied 10 congressional delegations to Russia and the former Soviet Union. In 1988, he was invited to join President Reagan in traveling to the Soviet Summit in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the House Appropriations Committee's Legislative Branch Subcommittee, and now I am its chairman. I got to know Dr. Billington from his regular appear-

ances before the Appropriations Committee to talk about the budget.

I often enjoyed the many events he held at the Library, the dialogues, the displays, and the exhibits he organized to engage Members of Congress in their Library.

Dr. Billington went out of his way to accommodate our needs. He once graciously hosted a small British delegation on my behalf that included a member of the royal family and a member of the House of Lords, both with an interest in Charles Carroll, one of the original signers of the Declaration of Independence. Despite the government shutdown at that moment a little while back, which forced us to move the forum into this building, the Capitol, Dr. Billington ensured that the Library's prized displays were in place and were on time, and that he was present to deliver welcoming remarks.

With his retirement, leaving the great institution he served faithfully for nearly three decades, Dr. Billington left an indelible imprint, having created programs and services that continue to benefit Congress and the American public.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, before he retired, in a conversation with his wife, Marjorie—and I knew his retirement was imminent—I told him: Dr. Billington, now it is time to write two books, the book that you want to write that is in your mind, and the book for the rest of us to read to make accessible your life story and your brilliant insights.

Long live his memory.

Again, Mr. Speaker, let me say, may God comfort Dr. Billington's wife, Marjorie, their four children, and their 12 grandchildren in their moment of grief.

I extend to them, as well as the entire Library of Congress community, my heartfelt condolences.

Jim Billington, well done, my friend. Well done, good and faithful public servant.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3342. An act to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons that are responsible for using civilians as human shields, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4111. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the number of small business investment companies in underlicensed States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4407. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3s101 Rockwell Street in Warrenville, Illinois, as the "Corporal Jeffrey Allen Williams Post Office Building."

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 245. An act to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 13, 2018, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7139. A letter from the Team Lead/RD Innovation Center, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Rural Development Environmental Regulation for Rural Infrastructure Projects (RIN: 0572-AC44) received December 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7140. A letter from the Team Lead/RD Innovation Center, Rural Development — Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — "Buy American" Requirement (RIN: 0572-AC42) received December 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7141. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Modification of DFARS Clause "Surge Option" (DFARS Case 2018-D025) [Docket No.: DARS-2018-D036] (RIN: 0750-AJ87) received December 3, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7142. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Defense Pricing and Contracting, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Documentation for Interagency Contracts (DFARS Case 2018-D073) [Docket DARS-2018-0054] (RIN: 0750-AK27) received December 3, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7143. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Competition and Infrastructure Policy Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to Reporting Requirements Governing Hearing Aid-Compatible Mobile Handsets [WT Docket No.: 17-228] received December 3, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7144. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Geomagnetic Disturbance Reliability Standard; Reliability Standard for Transmission System Planned Performance for Geomagnetic Disturbance Events [Docket Nos.:

RM18-8-000 and RM15-11-003; Order No.: 851] received December 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7145. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, covering the 6-month period that ended on September 30, 2018, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7146. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Administration's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, covering the period from April 1 through September 30, 2018, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7147. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, covering the period from April 1 through September 30, 2018, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7148. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, covering the period from April 1, 2018, through September 30, 2018, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7149. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer and Associate Administrator for Performance Management, U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's Agency Financial Report for FY 2018, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7150. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 2018 National Pool (Rev. Proc. 2018-55) received December 3, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7151. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Safe Harbor for Certain Infrastructure Trades or Businesses under Section 163(j) (Rev. Proc. 2018-59) received December 3, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7152. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's notice — Publications of the Tier 2 Tax Rates received December 3, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7153. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Interim Guidance and Request for Comments on Income Tax Withholding from Wages and from Retirement and Annuity Distributions [Notice 2018-92] received December 3, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7154. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legis-

lative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's First Annual Report, pursuant to the Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act of 2017, Public Law 115-59, Sec. 2(c)(4), Stat. 1152 (Sept. 15, 2017) (codified at 42 USCA Sec. 405, note); jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 6021. A bill to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to exclude privately held, non-custody brokers and dealers that are in good standing from certain requirements under title I of that Act, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115-1075). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 6130. A bill to provide for a 5 year extension of certain exemptions and reduced disclosure requirements for companies that were emerging growth companies and would continue to be emerging growth companies but for the 5-year restriction on emerging growth companies, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-1076). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 6745. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to revise the shareholder threshold for registration under such Act for issuers that receive support through certain Federal universal service support mechanisms, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-1077). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4758. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require the Federal Open Market Committee to establish interest rates on balances maintained at a Federal Reserve Bank by depository institutions (Rept. 115-1078). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 7264. A bill making further additional continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H.R. 7265. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to extend the authority of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to enter into leases of non-excess property of the Administration; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 7266. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to consider the Margaret R. Pardee Memorial Hospital as a covered entity for purposes of the 340B drug discount program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 7267. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the restrictions on the use of campaign funds for

personal use to the funds of leadership PACs and other political committees, to clarify the treatment of certain coordinated expenditures as contributions to candidates, to require the sponsors of certain political advertisements to identify the source of funds used for the advertisements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 7268. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to ensure that healthy research dogs and cats are adopted into suitable homes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 7269. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to make the Social Security Trustees Report process more accountable and transparent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself and Mr. CRIST):

H.R. 7270. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to clarify the authority of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration with respect to post-storm assessments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on 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. CURTIS:

H.R. 7271. A bill to establish the Public-Private Partnership Advisory Council to End Human Trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 7272. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to promote the ability of individuals entitled to benefits under part A or enrolled under part B of the Medicare program and individuals enrolled under a State plan under the Medicaid program to access their personal medical claim data, including their providers, prescriptions, tests, and diagnoses, through a mobile health record application of the individual's choosing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARR (for himself and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 7273. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a tiger team dedicated to addressing the difficulties encountered by the Department of Veterans Affairs in carrying out section 3313 of title 38, United States Code, after the enactment of sections 107 and 501 of the Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2017; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 7274. A bill to provide an incentive for firearm owners to sell their firearms safely and responsibly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 7275. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify the admissibility and deportability of aliens acting in accordance with State and foreign marijuana laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7276. A bill to prohibit the Social Security Administration from reinstating the reconsideration level of appeal for disability determinations in the 10 prototype States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 7277. A bill to limit the use of funds for kinetic military operations in or against Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ESTES of Kansas:

H.R. 7278. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LATTA, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CHABOT, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 7279. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for an integrated planning process, to promote green infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 7280. A bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to install a commemorative plaque next to each office previously used by a Member of Congress who became President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. McEACHIN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 7281. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a grant program for States that establish specific standards for education and training programs concerning civilian and law enforcement encounters during traffic stops and other in-person encounters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 7282. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to make Hispanic-serving institutions eligible for technical and financial assistance for the establishment of preservation training and degree programs; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 7283. A bill to provide minimal cybersecurity operational standards for Internet-connected devices purchased by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speak-

er, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. BERGMAN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 7284. A bill to require the Director of the United States Geological Survey to perform a nationwide survey of perfluorinated compounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 7285. A bill to provide women and girls safe access to sanitation facilities in refugee camps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 7286. A bill to provide for a more inclusive voluntary civilian national service program to promote civic engagement, enhance national unity, and foster a sense of shared sacrifice by helping young Americans participate in national service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 7287. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the eligibility of certain individuals exposed to burn pits for hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 7288. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of service connection for certain diseases in veterans who were exposed to burn pits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 7289. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to terminate the credit for new qualified plug-in electric drive motor vehicles and to provide for a Federal Highway user fee on alternative fuel vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 7264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ."

In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:

"The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ."

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of

the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 7265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 7266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 states "The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce . . . among the several States."

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 7267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 7268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 7269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 7270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 7271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 7272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 7273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section. 8. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 7274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 7275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 7277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ESTES of Kansas:

H.R. 7278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 7279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 3 (related to Regulation of Commerce among the several States)

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 7280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; [and . . .]

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 7281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

General Welfare Clause—Article 1 Section 8, Clause 1.

Necessary and Proper Clause—Article, 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 7282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 7283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 7284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 7285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 7286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 7287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 7288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 7289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 12: Mr. MORELLE and Ms. SCANLON.
 H.R. 334: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 893: Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 919: Mr. HULTGREN.
 H.R. 963: Mr. DELANEY.
 H.R. 1160: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1168: Mr. NEAL.
 H.R. 1818: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 1820: Mr. PETERS.
 H.R. 1957: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 2119: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 2267: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2598: Mr. MORELLE.
 H.R. 2640: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 2660: Mr. NORMAN.
 H.R. 2889: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
 H.R. 3222: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 3947: Mr. MORELLE.
 H.R. 4240: Mr. MORELLE.
 H.R. 4253: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 4271: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 4485: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 4647: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 4657: Mr. BYRNE.
 H.R. 4691: Mr. BERA, Mr. SERRANO, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
 H.R. 5158: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 5244: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 5471: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 5856: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 6016: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 6043: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 6060: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 6239: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 6274: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 6454: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 6455: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 6502: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 6503: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
 H.R. 6609: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 6643: Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 6646: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 6836: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 6880: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 6959: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 6961: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mrs. LESKO.
 H.R. 6988: Mr. TONKO, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 7108: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
 H.R. 7123: Mr. KIND, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 7127: Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 7150: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
 H.R. 7173: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 7202: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.	DEUTCH, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BEN RAY	H. Res. 1031: Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. LAMB, Mr.
H.R. 7224: Mr. DAVIDSON.	LUJÁN of New Mexico, Miss RICE of New	WALZ, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. MAXINE
H.R. 7225: Mr. DAVIDSON.	York, and Mr. LANGEVIN.	WATERS of California.
H.R. 7228: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. KIND.	H. Res. 274: Mr. MEEKS.	H. Res. 1125: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.J. Res. 31: Mr. MORELLE.	H. Res. 826: Mr. HECK.	H. Res. 1130: Ms. TITUS, Mr. KILMER, and
H. Con. Res. 142: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of	H. Res. 969: Ms. NORTON.	Mr. PAYNE.
California, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr.		



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2018

No. 196

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, we rejoice in Your strength. In spite of gathering storm clouds, our confidence in Your love sustains us. Be merciful to our Nation, for You are our hope.

Lord, provide our lawmakers today with the music of Your wisdom, that they may bring hope out of despair and joy out of sadness. Increase their faith, hope, and love, that they may receive Your promises.

Teach us all to celebrate, even in the darkness, because You are the God who saves us.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, DC, December 12, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator

from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PAUL thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the end of the year is fast approaching. There are a number of important items left on the Senate's agenda and little time to address them. We will clear more of the President's well-qualified executive branch and judicial nominees from the calendar. We will consider updated legislation supported by the administration to address criminal justice. We need to pass an agreement to fill the remaining gaps in appropriations, including critical funding for securing our borders.

Fortunately, the Senate took a major step yesterday by passing the farm bill. We got that much closer to delivering a big shot in the arm to farmers in rural communities across our country.

Along with providing certainty to agricultural communities, I am especially proud that the legislation will open a new door for farmers in Kentucky and around the country to explore the full potential of industrial hemp. This is the culmination of a lot of work by a number of us here in Washington, but really the victory is for the growers, processors, manufacturers, and consumers who stand to benefit from this growing marketplace.

American hemp has a long and distinguished history. Some of this very body's notable figures, including Thomas Jefferson and Henry Clay, are

believed to have grown it. During World War II, the Federal Government even encouraged hemp production to support the war effort. Unfortunately, because of hemp's illicit cousin, marijuana, the Federal Government subsequently banned it altogether for generations.

In 2013, Kentucky agricultural leaders showed me hemp's incredible potential for the Blue Grass State. We decided it was time to let America's farmers show everyone what hemp could do.

First, I included experimental pilot programs for States like Kentucky in the 2014 farm bill, and the results have been undeniable. Hemp has quickly become a booming success. Its uses range from food and pharmaceuticals to home insulation and automobile parts. Enthusiastic farmers quickly applied to plant the crop in their fields, entrepreneurs opened businesses selling hemp-based products, and consumers got to enjoy a whole new set of goods featuring American-made hemp. In my home State alone, farmers grew in excess of 3,200 acres of hemp in 2017. This year, the number of acres more than doubled. Estimates show that, once legalized, sales from hemp will soon surpass \$1 billion.

Watching this remarkable success, we knew it was time to take the next step. I introduced legislation to finally and fully legalize hemp. Working with agricultural leaders and law enforcement in Kentucky and here in Washington, we built support.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I was proud that the legislation was included in the Senate's version of the farm bill. I was proud to serve personally on the conference committee to ensure that the language stayed in place. Yesterday, the Senate passed the conference report. The House will pass it as early as later today, and this provision and the rest of the farm bill will be on its way to President Trump's desk to become law.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S7455

What exactly will this legislation do? The farm bill we passed yesterday both legalizes hemp as an agricultural commodity and removes it from the controlled substances list. It gives States the opportunity to be the primary overseers of hemp production. It also allows hemp researchers to apply for competitive Federal grants from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and made hemp eligible for crop insurance.

Together, these features will encourage new opportunities for struggling farmers and their families—new products for use in construction, healthcare, and manufacturing, and new jobs in a broad range of fields.

I have been honored to gain many partners throughout this process. Here in the Senate, thanks to the leading Democratic cosponsor of our original bill, Senator WYDEN, and to my Kentucky colleague, Senator PAUL. Congressman JAMIE COMER has championed hemp for years and sponsored our legislation in the House. In Kentucky, Commissioner Ryan Quarles has been a longtime ally of this crop's bright future in our Commonwealth.

I look forward to the House passing our farm bill soon and sending it to President Trump for his signature. I would be happy to loan him my hemp pen for the occasion.

PRIVACY REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, later today the Senate will vote on an attempt by some of our Democratic colleagues to undue a pro-privacy reform that Secretary Mnuchin and the Treasury Department implemented just a few months ago.

As I discussed yesterday, there is neither any valid accounting reason nor a disclosure reason why the IRS needs access to the donor lists of the kinds of tax-exempt, nonprofit organizations in question. The Treasury Department has said that "the IRS simply does not need tax returns with donor names and addresses to do its job in this area."

In a climate that is increasingly hostile to certain kinds of political expression and open debate, the last thing Washington needs to do is to chill the exercise of free speech and add to the sense of intimidation. The Senate should take a stand for America's privacy and the First Amendment and reject this misguided resolution.

YEMEN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, later on, the Senate may consider a resolution by the junior Senators from Utah and Vermont that pertains to the situation in Yemen. In effect, these Members want to end the limited American assistance to the Saudi-led coalition that is supporting the U.N.-recognized government in the civil war in Yemen.

I will oppose the motion to proceed to the Sanders-Lee resolution and

would urge Members to join me in voting against it. Members on both sides have legitimate concerns about the war in Yemen, about the U.S. interests tangled up in this conflict, and especially about the horrible plight of Yemeni citizens who are caught in the crossfire. And where Saudi Arabia is concerned, I think every single Member of this body shares grave concerns about the murder of Khashoggi and wants accountability. We also want to preserve a 70-year partnership between the United States and Saudi Arabia, and we want to ensure that it continues to serve American interests and stabilizes a dangerous and critical region.

This is the backdrop for today's debate: challenging circumstances that require the Senate to act with prudence and precision. But the Sanders-Lee resolution is neither precise enough nor prudent enough.

For one thing, I do not believe the resolution should be privileged under the War Powers Act. The United States is not involved in combat. It is not dropping ordnance. It is no longer even providing air-to-air refueling. As I have stated previously, even if these activities continued, it is a far cry to equate them with "hostilities." Regardless, the practice has already stopped.

If the Senate wants to pick a constitutional fight with the executive branch over war powers, I would advise my colleagues to pick a better case.

Second, their resolution is an inappropriate vehicle. There are more careful ways the Senate could express its concern about the conflict in Yemen or our partnership with Saudi Arabia without taking such a blunt instrument to the policy in this area. Indeed, this resolution would threaten other support the United States is providing that is designed to improve coalition targeting and limit civilian casualties.

Finally, from the Senate's perspective, considering a War Powers Act resolution has the potential to present a lengthy, messy process when our calendar is already packed more than full with other important business to complete for the American people.

This resolution's shortcomings do not mean the Senate must do nothing. There is a better option at hand. Legislation introduced by Chairman CORKER does a good job capturing bipartisan concerns about both the war in Yemen and the behavior of our Saudi partners more broadly without triggering an extended debate over war powers while we hasten to finish all our other work. I have cosponsored his legislation. It is a superior road to the outcome that most Senators want. So I urge every Member to vote against considering the Sanders-Lee resolution later today and join me in supporting Chairman CORKER's responsible alternative.

TRIBUTE TO ORRIN HATCH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on a completely different matter, it is my bittersweet job this morning to pay

tribute to a historic Senate career that will conclude at the end of this Congress.

Senator ORRIN HATCH has faithfully represented the people of Utah in this body for the last 42 years. That makes him the dean of our Republican conference and, of course, President pro tempore of the Senate. It also makes him the longest serving Republican Senator in our Nation's history. So ORRIN's longevity alone would have guaranteed him a place among the giants of the Senate. As he joked a couple of weeks ago, one of the most memorable experiences from his early Senate tenure was the confirmation process for Justice Joseph Story back in 1811. Apparently it was quite the scene, ORRIN tells us.

Seriously, though, the most impressive thing about ORRIN HATCH is not the historic length of his tenure here but how completely filled with accomplishments that time has been.

But let's back up for a moment. It wasn't always obvious that our friend would become a star U.S. Senator. At one point, it looked like another kind of stardom might be more probable. And I am not just talking about the successful law practice he set aside to run for office. We all know about ORRIN's musical talents and his contributions to the recording industry. I am told that just a few years before ORRIN's first campaign in 1976, the lawyer and family man was moonlighting as band manager for a groundbreaking Mormon folk group called The Free Agency. Well, it is fortunate for all of us that this free agent felt called to bring his talents here to Washington.

There is a famous story from that first campaign back in 1976. Think about this. ORRIN had no political experience—a stranger to running for office. But he had this sense that public service was his mission. Perhaps he was thinking of his beloved big brother Jesse, who gave his life in World War II when ORRIN was just 10.

He started asking around: Did his friends and family think he had a shot at a Senate seat? Few liked his chances in the primary and even fewer against the three-term incumbent. But the worst reaction of all came from his beloved wife Elaine.

The story goes that when ORRIN filed his papers to run, she cried for 3 straight days. I am not sure whether that was unhappiness at the prospect of an east coast life they hadn't planned for or a fairly accurate assessment of his chances at that point.

But ORRIN beat the odds. With the help of a big endorsement from a former California Governor named Ronald Reagan, this young, conservative upstart pulled off the upset.

Actually, there is a little secret surrounding this endorsement. Few people know this, but I am sorry to say that ORRIN was actually the Gipper's second choice. You see, our friend was so unknown back then that Reagan's first telegram offered a ringing endorsement

of someone called "Warren Hatch." Happily, the error was quickly corrected. ORRIN earned Utah's trust and found his way right here to this Chamber.

Some of his new Senate peers thought their new colleague should lay low and keep quiet about his principles. They had no idea what they were in for.

This Pittsburgh-born son of a metal lather was actually ready for action. Remember, ORRIN was once an amateur boxer. So he came to the Senate ready to brawl. In his very first term, he decided he had to take down this far-left labor reform law that would have hurt free enterprise and future prosperity. So he took on a couple of heavyweights—Robert Byrd, George Meany, and the whole machinery of Big Labor.

So this freshman became the public face and private backbone of the opposition. It was an epic showdown. ORRIN worked 18-hour days. He taught his whole staff how to draft amendments. He gave pep talks to his ragtag, bipartisan band of brothers—Dick Lugar, Howard Baker, and Fritz Hollings, from across the aisle—trying to keep everyone in the boat. And it worked. It withstood six cloture votes, breaking the record for a single bill, and they won. American prosperity was kept safe from a big power grab by union bosses.

It only seems fitting, decades later, that the other end of ORRIN's Senate tenure would also be marked by a major, hard-won, right-of-center accomplishment to help advance prosperity for all Americans.

ORRIN has chaired three of the Senate's most distinguished and critical committees—the HELP Committee, Judiciary, and, most recently, Finance. In this Congress, as Finance chairman, he led the charge to deliver once-in-a-generation tax relief to middle-class American families and tax reform to American job creators. This meant more late night and more painstaking negotiations. Chairman HATCH had to thread the needle, attending carefully to his colleagues' needs and keeping their eyes on the prize. Once again, he got it done.

So what about the decades in between these two bookmarks? First and foremost may be Senator HATCH's special devotion to the Federal judiciary—to its essential role in our constitutional order, to its need for the highest quality personnel. Well, over his Senate tenure, ORRIN has participated in the confirmation of more than half of all of the article III judges who have served in the United States of America in our Nation's history. Let me say that again. ORRIN has met with, studied up on, questioned, or at least voted on more than half of all of the Federal judges in American history. That includes all nine Members of the current Supreme Court.

When he supported a particular nominee, such as Justices Thomas,

Gorsuch, and Kavanaugh, ORRIN has been a leading champion of their cause, even in the face of unfair slights and smears. Even in cases when he has felt compelled to vote against nominees, he has treated them and the process itself with the respect and dignity that it is due.

The pile of ORRIN's legislative victories is almost as high as that tower of distinguished judges, and many of them are defined by one signature thread that connects much of his proudest work, his care for and commitment to serve the most vulnerable members of our society—the State Children's Health Insurance Program, the Americans with Disabilities Act, Hatch-Waxman for generic drugs, some of the earliest work on AIDS research, and even his very recent work to designate 6-1-1 as the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline.

So ORRIN has led a bit of a double life here in the Senate, and I mean that in the best possible way. He has been every bit the principled fighter, as advertised. He has led the charge often and hasn't flinched from the big battles, but at the very same time, there was ORRIN, constantly working quietly behind the scenes and across the aisle to tick off victories for vulnerable Americans who could have easily been left behind.

One perfect illustration of this was ORRIN's friendship with the late Ted Kennedy. For many of the years they spent here in the Senate, it seemed like they managed to rank among each other's closest friends, top collaborators, and most consistent sparring partners—all at the same time.

But that is ORRIN. He loves to give and take. He loves to discuss and debate. His colleagues and staff can rely on him equally to sit down and talk at length if they see an issue differently than he does. He does not dismiss or overrule. He wants to learn, persuade, and to be persuaded. It is no wonder that ORRIN's peers are so fond of him and his team is so loyal to him.

I am speaking especially of Ruthie Montoya, ORRIN's scheduler for more than three decades—a member of the Senate family in her own right. But you can't help but respect ORRIN because his own respect for this institution and the dignity of every individual he meets is so evident.

Utahns know this better than anyone. They know they can run into their senior Senator on the sidewalk or out shopping, and he will stop and listen carefully to their thoughts and concerns and life stories—maybe over a Costco hot dog—and he will take it all to heart.

How could this be surprising? This distinguished Statesman grew up modestly. His mother had her hands full raising seven children, and his father supported the family with his work as a metal lather. The hours were long and the work was hard, but the life lessons were invaluable.

ORRIN worked his way through college and law school. When his scholar-

ship didn't prove quite enough to support a young family, he worked as a janitor and attendant and still graduated with honors. That education has carried ORRIN far, but not as far as something else he gained in college.

It was in one BYU classroom that providence did ORRIN a great favor, with an assist from alphabetical order. Because "Hatch, Orrin" came after "Hansen, Elaine," he found himself seated next to this pretty young lady and struck up a conversation. That seating chart kicked off a blessed marriage of 60-plus years and counting.

Not every young husband would have left a successful law practice on the east coast and started over in Utah to be closer to his wife's family. Not every wife and mother would tolerate—let alone encourage and support—half a lifetime of public service 2,000 miles from where they planned to call home.

That loving partnership has brought six children, 23 grandchildren, and 24 great-grandchildren. ORRIN has been known to refer to his brood as "the Hatchlings."

So it is our hope that the Senate's great loss upon ORRIN's retirement will at least be this great family's loving gain.

We are sad to bid farewell to our artist-in-residence and his platinum records, to this former all-star missionary and LDS bishop who still practices what he preached, to this living example of the American dream at its most extraordinary—the Pittsburgh fighter who climbed up from working poverty and became "The Gentleman of the Senate," where he dedicated his work to strengthening that ladder for the generations that would follow.

ORRIN has been so generous to his colleagues, to this institution, and to the State and the Nation he has served. He has given us so much. He retires with great congratulations on a most distinguished career and our very warmest wishes for a peaceful and happy retirement.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. First, Mr. President, let me add my words of fond farewell to the senior Senator of Utah. Back in the good old days, we worked on a whole lot of things together, when the place was a little less partisan—immigration, patents, and so many other things. He was a fine legislator and a fine craftsman. I wish him and his entire large, beautiful family the best.

I also note that Leader MCCONNELL talked about the good bipartisan work we have created in the farm bill, something good for his State and something he has cared about for a long time. I hope the leader—and I will talk more about this later—will use the same bipartisan spirit and help us to deal with the appropriations bills that are still awaiting our agreement.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me talk a little bit about yesterday afternoon. Yesterday, Leader PELOSI and I met with President Trump about funding the government past next week. We gave the President two options to keep the government open. The first option: Pass the six bipartisan appropriations bills and a 1-year CR for the Department of Homeland Security only. And, if they don't like that one, a 1-year CR for the rest of government.

We told the President that both of these options would pass both Chambers. It was his choice to either accept one of those two options or shut the government down. Yesterday, unfortunately, it was clear that the President is clinging to his position of billions of dollars for an unnecessary, ineffective, border wall. President Trump will soon realize that his position will not result in a wall but will result in a Trump shutdown, and he seems to relish the idea, amazingly enough.

The President has called for a shutdown at least 20 times since he came to office. You can add at least five or six more times to that number from our meeting. Here is a direct quote from President Trump yesterday: "If we don't get what we want, one way or the other . . . I [President Trump] will shut down the government. . . ."

President Trump said:

I am proud to shut down the government. . . . [so] I will take the mantle. I will be the one to shut it down. I'm not going to blame you [meaning Democrats] for it. . . . I will take the mantle of shutting it down.

It was astounding that any President, even this one, would say that. No President should ever say that he or she would be proud to shut the government down. No President should so glibly use the American Government and the millions of workers who work so hard as a bargaining chip, but that is where President Trump is headed.

President Trump made clear that he will hold parts of the government hostage for a petty campaign pledge to fire up his base. That is all it is. He never researched the wall. He talked about it on the campaign and he said: Oh, Mexico will pay for it. If President Trump holds to this position—that unless he gets his wall, he will shut down the government—who will suffer needlessly? The American people.

Of course, Leader PELOSI and I had to spend much of the meeting trying to untie the knots in logic the President was tying himself in. President Trump started by bragging about how great border security is going under his watch. That, by the way, is with no wall. If it were truly the case as the President said, that border security is better than it has ever been, what is wrong with another year of the same funding? If things are going so great, why does he have to threaten to shut down the government for his \$5 billion wall? It makes no sense. None of it is based on fact.

Mr. President, there is no wall.

Mr. President, Mexico has not agreed to pay for it. None of that is true, and it is difficult—if nearly impossible—to negotiate with a President in front of the press who peddles such blatant and dangerous falsehoods.

Because Leader PELOSI and I simply didn't go along with him, President Trump threw a temper tantrum and promised to shut down the government unless he got what he wanted. Evidently, the Trump temper tantrum continued even after the meeting, with news reports saying he threw papers around the White House in frustration.

Why did he continue? Because someone finally spoke truth to power. Someone finally contradicted him when he throws around blatant falsehoods on such a regular basis. The President is so used to obsequious advisers who fail to dispel his false and made-up facts that he lives in a cocoon of his own mistruth. Leader PELOSI and I had to tell him, no, Mr. President, that is not true. We had to puncture that cocoon, and he threw a temper tantrum because of it.

It is unfortunate that we have arrived at this point. The President's advisers should have been telling the President the truth all along. Unfortunately, too many of my Republican colleagues in the Senate and in the House seem too afraid to tell the President when he is wrong, even though they know he is wrong. They find it easier to throw up their hands and wait for someone else to solve the problem or capitulate and agree with the President.

At the moment, Senator MCCONNELL, the majority leader of this body and my friend, is staying as far away as he can from the year-end spending fight. We didn't hear a peep about it today. Leader MCCONNELL says he doesn't want a shutdown, but he refuses to engage with the President to tell him what is transparently obvious to everyone else: There will be no additional money for the wall. We need to pass a continuing resolution for DHS or for all the remaining Agencies to keep the government open.

Leader MCCONNELL has an obligation as majority leader, and that is to help persuade President Trump to take one of the two options we offered. The idea that Senator MCCONNELL has nothing to do with appropriations as majority leader of the Senate, who still is on that committee, does not withstand the slightest scrutiny.

If, unfortunately, the President refuses to compromise, Leader MCCONNELL will not be able to avoid this issue. In the unfortunate event that President Trump causes a shutdown, the Democratic House will come into power January 3 and pass one of our two options to fund the government, and then it will fall right back in Leader MCCONNELL's lap.

My view is—for whatever it is worth to him—it is better to solve this now because the leader is going to be stuck with it 2 weeks from now, after an un-

fortunate government shutdown caused by his President, if he doesn't act now.

If I were a Republican, I would get involved right now and help pull the President back from the brink. Democrats have given him two reasonable options. We made it crystal clear that Democrats are for keeping the government open. We have no demands beyond that, only the President does.

If President Trump wants to continue his temper tantrum ahead of the holidays and cause a shutdown, it is now so clear it is solely on his back. We hope the President chooses one of the reasonable options we gave him yesterday, and we hope the country can avoid a Trump shutdown.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY TO RETURNS BY EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS AND RETURNS BY CERTAIN NON-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S.J. Res. 64, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Treasury relating to "Returns by Exempt Organizations and Returns by Certain Non-Exempt Organizations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate is voting on a resolution of disapproval that would rescind a dangerous decision made by the Treasury Department and restore a vital tool in the fight against illegal spending in U.S. elections.

In July, the Treasury decided to reverse decades of precedent and eliminate a requirement that certain tax-exempt organizations must report the identities of their major donors to the Internal Revenue Service as part of their annual returns.

Why is this important? Because the 501(c)(4) "social welfare organizations" and 501(c)(6) business leagues that now are no longer required to disclose their donors to the IRS are the very same groups that have poured nearly one billion dollars of dark money into U.S. elections since 2010.

Dark money makes it nearly impossible for the public to find the true sources behind the shady attack ads and political campaigns that these organizations fund. But by at least requiring these groups to disclose their major donors to the IRS, the rule ensured that the government could monitor the groups' compliance with campaign finance laws, such as the ban on foreign contributions. Now that this enforcement tool has been lost, it will be much easier for foreign powers to illegally funnel money into our elections through dark money organizations.

At a time when we know the U.S. remains under threat of foreign interference in our elections, why would we make it harder for the IRS, law enforcement, and our nation's intelligence organizations to monitor the movement of money in our political system? The answer is clear—we shouldn't. The Senate must act to rescind Treasury's misguided decision and restore an essential tool in the fight against illegal money in politics and ward off the threat of foreign funds influencing U.S. elections.

I am proud to join Senators TESTER and WYDEN in support of this resolution and urge my colleagues to cast their vote in support of today's CRA.

TRIBUTE TO BILL NELSON

Mr. President, I would like to enter into the RECORD a tribute to my colleague and friend BILL NELSON of Florida.

BILL is leaving the Senate after an amazing career. We served together on the House for 8 years, 17 years in the Senate—a quarter of a century working together. He is an extraordinary man who has represented the State of Florida so well, served as one of the few congressional astronauts in 1986 when he was on the Space Shuttle *Columbia*.

He is a courageous, hard-working man. With his wife Grace by his side, they have done so many good things. They went to Haiti together, and I respect his commitment to public service and his commitment to the people of Florida.

Senator NELSON and I go back a long ways. We served together in the House for 8 years—and 17 years in this Senate. A quarter-century together in the arena. I remember then-Congressman BILL NELSON made the gutsy decision to fly in space aboard NASA's Space Shuttle *Columbia* in January 1986.

To give you an idea of how much courage that took, consider this: That was the last shuttle mission before the Space Shuttle *Challenger* disaster.

A number of people who have flown in space talk about something they call "the overview effect"—a shift in perspective that occurs when you see the Earth hanging like a tiny, fragile ball in the black void of space. From the heavens, there are no boundaries, and you see that all of us on this planet are part of the same whole.

I think that seeing the Earth from that perspective would make anyone a better Senator. It may explain why

BILL NELSON has always been so willing to reach out to other Senators—including our friends on the other side of the aisle—to solve problems for the people of Florida and for our Nation. He knows that our common humanity is bigger than our differences of opinion.

Senator NELSON displayed a different kind of courage in the Senate. He voted for the economic stimulus package that helped pull America and the world back from the brink of a Second Great Depression. He voted to create the Affordable Care Act—a vote that was politically risky, but has saved lives.

NASA and America's manned space program has had no greater champion—save possibly John Glenn himself.

BILL NELSON has been a champion for: Working families; economic fairness; and good schools and affordable college education.

He has fought for: Clean oceans; safe and sustainable energy; reasonable, responsible action to prevent climate chaos; and for scientific integrity.

He has given most of his adult life to public service. He is a reasonable man in an unreasonable time. I will miss his courage in our caucus and in this Senate. I wish my old friend all the best as he begins the next chapters in his remarkable life. He will be missed.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, let me also say at this moment that we are debating the question of border security.

Yesterday, the Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Mr. McAleenan, who has been the Commissioner, is a professional. I respect the fact that he has a world of experience.

When he came to my office last year, I said to him: If I gave you a blank check for border security to make us safer in the United States, what would you buy?

He said: More technology, more people.

You will note that he didn't say a wall because he knows, as we do, that a wall is a 19th century answer to a 21st century challenge. We can make America safer, and should, with a secure border, using technology and personnel—well trained. This notion that we need to build a \$5 billion wall came up yesterday during the course of the hearing.

I noted the fact that for the first time in my life, it was being reported publicly that the life expectancy of Americans has gone down. You wonder why, in this great, progressive, prosperous Nation, it is the case. It is because of the drug epidemic—an epidemic which has been fueled by opioids and heroin and fentanyl. Some 40,000 or more Americans lose their life annually to this epidemic—more than we lose in traffic accidents, for example.

When you look at the source of the narcotics, you find the most deadly chemical, fentanyl, is coming into the United States over our borders, where

it is then mixed with other chemicals and sold to those on the street, ultimately leading to their death.

My question to Customs and Border Protection was: What more can we do to stop the flow of fentanyl into the United States from China, through Mexico, and other places? What I heard from Mr. McAleenan was not encouraging because it says to me he knows what can be done, and yet he doesn't have the resources to address it.

Let me be specific. He told me last year there is something called a Z Portal. This is a scanning device which can literally scan railroad cars, trucks, and cars coming into the United States to see if they detect anything suspicious—whether it is narcotics or contraband or guns or individuals hidden away.

Currently, almost 100 percent of the railroad cars go through the scanning before they come into the United States, but fewer than one out of five other vehicles are scanned. I asked Mr. McAleenan, if we are going to put more money into border security, wouldn't we put money into these Z Portals; wouldn't you ask for more money to fund this technology? He said he would, and he wanted to.

I asked him how much it would cost to really make sure we have border protection to stop these deadly narcotics from coming into the United States. His answer was \$300 million. Put that next to the President's outrageous demands for \$5 billion for a wall that all of us agree—at least most agree—is an ineffective and wasteful expenditure of taxpayers' money.

The President may think he made some campaign pledge that he has to keep come hell or high water, but that pledge also included a promise that Mexico was going to pay for this wall. Now the President wants us to pay for this wall. That is \$5 billion for his campaign promise instead of \$300 million to keep America safe from more narcotics flowing across our borders. That, to me, is a ridiculous option that the President is demanding.

If we want a safe border, if we want to stop this drug epidemic which is killing so many people, let us put the technology in place which will keep us safer. That technology is not a wall from sea to shining sea that the President demands.

SAUDI WAR POWERS BILL

Mr. President, regardless of who is serving in the White House—a Democrat or Republican—I have long felt the Constitution is very clear. The American people—through Congress, and through Congress alone—have the constitutional responsibility to declare war.

Whether I was holding President Bush in the Iraq war or President Obama in our interventions in Syria or Libya to this standard, it really came down to the same basic principle. The Constitution is clear. Article I section 8 states: "The Congress shall have the power . . . to declare War."

What we are doing later today is a debate over the future of the U.S. involvement in the war in Yemen. It is long overdue and deeply important.

It occurs as we are entering the 18th year of the war in Afghanistan. That is an incredible fact. I was on the Senate floor and voted some 18 years ago, after the 9/11 occurrence, to go after those responsible for killing 3,000 innocent Americans and who were believed to be in Afghanistan at the time. I voted with a clear conscience, understanding no one can strike the United States and kill innocent people without being held accountable.

I had no idea when I cast that vote that beyond Osama Bin Laden, we would continue using that authorization against terrorism 18 years later to prolong the longest war in the history of the United States—the war in Afghanistan.

I don't believe anyone who voted, as I did, in 2001, for that authorization of force could have imagined that 18 years later we would still be engaged in a war in Afghanistan or that the authorization would be stretched beyond credibility to approve the U.S. military action in multiple countries around the world, which brings us to the war in question today.

The disastrous and bloody Saudi-led war in Yemen is supported by the United States. Does anyone here remember voting to authorize U.S. military involvement in that war? Of course not. Did anyone who voted for the 2001 AUMF, authorization for the use of military force dealing with al-Qaida, believe we were including the Saudi-led quagmire in Yemen, a quagmire led by a reckless, young Saudi Crown Prince who I believe had direct knowledge of the brutal murder of journalist and U.S. resident Jamal Khashoggi?

Not only was this war never authorized by the elected representatives of the American people, it is a humanitarian disaster. An estimated 85,000 children have already died of malnutrition in this war, and in a country of 28 million, nearly half are facing famine because of a war that was initiated by the Saudis and supported by the United States.

Look at this heartbreaking photo. This is the photo of a 7-year-old, young Yemeni girl, named Amal Hussain. This photo was taken and featured in the New York Times in November. This young girl died shortly after this photo was taken.

"My heart is broken," her mother said.

I know this is a difficult photo to display in the U.S. Senate, but I believe it is necessary. It shows the consequences of this war and the failure of Congress to speak out clearly to this administration and take the actions necessary to stop our involvement in this war and humanitarian disaster in Yemen. The malnutrition and innocent suffering that you see in this photo cannot be ignored.

On Sunday, some may have read the New York Times columnist Nick Kristof's devastating piece "Your Tax Dollars Help Starve Children" about his recent and courageous trip to Yemen. Mr. Kristof writes about girls like Amal and notes how we typically think of war casualties as being men who have had their legs blown off. Yet, in Yemen, he writes, the most common war casualties are children who are dying of starvation and that in the conference room in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, and here in Washington, officials, simply, don't fathom the human toll of their policies. Maybe some think that this war in Yemen is justified, that Iranian influence and the Houthis in Yemen are credible threats to U.S. security interests.

Ultimately, this is not about the merits of any such fight. It is not about soldier against soldier or combat against combat. It is about the innocent bystanders who are dying by the thousands. It is also not any way to vindicate the Houthis' troubling role in the horrible Yemeni civil war or their likely support from Iran. I don't try to do that, and I won't. It is about our constitutional duty and responsibility to debate and vote to participate in this war or in any war.

Our Founding Fathers were wise and knew that the decision to send someone's son or daughter into war must not be made by a King or a supreme executive, but in our case, it is by the United States, by the elected Representatives of the people. Just think of how many battles in human history—how many deaths, how much blood and destruction—have occurred to satisfy vanity or the narrow interests of a despot or an unelected ruler.

Our Constitution makes it clear that we are different. The American people are given the voice and the responsibility to decide if their sons or daughters will participate in the war, and they do it through the U.S. Congress, including this very organization, body, in which I serve. We have utterly failed as the U.S. Senate in this responsibility.

So we are long overdue to have this debate, which is coming up today or tomorrow, and a vote, which will ultimately reflect whether we should continue with the war in Yemen. I will be voting against that war. I believe we have to put an end to this humanitarian disaster, and the American people, especially those in Illinois, have sent me here to Congress to express that clearly.

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. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Senate is now opening the crucial debate on our proposal to throw out the Trump pro-dark money campaign rule under the Congressional Review Act.

At the outset, I thank my colleague Senator TESTER for his leadership on the issue of bringing sunshine to American elections.

The fact is the State of Montana is the poster child of campaign finance reform—a textbook case of the sort of transparency and accountability that American elections need to all be about, and no Senator embodies that tradition more than Montana's own JON TESTER.

If you know anything about the history of the State and the Montana Copper Kings, you know why Montanans and JON TESTER always lead this fight. That is why I am so glad, as the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee, to be able to partner with him on this critical issue. The Trump administration's dark money rule makes it easier for foreigners and special interests to corrupt and interfere in our elections. Senator TESTER and I have filed this Congressional Review Act proposal because we want to make it harder.

I believe deeply that when you are facing down secret money that is shifting between shadowy groups that want to buy our elections, sunlight is the best disinfectant. If you are concerned about foreign actors who are hostile to our country and who are illegally funding candidates who will do their bidding, sunlight is the best disinfectant. If you are worried about anonymous political insiders who have deep pockets that are tightening their grips on Washington, DC, sunlight is the best disinfectant. I hope, today, we will prove that sunlight should not be a partisan proposition.

Yet the rule change the Trump administration pushed through this summer is not about sunlight; it is all about darkness. It is about secrecy. It is about giving the well-connected even more of a say in how American Government works. You can see that pretty clearly just by going back to the day the rule was announced. That alone shows how out of whack these policies are, how wrongheaded they are.

On July 16, 2018, a Monday morning, the American people woke up to the news of the arrest of an accused Russian spy in Washington, named Maria Butina. She had come to our country years earlier and had set out to infiltrate conservative organizations, especially the NRA. She cultivated relationships with political insiders. She worked to organize back channel lines of communication for the benefit of the Russian Federation, and she set up a shell company in North Dakota with a very prominent NRA political operative. For months, her lawyer claimed she was nothing more than a typical college kid who was enjoying life in the Nation's Capital.

It has been a few years since I have been in college, but I don't know of many students at Portland State or Southern Oregon who cross State lines to set up shell companies and organize lines of communication with the Kremlin. Most college kids in Oregon are too busy being college kids to infiltrate conservative political circles on behalf of a hostile foreign power.

Hours after the vast majority of the American public heard Maria Butina's name for the first time, the Trump administration dropped its dark money bombshell. It announced a new policy that is going to let even more untraceable dark money from foreigners and special interests find its way into—infiltrate—our elections. For those like Maria Butina who want to secretly, furtively, invade and twist and corrupt our democracy, the Trump administration, just this summer, made it a lot easier.

Shadowy political spending groups used to be required under tax law to disclose the identities of their major donors. After this rule was adopted, they didn't have to disclose their donors at all. Federal investigators are going to be blind to bad actors who use dark money groups to do their bidding. Even if the Internal Revenue Service and State tax authorities suspect a particular spending group is guilty of wrongdoing, they will not know who provided the cash.

Since this is a tax policy change, it falls under the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee, where we do a lot of work on issues that deal with tax exemptions. Let's make one thing clear. There was no debate on this issue in the Finance Committee, and it received no debate on the Senate floor. The American people had no opportunity to comment on the rule change, which would be typical if you are talking about a major change in a regulation. So we are going to unpack that this morning.

I am going to start by just spending a minute or 2 on some of the arguments I have heard from some who might not be inclined to support it.

First, there has been an argument that disclosing these major donors is a violation of privacy. The Presiding Officer and I serve together on the Select Committee on Intelligence, and I think anybody who has followed that work knows that I am a real privacy hawk and don't take a backseat to anybody in terms of privacy rights. Yet allowing foreigners and megawealthy corporations to buy elections in secret is not a matter of privacy policy; it is a proposition that is anti-democratic. Furthermore, I will point out that the group that is making the case for the privacy argument online is, in fact, a dark money group.

Second, since the announcement, the Trump administration has tried to downplay the significance of the new rule. The Deputy Secretary of Treasury told the Finance Committee that cutting off disclosure was all about work-

ing to "further efficient tax administration." That sounds, to me, like dry Washington lingo for "enforcing the pro-sunshine law is a pain, so why would anybody bother?" Others, simply, claim it will have no real consequence.

I have two responses to that one.

First, if the dark money rule change is not any big deal, then why did the Trump administration work so hard to block Congress from challenging it? It kept the rule change off the official books for as long as it could because it was hoping to run out the clock on our oversight. This is real gamesmanship in order to make sure the American people don't find out about how there would be less sunlight with respect to big political donations.

Second, the argument that cutting off disclosure will not have harmful consequences is another one that has been trotted out in opposition to our reform.

If the existing rule requiring disclosure of major dark money donors to the IRS wasn't casting enough sunshine, that is not a reason to bring on total secrecy. That is not a reason for bringing on darkness. It is a reason to say you want to be on the side of more sunshine.

A number of our colleagues on the Finance Committee—Senator MCCASKILL and Senator WHITEHOUSE, who is a champion of disclosure—are all in favor of more sunshine. To me, this argument, as well, just doesn't stand up. We think that making as much public information public ought to be the policy of our land.

One thing that is clear to me from my conversations this election season is that voters do not want more secret spending for more anonymous wealthy donors and foreigners leading to more political ads.

It is not possible to escape all of these ads on television. Short of pitching a tent and camping out in the woods until the second week of November, you can't get away from it. People hear all of these charged-up political ads, but much of the time they have no way of determining who is behind them. You get to the end of the ad, and a voice says that it was paid for by an oddly named group that you have probably never heard of, something like "Americans United for Patriotic Priorities" or "Grandparents for This and That." Maybe the group is called "Families for Stuff." That is the kind of nonsense that is offered up in terms of disclosure that I, Senator TESTER, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and others who have been in this fight think is ridiculous.

By the way, there are real-life examples that actually demonstrate my point. Some will remember Don Blankenship, whose mining company broke safety laws and lost 29 employees in the worst mine explosion in decades. A couple of years ago, he wanted, more or less, to buy a seat on the West Virginia Supreme Court. So he set up a po-

litical spending group called "And For The Sake Of The Kids." Then he dropped a mountain of cash on the election, and his preferred candidate won. Let me repeat that in case anybody didn't get the essence of what he was up to. An energy baron, a leader in the fight for more dirty energy started a political spending group to protect his dirty energy interests, and he actually named it "And For The Sake Of The Kids."

The dark money rule change—what the Trump administration worked so hard to get, what they worked so hard to hide from oversight—feeds right into what I have shown is a system of malignant, secretive politics that our people have had a belly full of. It gets to the heart of a larger problem. Across the country, our right to vote, our elections, and our democracy are under assault.

Here are a few examples of what that means. Since the Citizens United decision, the amount of outside money spent by shadowy groups on our elections has gone into the stratosphere. Congressional districts are gerrymandered to such an extreme that millions of Democratic voters are, in effect, denied equal representation. In Wisconsin, Democrats got 54 percent of the vote, but only 37 percent of the seats in the legislature.

Republicans ignore the advice of Trump intelligence experts ringing the alarm bells over election security, and they ignore the cyber security experts who have clearly stated that paper ballots and risk limiting audits are the key—the best way—to defend attacks on our voting system.

Tens of millions of Americans cast their votes on insecure, hackable machines produced by companies that buy off election officials and evade oversight by the Congress. The Trump administration and his allies have invented a fake crisis of voter fraud out of thin air, and they have used it as a pretext to purge millions of voters from the rolls and discourage Americans from casting a ballot.

State officials have targeted communities of people of color, shutting down polling places where they live and restricting opportunities to vote early or as an absentee.

In the last few days, Americans have learned more and more about what happened in one district in North Carolina, where Republican Party operatives schemed to confiscate and destroy mail-in ballots, likely belonging to Democratic voters, if you read the press reports that are coming out daily.

In some States where Democrats have won elections—look at Wisconsin and North Carolina—outgoing Republican lawmakers have sabotaged the powers of incoming Governors, in defiance of the voters who elected them.

Trump's dark money policy—the idea that it is OK to have more dark, secret money in politics—reinforces the corruption that I have just described. It

concentrates power in the hands of special interests that can afford to cut a big check and buy the election results they want. It takes power away from individuals, away from moms and dads who vote to give their kids a brighter future, away from seniors who vote to protect Medicare and Social Security, and away from young people who are saying it is long past time to fight the devastation of climate change and the rising cost of education.

Having more disclosure and more sunshine in elections traditionally has been bipartisan, and I hope the resolution Senator TESTER and I are offering will also be bipartisan. All we have to do is have an outbreak of the legacy of the late John McCain.

A few years ago, I introduced a bipartisan disclosure bill with my friend and colleague Senator MURKOWSKI. Big bipartisan majorities passed campaign finance legislation in the 1970s. That is what Senator TESTER and I believe the Congress ought to get back to. Throwing out the Trump dark money rule seems to us to be a good first step.

This is an opportunity, today, to vote for sunshine in our elections, to say that sunshine is, again, the best disinfectant. There is none other like it for corruption in our elections. I am hopeful that, once again, this idea of transparency, disclosure, and accountability will be bipartisan in the Senate when we vote a little bit after noon today.

I will close by way of saying that I come from a State where citizens have insisted on open government. I have had more than 900 open-to-all townhall meetings, and the reason why people want them is because they see that as a path to accountability, and they don't want politics driven by just campaign donations and big money. They certainly don't want it to be dark money.

We are going to know a little bit more about Maria Butina here in the next day or so, but, again, when you have college students setting up shell companies thousands of miles away from going to college, that ought to be a wake-up call that the Trump dark money rule makes it more likely and that we will have more of those shell companies in the days ahead.

When we vote at 12:15, I urge my colleagues to support Senator TESTER's and my resolution, with the support of many colleagues, like Senator WHITEHOUSE, who has been a champion on these disclosure issues. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to remember that these issues have always been about bipartisanship and to join us in voting for our proposal that we will vote on shortly after noon.

I yield the floor to Senator WHITEHOUSE and thank him for all his work on these issues over the years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am honored to join the senior Senator from Oregon in support of this important resolution.

As I think everybody on this floor has observed, there is a rot in our American democracy, and there is a shadow over the Halls of Congress. The rot is dark money, and the shadow is special interest influence empowered by that dark money.

A lot of this goes back to the extraordinarily misguided decision of the U.S. Supreme Court—or, I should say, five Republican appointees to the U.S. Supreme Court—in *Citizens United*, which took the astonishing position that the integrity of our elections should receive a value of zero in their calculus and their solicitude should be exclusively for the wealthiest forces that bring their power to bear on American democracy, because, after all, if what you are doing is unleashing the power of special interests to spend millions of dollars, by definition, you are only powering up the group that has millions of dollars to spend and a reason to spend it.

That is, perhaps, the segment of the American population entitled to the least solicitude in our great American debate. Yet it was the exclusive interest of the five Republican appointees on the Court. It was an evil balancing of priorities but, sadly, part of a long tradition—going back to the *Bellotti* decision—of Republican appointees to the Supreme Court expanding the role and influence of corporations and special interests.

In their foolishness, the five Republican judges who gave us the *Citizens United* decision claimed that the spending they unleashed was going to be transparent—not so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to append to my remarks at the end with an article pointing out that secret political spending in elections in the United States of America is on track to hit a \$1 billion milestone.

Not only is the secret spending a menace, but once you allow unlimited spending—particularly, if you allow unlimited secret spending—there is another dark problem, which is that if you are a big special interest that is able to spend unlimited money, and perhaps secret unlimited money against a candidate, what else have you been given the power to do? You have been given the power to go to that candidate and say: We are coming after you unless you do what I tell you.

It opens threats and promises that are always going to be secret. So even were there not these evil channels for dark money to pollute and influence our democracy, *Citizens United* would still be misguided with respect to the darkness of the threats and promises that it empowered.

Of course, when you remove accountability for the advertising and the sleazy campaigns that this supports, you get a lot more negative advertising. That is why one of the consequences of all of this has been described as a tsunami of slime.

Whether you want to rid dark money channels, whether you want to dimin-

ish secret threats, or whether you want to combat the tsunami of slime, there is every reason to take a stand against what has become of our democracy. If you think this is just an academic pursuit, take a look at the climate change dispute.

In 2007, 2008, and 2009, when I was a new Senator, we did bipartisan work on climate change every one of those years. We had bipartisan hearings. We had bipartisan bills. I think we had four of them in the Senate.

Along comes *Citizens United* in January of 2010. From that moment forward, bipartisanship was dead because the fossil fuel industry that asked for the *Citizens United* decision and that got the *Citizens United* decision from the five Republican appointees was instantly ready to bring that new power to bear. They went to the Republican Party, and they said: Anybody who crosses us on climate is dead. They took representatives like Bob Inglis and put him out of his job to demonstrate their seriousness.

From that moment, from the day the *Citizens United* decision was announced, there has not been a serious piece of climate legislation that any Republican has been willing to sign onto.

If you doubt the effects of dark money, take a look at where we are on climate change. In this weird way, the pollution of our democracy is directly connected to the pollution of our atmosphere and oceans.

And, of course, once you open a channel for a dark money influence—an American dark money influence; ExxonMobil, the Koch brothers, Big Pharma, you name it—when you open a dark money channel for that influence to wreak its power, you can't control who comes through it. Dark is dark. And there is every reason now to believe that foreigners are taking advantage of our dark money channels to exert influence in our elections.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks an op-ed in *Politico* entitled "Foreign Dark Money Is Threatening American Democracy," written by former Vice President Biden.

Today's Congressional Review Act measure is a small step. It won't provide much public disclosure; it will only require that companies and entities that are using these dark money channels continue to report to the IRS. So there is not going to be an enormous difference made here, but there is an enormous difference in which side this body will choose to be on in this vote today on Senator TESTER's resolution. It is a very simple and a very stark choice. We can choose, one by one. Each one of us will make this choice today. We can choose to be on the side of dark money. We can choose to decide to be on the side of special interest influence, we can choose to decide to be on the side of whispered threats—I will tell you that dark money and special interest influence

and whispered threats have a disgraceful force in this building right now, thanks to Citizens United and the dark money channels that it empowered—or we can choose to be on the side of America as a city on a hill. Why do we call America a city on a hill? Because everyone can see it. And a city on a hill does not do its business through the dark money sewers that run under the city; it does its business in the plain marketplace and open spaces of that city, and that is what we should be for.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report on this issue by a terrific bipartisan group, called “Issue One,” as a third appendant to my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From MarketWatch, Nov. 26, 2018]

SECRET POLITICAL SPENDING ON TRACK TO
REACH \$1 BILLION MILESTONE

(By Victor Reklaitis)

So-called dark money, which came into being after a Supreme Court ruling, soon may reach a ten-digit milestone.

That term refers to election-related spending by groups that don't disclose their donors. This type of political outlay remains far from becoming dominant, but it keeps spooking researchers, lawmakers and activists, as it nears a big round number.

“We see dark money flowing into this process from both liberal and conservative sources, and in 2020 we will be reaching this milestone where \$1 billion will have been spent by dark-money groups since Citizens United,” said Michael Beckel, manager of research, investigations and policy analysis at Issue One.

He was referring to the 2010 Supreme Court ruling in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission that struck down a ban on political spending by corporations. Beckel, whose nonprofit organization aims to reduce the role of money in politics, was speaking at a recent event focused on dark money.

FAR FROM THE BIGGEST SOURCE OF FUNDS

Getting to \$1 billion shouldn't be a big stretch, given the current estimates for how much has been spent in the shadows. More than \$800 million has been shelled out to date since the court decision eight years ago, according to Anna Massoglia, a researcher at the Center for Responsive Politics, who also spoke at the event.

While it would be significant to have dark-money groups hit \$1 billion in spending since 2010, that amount is far below what's spent in just one election cycle by all groups. The 2018 midterm races, for example, sparked an estimated \$5.2 billion in outlays alone, mostly by Democratic and Republican candidates, rather than dark-money groups or other outside organizations.

The \$800 million spent to date by groups that don't disclose their donors in the past eight years represents about 18% of all political spending by outside groups during that period, said Massoglia from the Center for Responsive Politics, a campaign-finance watchdog.

Dark money's rise has been rapid, but it's hard to predict if it eventually could make up 100% of all outside spending, Massoglia told MarketWatch. She noted some organizations want to publicize their spending, rather than hide it: “There are advantages to doing that, in terms of getting credit for what you're spending on.”

THE TROUBLE WITH DARK MONEY

Dark money is a growing problem for candidates and voters, according to Issue One Executive Director Meredith McGehee.

“Talking to members of Congress—whether they be Republican, Democrat or independent—one thing they all fear is dark money, because it's money that they have a hard time anticipating, responding to, understanding,” she said.

“And it's really a big question for the American people, because when you don't know where the money is coming from, it's hard to do what the Supreme Court said you should be able to do as an American citizen—and that is to judge the message partly by who the messenger is.”

Other campaign-finance activists have said secret money encourages corruption and threatens democracy.

On the other side of the issue, former commissioner for the Federal Election Commission Brad Smith, known for opposing campaign-finance regulations, once wrote that dark money is “a term used not to enlighten, but to scare Americans into approving of sweeping new laws, invading privacy in ways never before seen in American politics.” Supporters of anonymity in politics have noted Thomas Paine's famous “Common Sense” pamphlet was published anonymously in 1776. They also have said that throughout history anonymous political speech has been attacked by entrenched powers but has helped challengers, and they've stressed that disclosures can chill speech and lead to the harassment of donors.

THE BIG SPENDERS AND KEY VEHICLES

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has been the biggest spender of dark money with an estimated \$130 million paid out, according to Issue One's recent “Dark Money Illuminated” report. It's followed by Crossroads GPS, which is tied to Republican operative Karl Rove and has spent about \$110 million, and Americans for Prosperity, which is funded by conservative billionaire industrialists Charles and David Koch and has shelled out \$59 million. The Democratic-leaning spenders of dark money include Patriot Majority USA, with its \$18 million in outlays.

Issue One said it was able to reveal some dark-money through back-door methods such as analyzing tax returns, looking at lobbyists and labor unions' filings and examining other data sources.

There are three main vehicles for putting such money in play, according to Issue One. They are “social welfare” groups organized under Section 501(c)(4) of the tax code, trade associations established under Section 501(c)(6), and limited liability companies.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which lobbies for big business in Washington, didn't respond to a question about whether it agreed with Issue One's \$130 million figure. “As a 501(c)(6) organization, the chamber complies with all applicable lobbying disclosure laws as we advocate for policies that grow the economy and create jobs,” the trade association said in a statement.

AN FEC CREATION THAT LOOKS SET TO STAY
ALIVE

After the Supreme Court opened the door for corporate spending in elections, the FEC said existing disclosure laws weren't a good fit for this new category of outlays, said Adav Noti, an attorney with the Campaign Legal Center, an ethics and campaign-finance watchdog. The regulatory agency then created a new disclosure rule that was “extremely narrow” and led to dark money's rise, he said.

“Although it gets conflated with Citizens United pretty frequently, it's not a creation of the Supreme Court,” Noti said at the Nov.

14 event. “Dark money is a creation of the FEC.”

You don't need judges to overturn Citizens United to end secret political spending, and you don't need Congress to make a move, he added. You just need action by the FEC, but that is “simply not going to happen, at least not as the FEC is currently constituted,” said Noti, who worked as an FEC attorney for a decade. He doesn't sound upbeat about seeing an imminent end to dark money.

“The courts may intervene at some point. Congress may intervene at some point. Otherwise we'll see what the FEC does,” Noti said.

The U.S. Supreme Court in September let stand a lower court's ruling that required dark-money groups to reveal some secret donors, but then new guidance in October from the FEC was viewed as limiting that development's impact.

FEC Chairwoman Caroline C. Hunter and Commissioner Matthew S. Petersen, both Republicans, blasted the lower court's ruling in a joint statement, saying it had ordered a new expenditure reporting regime just two months before the midterm election and caused confusion. Commissioner Ellen Weintraub, a Democrat, had praised the judicial actions as “a real victory for transparency,” but then after the October guidance described the overall progress on the matter as “not as broad as some people had hoped.” Hunter, Petersen and Weintraub didn't respond to requests for comment.

This report was first published on Nov. 20, 2018.

[From POLITICO, Nov. 27, 2018]

FOREIGN DARK MONEY IS THREATENING
AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

(By Joseph Biden and Michael Carpenter)

Here's how to put a stop to it.

Whatever Special Counsel Robert Mueller's investigation ends up revealing about Russia's efforts to subvert our democracy, one thing is already clear from the media attention this topic has received: America's democratic institutions are highly vulnerable to foreign influence.

Foreign powers use three basic tools to interfere in democratic politics: cyber operations, disinformation and dark money. Thanks in part to Mueller's indictments of members of Russia's military intelligence agency (GRU) and the St. Petersburg troll farm known as the Internet Research Agency, we have begun to address election-related cyber attacks and foreign disinformation. But when it comes to foreign dark money—money from unknown foreign sources—we remain woefully unprepared.

The lack of transparency in our campaign finance system combined with extensive foreign money laundering creates a significant vulnerability for our democracy. We don't know how much illicit money enters the United States from abroad or how much dark money enters American political campaigns, but in 2015, the Treasury Department estimated that \$300 billion is laundered through the U.S. every year. If even a small fraction of that ends up in our political campaigns, it constitutes an unacceptable national security risk.

While foreign funding of campaigns is prohibited by federal statute, the body that enforces campaign finance laws—the Federal Election Commission (FEC)—lacks both teeth and resources. Sophisticated adversaries like Russia and China know how to bypass the ban on foreign funding by exploiting loopholes in the system and using layers of proxies to mask their activities, making it difficult for the FEC, the FBI, and the Treasury Department's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network to follow the money.

One of the key loopholes is the ability of so-called super PACs to accept money from U.S. subsidiaries of foreign corporations. And while super PACs are required to file financial disclosure reports, non-profit 501(c) organizations (for example, the National Rifle Association or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce) are not. So if a foreign entity transfers money to a 501(c), that organization can in turn contribute funds to a super PAC without disclosing the foreign origin of the money.

The last time Congress took on dark money was after 9/11, in the Patriot Act, when we made it illegal for banks to be “willfully blind” to money laundering and requiring them to verify their customers’ identities. But the lack of any requirement to disclose the beneficial (i.e. “true”) ownership of limited liability companies (LLCs) makes it easy for foreign entities to establish shell companies in the United States. These shell companies can then contribute to a 501(c), invest in real estate or channel money directly to a super PAC. Fortunately, there are steps we can take to secure our system and shine a light on these murky transactions.

In August, two dozen state attorneys general asked Congress to pass legislation to disclose the beneficial owners of LLCs. A federal solution to this issue is necessary because individual states compete for incorporation revenue and therefore have little incentive to reform on their own. In Nevada, for example, the process of registering a company has been described as “easier than getting a library card.” A federal requirement to disclose the true owners and controlling interests of LLCs would allow law enforcement to scrutinize the “ghost corporations” that pop up overnight in states like Nevada or Delaware—and that could be used to funnel dark money into our politics.

Real estate deals are also susceptible to foreign money laundering because they are largely exempt from the “know your customer” rules that apply to the banking industry. This allows foreign entities to use shell companies to park their wealth in the United States or to channel that money to U.S. political interests (for example, by purchasing real estate at above-market prices). Implementing more comprehensive disclosure requirements in high-end real estate and prohibiting all-cash sales above certain thresholds would help create transparency in this sector.

The fact that we don’t know exactly how much foreign dark money is being channeled into U.S. politics is precisely why we need to reduce our vulnerabilities. There is ample evidence of dark money penetrating other democracies, and no reason to believe we are immune from this risk. In 2004, for example, Lithuania’s president was impeached after the media disclosed that a Russian oligarch who contributed to his campaign later received Lithuanian citizenship. Just this past January, in Montenegro, a local politician was charged with laundering Russian funds to support a pro-Russian political party. In Australia, an intelligence report leaked in 2017 exposed pervasive Chinese financial influence in the country’s domestic politics. Similar allegations recently surfaced in New Zealand.

As we take on the threats posed by cyber attacks and disinformation from foreign actors, we can’t ignore the threat posed by foreign dark money. With a new Congress about to be sworn in, there’s an opportunity to finally end the permissive environment for foreign dark money in this country. Campaign finance reform is certainly a necessary part of the solution, but so too is disclosure of beneficial ownership and greater transparency in real estate transactions. As mat-

ters of national security, these are issues that should be of interest to both Democrats and Republicans who want to reduce our vulnerability to foreign corrupt influence.

[From Issue One]

DARK MONEY ILLUMINATED

Today many—if not all—politicians live in fear that opaque dark money groups will launch 11th-hour smear campaigns against them. If you listen closely, many members of Congress continuously fundraise precisely to prevent this doomsday scenario, leading some of them to even leave office rather than try to out-raise the deep-pocketed donors attempting to control their electoral fates.

Dark money groups hold enormous sway over what issues are, and are not, debated in Congress and on the campaign trail. But the donors behind these groups rarely discuss their motivations for bankrolling these efforts, leaving the public in the dark about who funds these increasingly prominent and potent organizations.

Unfortunately, Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy was either ill-advised or misinformed when he—while writing the majority opinion in the Supreme Court’s *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* case—assumed that any new corporate spending in politics unleashed by the decision would be wholly independent of candidates and promptly disclosed on the Internet. In that ruling, Justice Kennedy wrote that “a campaign finance system that pairs corporate independent expenditures with effective disclosure has not existed before today.”

But let’s be clear: It still does not exist today.

Issue One’s new “Dark Money Illuminated” project—a year-long, deep-dive analysis into the forces at play in the post-*Citizens United* political world, which is accompanied by a first-of-its-kind database of dark money donors—chronicles just how difficult it remains to effectively ascertain information about the true sources behind the deluge of political dark money that *Citizens United* ushered in, even for campaign finance experts. The project also offers constitutional, bipartisan solutions to bring additional accountability to the political advertisements from dark money groups that are increasingly bombarding citizens across the country.

AN EXPLOSION OF POLITICAL DARK MONEY

Dark money groups are influential in part because they aim to define candidates and issues before, during and after an election. Thus, even if their preferred candidates lose, the issues that define the election are aligned more closely with the labor unions, corporations, mega-donors and other special interests bankrolling these secretive groups.

According to the Center for Responsive Politics, dark money groups reported spending more than \$800 million on campaign-related activities to the FEC between January 2010 and December 2016 (the last full election cycle). What is less known is that this surge of opaque spending has been incredibly concentrated: Issue One’s new analysis shows that the top 15 dark money groups accounted for three-fourths of this spending—more than \$600 million.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce—the nation’s largest lobbying organization for businesses—alone has spent approximately \$130 million on political advertisements since *Citizens United*. That’s about \$1 of every \$6 spent on political ads by dark money groups between 2010 and 2016.

Other major dark money players in this top 15 list—each of which reported spending at least \$10 million on political activities to

the FEC since January of 2010 and all of which are profiled on Issue One’s website—include:

Americans for Prosperity, the flagship politically active nonprofit of the billionaire industrialists Charles and David Koch;

Crossroads Grassroots Policy Strategies (Crossroads GPS), a Republican-aligned group associated with Karl Rove, a former advisor to President George W. Bush;

The League of Conservation Voters, an advocacy organization that works to elect pro-environment candidates who are typically Democrats;

The National Rifle Association, the nation’s top gun lobby and backer of politicians who champion the Second Amendment;

Patriot Majority USA, an organization led by political operatives with close ties to Democratic Sens. Harry Reid and Chuck Schumer; and

The Planned Parenthood Action Fund, an advocacy group working to elect politicians who support reproductive rights and to thwart anti-abortion politicians.

Informing and augmenting the profiles of these 15 major dark money groups is an exclusive, first-of-its-kind database created by Issue One that features information about the donors identified by obscure public records—and other little-known sources—who are funding these organizations.

In all, this new database contains nearly 1,200 transactions spanning more than eight years—and identifies approximately 400 unique donors who have collectively given more than \$760 million to these dark money groups in recent years.

Each record also contains a link to the primary source document for each transaction—constructed through painstaking research and fact-checking by the Issue One team, building off of work previously done by the Center for Responsive Politics, Center for Public Integrity, Center for Political Accountability and others.

HOW DID CITIZENS UNITED LEAD TO AN EXPLOSION OF POLITICAL DARK MONEY?

By a slim 5-4 margin, the Supreme Court held in *Citizens United* that corporations—including limited liability companies and certain nonprofit corporations—could bankroll overt political advertisements that called on people to vote for or against federal candidates.

While charities and foundations organized under Section 501(c)(3) of the U.S. tax code—the types of nonprofits to which you may make tax-deductible contributions—are still prohibited from engaging in electoral politics, the *Citizens United* ruling allowed certain other nonprofits—most notably 501(c)(4) “social welfare” organizations and 501(c)(6) trade associations—to spend heavily in elections.

Unlike political candidates, parties or political action committees, these nonprofits are generally not required to disclose their donors, meaning the public is frequently left in the dark about who is funding the ads that are trying to influence their votes.

DARK MONEY DONORS REVEALED

To paint as comprehensive a picture as possible about what interests have bankrolled the top 15 dark money groups since *Citizens United*, Issue One searched obscure public records for information that has essentially been hiding in plain sight.

To this end, Issue One reviewed FEC filings, tax returns, annual reports submitted by labor unions to the Department of Labor, documents submitted to Congress by registered lobbyists, corporate filings, press releases and other sources. (See Appendix 2: Methodology for a more detailed description.)

These methods frequently led Issue One to be able to identify transactions—and donors—that have never previously been associated with these dark money groups.

Here are some of the highlights of what we learned:

Companies and labor unions are among the donors identified by this research.

For instance, while the U.S. Chamber of Commerce does not publicly reveal its donors, Issue One found that nearly 100 blue-chip companies have voluntarily disclosed their own dues payments to the trade association. The Dow Chemical Co. alone has contributed about \$13.5 million to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in recent years, while health insurer Aetna Inc. has contributed \$5.3 million and oil giant Chevron Corp. has contributed \$4.5 million.

Meanwhile, Issue One found that gun manufacturer Sturm, Ruger & Co., Inc. has contributed more than \$12 million in recent years to the National Rifle Association, while tobacco company Reynolds American Inc. has contributed substantial sums to three major dark money groups in recent years: \$275,000 to Americans for Tax Reform, \$61,000 to Americans for Prosperity and at least \$50,000 to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

At the same time, Issue One found that labor unions accounted for about \$1 of every \$8 raised between July 2009 and June 2017 by a dark money group known as the VoteVets Action Fund—which has touted itself as the “largest progressive organization of veterans in the United States.” In all, the VoteVets Action Fund raised more than \$5.6 million during this time from labor unions, with significant union donors including the American Federation of Government Employees, the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME).

Issue One’s analysis additionally revealed that more than two dozen of the nation’s largest trade associations have contributed to many of the top dark money groups in recent years. Some have even contributed to three, four or five of the top 15 dark money groups since Citizens United.

For instance, the American Petroleum Institute (API), the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) and Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA) each contributed to five of the top 15 dark money groups during the past eight years.

PhRMA alone, in recent years, has contributed \$12 million to the American Action Network—a dark money group launched in 2010 by former Sen. Norm Coleman (R-MN) and GOP fundraiser Fred Malek.

Another large donor identified on the other side of the ideological spectrum: The Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation, a private foundation that is primarily funded by billionaire investor Warren Buffett and that is named for his late wife. The Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation has contributed \$26 million to the Planned Parenthood Action Fund since 2012, earmarking these funds for “the charitable purpose of reproductive health advocacy.”

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of overturning the Treasury Department’s rule that will allow even more dark money into our political process. This action by the

Trump administration allows groups to hide the identities of their donors. It allows big corporations and wealthy individuals to inappropriately influence elections by contributing to outside groups in secret. This amounts to unlimited corporate political spending, effectively silencing the voices of everyday voters.

Under this President, the Internal Revenue Service is looking out for wealthy donors rather than hard-working, middle-class voters.

I strongly support today’s action to overturn this rule. We need to reform our campaign finance system, improve disclosures and transparency, and restore the voice of the people in the democratic process.

Michigan voters deserve to know who is behind the money being spent in our elections. We must take steps to improve transparency and restore trust in our electoral system. Above all, we must ensure that every American has an equal say in our elections, regardless of their means. The right of every citizen to make their voice heard at the ballot box is the very foundation of our democracy. I will continue to fight to ensure that the voices of Michigan families aren’t being drowned out by big corporations or wealthy individuals with limitless resources who are trying to buy elections and the outcomes.

We should be working to bring transparency to our political system, not shielding special interest groups, big donors, and this administration’s political allies. I will support today’s IRS dark money rule CRA, and I urge my colleagues to join me in giving the power back to the American people.

I yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the resolution sponsored by Senators TESTER and WYDEN to overturn the Treasury Department rule.

We have heard loud and clear from the American people that they are sick and tired of the hundreds of millions of dollars of special interest money going into our elections. They are especially sick and tired of all of the secret dark money going into our elections.

What do I mean by that? I mean when wealthy individuals can contribute to organizations and the American public has no idea who those individuals are, while those organizations go on to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to try to influence the votes of our fellow Americans.

We have all seen those commercials that come on TV that say they are sponsored by the Committee for a Better America, the Committee to Support Mom and Apple Pie, and the public wants to know and has a right to know who is spending all of that money to try to influence their votes.

The vehicle of choice for these shadowy, dark money organizations has been organizing their entities under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

We will soon—probably in January but early on—we will see a bill coming over to the Senate from the new Democratic majority in the House of Representatives because their No. 1 priority is electoral reform, including getting rid of secret money, making sure the public has that right to know who is bankrolling these entities.

What the Treasury Department did took us in the opposite direction. Currently, 501(c)(4) organizations have to report to the IRS the information about their donors, but currently the IRS keeps that information confidential. It does not share it with the public. We should share it with the public, and that is what the DISCLOSE Act that the House will pass will do.

What this Treasury rule does is it takes us in the opposite direction. It says to those 501(c)(4)s that they no longer even have to provide that information to the Treasury Department on a confidential basis. So it heads in the wrong direction. It is especially outrageous because it will take away one of the key tools the Treasury Department has to prevent foreign money from being spent in our elections, because right now that information is made available to the Department of the Treasury.

If you are a 501(c)(4), you have to confidentially report who is giving you money and how much. Now the Treasury Department says: We don’t want that information. We don’t want to see anything. We don’t want to know if foreign governments are putting money into 501(c)(4)s. We don’t want to know if the primary purpose of these funds is for electing or defeating candidates as opposed to social welfare—which is the requirement for a 501(c)(4) organization under our law.

I think a lot of people are wondering why it is that this administration—and now maybe the Senate—wants to actually cover up for those who want to spend their money secretly to try to elect or defeat candidates. One thing we know is that across the board, whether they are Republicans or Democrats or Independents, Americans believe—and I agree with them—that they have a right to know who is spending all of that money to try to influence their vote. So let’s pass this resolution to overturn the Treasury rule in defense of secret money, when we need more transparency and more accountability.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Utah.

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, for more than four decades, I have had the distinct privilege of serving in the United States Senate—what some have called the world’s greatest deliberative body. Speaking on the Senate floor, debating legislation in committee, corralling the support of our colleagues on compromise legislation—these are the moments I will miss. These are memories I will cherish forever.

To address this body is to experience a singular feeling—a sense that you are a part of something bigger than yourself, a minor character in the grand narrative that is America. No matter how often I come to speak at this lectern, I experience that feeling again and again.

But today, if I am being honest, I also feel sadness. Indeed, my heart is heavy because it aches for the times when we actually lived up to our reputation as the world's greatest deliberative body. It longs for the days in which Democrats and Republicans would meet on middle ground rather than retreat to partisan trenches.

Now, some may say I am waxing nostalgic—yearning, as old men often do, for some golden age that never existed. They would be wrong. The Senate I have described is not some fairy tale but the reality we once knew.

Having served as a Senator for nearly 42 years, I can tell you this particular thing: Things weren't always as they are now. I was here when this body was at its best. I was here when the regular order was the norm, when legislation was debated in committee, and when Members worked constructively with one another for the good of the country. I was here when we could say without any hint of irony that we were Members of the world's greatest deliberative body.

Times have changed. Over the last several years, I have witnessed the subversion of Senate rules, the abandonment of regular order, and the full-scale deterioration of the judicial confirmation process. Polarization has ossified. Gridlock is the new norm. And, like the humidity here, partisanship permeates everything we do.

On both the left and the right, the bar of decency has been set so low that jumping over it is no longer the objective. "Limbo" is the new name of the game. How low can you go? The answer, it seems, is always lower.

All the evidence points to an unsettling truth: The Senate as an institution is in crisis, or at least may be in crisis. The committee process lies in shambles, regular order is a relic of the past, and compromise—once the guiding credo of this great institution—is now synonymous with surrender.

Since I first came to the Senate in 1977, the culture of this place has shifted fundamentally—and not for the better, in my opinion. Here, there used to be a level of congeniality and kinship among colleagues that was hard to find anywhere else. In those days, I counted Democrats among my very best friends. One moment we would be locking horns on the Senate floor, and the next we would be breaking bread together over family dinner.

My unlikely friendship with the late Senator Ted Kennedy embodied the spirit of goodwill and collegiality that used to live and thrive here. Teddy and I were a case study in contradictions. He was a dyed-in-the-wool liberal Democrat. I was a resolute Republican. But

by choosing friendship over party loyalty, we were able to pass some of the most important and significant bipartisan achievements of modern times—from the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to the Ryan White bill and the State Children's Health Insurance Program. These are very important bills, and we were able to work together even though we differed widely on politics.

Nine years after Teddy's passing, it is worth asking: Could a relationship like this even exist in today's Senate? Could two people with polar-opposite beliefs and from vastly different walks of life come together as often as Teddy and I did for the good of the country? Or are we too busy attacking each other to even consider friendship with the other side?

Many factors contribute to the current dysfunction, but if I were to identify the root of the crisis, it would be this: the loss of comity and genuine good feeling among Senate colleagues.

Comity is the cartilage of the Senate, the soft connective tissue that cushions impact between opposing joints, but in recent years, that cartilage has been ground to a nub, and I think most of us feel that. We have actually seen it happen. All movement has become bone-on-bone.

Our ideas grate against each other with increasing frequency and with nothing to absorb the friction. We hobble to get any bipartisan legislation to the Senate floor, much less to the President's desk. The pain is excruciating, and it is felt by the entire Nation.

We must remember that our dysfunction is not confined to the Capitol. It ripples far beyond these walls—to every State, to every town, and to every street corner in America. The Senate sets the tone of American civic life. We don't mirror the political culture as much as we make it. It is incumbent on us, then, to move the culture in a positive direction, keeping in mind that everything we do here has a trickle-down effect. If we are divided, then the Nation is divided. If we abandon civility, then our constituents will follow.

So to mend the Nation, we must first mend the Senate. We must restore the culture of comity, compromise, and mutual respect that used to exist here—and still does, in some respects. Both in our personal and public conduct, we must be the very change we want to see in the country. We must not be enemies but friends. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection.

"The mystic chords of memory will swell when again touched . . . by the better angels of our nature." These are not my words but the words of President Abraham Lincoln. They come from a heartfelt plea he made to the American people long ago on the eve of the Civil War. Lincoln's admonition is just as timely today as it was then. If

ever there were a time in our history to heed the better angels of our nature, I think it is now.

How can we answer Lincoln's call to our better angels? In the last year, I have devoted significant time and energy to answering that question. Today, I wish to put flesh on the bones of Lincoln's appeal.

Our challenge is to rise above the din and divisiveness of today's politics. It is to tune out the noise and tune into reason. It is to choose patience over impulse and fact over feeling. It is to reacquaint ourselves with wisdom by returning to core principles.

Today, allow me to offer a prescription for what ails us politically. Allow me to share just a few ideas that, when put into practice, could help us not only fix the Senate but put our Nation back on the right path.

Heeding our better angels begins with civility. While our politics have always been contentious, an underlying commitment to civility has been important and held together the tenuous marriage of right and left, but the steady disintegration of public discourse has weakened that marriage, calling into question the very viability of the American experiment.

As the partisan divide deepens, one thing becomes increasingly clear: We cannot continue on the current course. Unless we take meaningful steps to restore civility, the culture wars will push us ever closer to national divorce.

We would do well to remember that without civility, there is no civilization. Civility is the indispensable political norm—the protective law between order and chaos. But, more than once, that wall has been breached.

Consider recent events: the pipe bomb plot in the midterm election, the terrorist attack in Charlottesville last year, and the shooting at the congressional baseball practice before that. These are stark reminders that hateful rhetoric, if left to ferment, becomes violence.

Restoring civility requires that each of us speak responsibly. That means the President, that means Congress, and that means everyone listening today. We live in a media environment that favors outrage over reason and hyperbole over truth. The loudest voices, not the wisest ones, now dictate the terms of the public debate. For evidence, simply turn on the TV, but be sure to turn down the volume.

The media deserves some culpability in creating this environment by adopting outrage as a business model, but we are complicit when we use words to provoke rather than to persuade, to divide rather than to unite. We only make the problem worse when the object of our discourse becomes to belittle the other side—to own the libs, for example, or to disparage the deplorables. If you are looking to convert someone to your side, humiliating them is probably not the best place to start. Who among us would make friends with the same person who would make him a fool?

Put simply, pettiness is not a political strategy. It is the opposite of persuasion, which should be the ultimate aim of our dialogue. Our better angels call on us to persuade through gentle reason. They call on us to inspire and unite rather than to provoke and incite. In short, they call on us to embrace civility.

In addition to embracing civility, we must rediscover a forgotten virtue, one that lies at the heart of our Nation's founding—pluralism. Pluralism is the adhesive that holds together the great American mosaic. It is the idea that we can actually be united by our differences, not in spite of them.

In a pluralist society, we can be polar opposites in every respect yet still associate freely with one another. I can be White, conservative, and Christian, and my friend can be Black, progressive, and Muslim. We can be different but united precisely because we are united by our right to be different. That, in a nutshell, is pluralism.

Pluralism is the alchemy that makes, out of many, one possible. It is the means by which we have been able to weave together the disparate threads of a diverse society more successfully than any other nation on Earth. At the heart of pluralism is the understanding that our country was built not on a collection of common characteristics but on a common purpose.

When we approach political problems from a pluralist perspective, we recognize that the majority of our disagreements are not matters of good versus evil but good versus good. Pluralism acknowledges that there is more than one way to achieve the good life, if you will. Accordingly, it seeks to accommodate different conceptions of the good rather than pit them against each other.

The adversary of pluralism is zero-sum politics, which we embrace at our own peril. Zero-sum politics tempts us to view life through an absolutist prism, one that filters all nuance and recasts everything as an either-or fallacy. This distorted way of thinking renders every policy squabble as a Manichaean struggle for the soul of the country. If the Republican tax bill passes, it will be Armageddon. If a Democrat takes the White House, it will be the end of America as we know it. It is funny how these prophecies never come to fruition.

Answering the call to our better angels requires us to reject zero-sum politics in favor of pluralism. It requires us to make room for nuance and to see our differences not as competing but as complementary.

Nowhere is the pluralist approach more needed than in the fraught relationship between religious liberty and LGBTQ rights. As my colleagues know, I have made religious liberty a priority of my public service. Of all the hundreds of pieces of legislation I have passed—and I have passed a lot during my 42 years in the Senate—the one

that I am most pleased with and the one that I hope will most define my legacy is the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. Religious liberty is a fundamental freedom. It deserves the very highest protection our country can provide.

At the same time, it is also important to take account of other interests as well, especially those of our LGBTQ brothers and sisters. We are in the process now of working out the relationship between religious liberty and the rights of LGBTQ individuals here in America. There are some who would treat this issue as a zero-sum game, who would make the religious community and LGBTQ advocates into adversaries. In my opinion, this is a mistake.

Pluralism shows us a better way. It shows us that protecting religious liberty and preserving the rights of LGBTQ individuals are not mutually exclusive. I believe we can find substantial common ground on these issues that will enable us to both safeguard the ability of religious individuals to live their faith and protect LGBTQ individuals from invidious discrimination. We must honor the rights of both believers and LGBTQ individuals. We must, in short, find a path forward that promotes fairness for all. My personal religious beliefs require that, and I surely want to live up to those beliefs.

In my home State, we were able to strike such a balance with the historic Utah compromise, a bipartisan anti-discrimination law that both strengthened religious freedoms and offered special protections to the LGBTQ community. No doubt we can replicate that same success on a Federal level. That is why, as one of my final acts as a U.S. Senator, I challenge my colleagues to find a way to compromise on this crucially important issue—a compromise that is true to our founding principles and that is fair to all Americans.

Our better angels invite us to walk the path of civility and to embrace the principles of pluralism. Above all, they call on us to strive for unity. Before President Lincoln beckoned us to our better angels, he warned that a nation divided against itself cannot stand. That warning is especially relevant in our time. Today, our house is as divided as at any time since the Civil War.

Each year, red and blue America drifts further apart. As progressives move to the coasts and conservatives retreat to the interior—to the center of the country—we are finding that a lot of difficulties have arisen, and they are not easy to solve. We increasingly sort ourselves by geography. We also sort ourselves by ideology, with media diets catered to quiet our cognitive dissonance and confirm our preconceived notions. It is a sad consequence of the Information Age that Americans can now live in the same city but inhabit completely different worlds.

Something has to give; the status quo cannot hold. These are, and should

always be, the United States of America. While that name has always been more aspirational than descriptive, it at least gives us an ideal to strive for.

To achieve the unity that is our namesake, we must reject the politics of division, starting with identity politics. Identity politics is nothing more than dressed-up tribalism. It is the deliberate and often unnatural segregation of people into categories for political gain. This practice conditions us to define ourselves and each other by the groups to which we belong—in other words, the things that divide us rather than unite us.

When institutionalized, identity politics causes us to lose sight of our shared values. In time, we come to see each other not as fellow Americans united by common purpose but as opposing members of increasingly narrow social subgroups, and thus begins the long descent into intersectional hell.

Our better angels call on us to resist identity politics by recommitting ourselves to the American idea, the idea that our immutable characteristics do not define us. It is the idea that all of us—regardless of color, class, or creed—are equal and that we can work together to build a more perfect union. When we heed this call, we can achieve unity, and ideas—not identity—can resume their rightful place in our public discourse.

This is the last request I will ever make from this lectern—that as a Senate and as a nation, we listen to our better angels; that we recommit ourselves to civility; that we restore civility to the public discourse; that we embrace wholeheartedly the principles of pluralism; and that we strive for unity by rejecting the rhetoric of division.

When we heed our better angels—when we harken to the voices of virtue native to our very nature—we can transcend our tribal instincts and preserve our democracy for future generations. That we may do so is my humble prayer.

Before I close, let my parting words be words of gratitude. There are countless people I personally need to thank, but first and foremost, I wish to thank the good people of Utah. Without you, I could have accomplished nothing. The landmark reforms that I have helped to pass in Congress have always been a joint effort, drafted by me under constant guidance from people like you. In that sense, the legislative legacy I leave behind is not mine but ours. That goes for my colleagues here as well.

Representing the Beehive State has been the privilege of a lifetime. Thank you for allowing me to do so for 42 years. That is a long time—the longest service of any Republican.

I likewise wish to thank my family—my dear wife Elaine and our six children, who have stood by me through thick and thin.

Of course, I wish to thank my congressional colleagues, especially Leader MCCONNELL and Speaker RYAN, and the countless other public servants, including my friends on the Democratic

side, as well, whom I have had the privilege of working with over the years. These are friendships I will treasure forever.

I also wish to thank my protective detail—the 20-plus men and women who have worked day and night to keep me safe over the years. These officers are like family to me.

As all of you know, a Senator is only as good as his staff, which is why I need to recognize mine today. My Finance Committee staff is unequalled. Led by Jeff Wrase, it has helped me accomplish things I never could have accomplished on my own.

In particular, I wish to thank my personal staff—the countless men and women who have served alongside me over the years. Because of you, I have been able to pass more bills into law than any legislator alive today. Thank you. I love you all.

Let me take a moment to recognize them personally. Thanks to my chief of staff, Matt Sandgren, I am ending this term on a crescendo of legislative activity, having introduced more bills this Congress than at any other time during my Senate service. In the last 2 years, we have also enacted a historic number of bills into law. My staff has not let up in the final stretch, not one bit. We have been a legislative powerhouse to the very end, and I have to thank Matt Sandgren for his efforts in that regard. I have had many chiefs of staff, and I have loved all of them, but I think I saved, maybe, the best for last.

My Utah staff has also played a critical role in my legislative success. A huge thank-you goes to Melanie Bowen, Sharon Garn, Annette Riley, Heather Barney, Sean Firth, Cloe Nixon, Jessa Reed, Ron Dean, Matt Hurst, Nathan Jackson, Courtney Brinkerhoff, and Emily Wilson.

Here in DC, a huge thank-you goes to Matt Jensen, James Williams, Matt Whitlock, Corey Messervy, Ruth Montoya, Celeste Gold, Sam Lyman, Chris Bates, Peter Carey, Brendan Chestnut, Kristin McLintock, Jacob Olidort, Ally Riding, Dianne Browning, Heather Campbell, Nick Clason, Jeff Finegan, Will Holloway, Rick James, Bailee Flitton, Abdul Kalumbi, Monique Laing, Karen LaMontagne, Keri Lyn Michalke, Romel Nicholas, Lauren Paulos, Jordan Roberts, Margo Robbins, and Samantha Ryals. This truly is the best staff on Capitol Hill, in my opinion.

Last, and perhaps most importantly, I wish to thank my Father in Heaven, who has allowed me to serve much longer than my detractors would have hoped. Each time I walk into this Chamber, I am humbled by the symbolic significance of it all. I am reminded of a passage of scripture, one of my favorites: For of him unto whom much is given, much is required. Truly, God has given me so much. In return, I have tried to give back as much as I could. I hope He will accept my best efforts.

Before I get even more sentimental, I note that this is a final floor speech, not a final goodbye. Three weeks from now, I will no longer hold office, but I will continue to hold a special place in my heart for all of you, for all of my colleagues. I look forward to continuing these special friendships even long after I have left the Senate.

I want to thank everybody in the Senate, all of the staff members, all of the law enforcement people, all of the people who have provided us with knowledge and ability. I want God to bless all of you.

May God bless the Senate, and may He bless the United States of America. With that, I yield the floor.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

Thank you very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President and colleagues, we have so many waiting to speak about our friend Chairman HATCH that I am going to be very brief.

If you are to talk about the Chairman's record over the last 42 years, we would be here for months and months on end.

I wish to say, if you had told this body or the country in the winter of 2017 that you would pass in this Congress a bipartisan 10-year reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program—we have plenty of Finance members here—you would have been charged with hallucinating. People would have said: No way; it couldn't possibly happen.

If you had said in the winter of 2017 that you were going to pass a major set of reforms on foster care—reforms that Marian Wright Edelman of the Children's Defense Fund has been dreaming about for decades—they would simply have said: That is impossible. It couldn't possibly happen. You are hallucinating.

Colleagues, listen to this. If you had said in the winter of 2017 that you were going to start a transformation of Medicare with over 50 million seniors—a transformation from a program that traditionally used to be about acute illness and now is largely about chronic illness: cancer, diabetes, heart disease, and stroke—if you had said in 2017 that you were going to transform Medicare to update the Medicare guarantee to help seniors, once again, they would have said: Impossible.

Colleagues, that has happened in this Congress because Chairman HATCH was willing to reach across the aisle, and now millions of kids, millions of seniors, and families from sea to shining sea for whom the foster care system didn't work are now going to be able to have a better path.

I am going to close my remarks—I know so many colleagues want to speak—by quoting Senator Kennedy. As you know, Senator Kennedy had a long friendship with ORRIN HATCH. In 1981, Chairman HATCH took the gavel of what was called the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee. And I

am telling you—the chairman remembers this—Senator Kennedy and ORRIN HATCH got down right away to duking it out. They were duking it out over labor law and all kinds of things, but they began to develop a mutual respect. I am going to close by reading what Senator Kennedy said about ORRIN HATCH.

Senator Kennedy said: We are beyond the point where we let our differences get in the way of opportunities for progress. We have just learned it is a lot easier to work together than it is to fight each other.

Senator Kennedy said:

We have differences in terms of perhaps how we achieve the objectives, but I don't really feel that I have a difference with Orrin in terms of what the objectives ought to be. If you build upon that kind of understanding and respect, you get a lot of things done.

Colleagues, I am telling you, if you look at 2017 and 2018, for the millions of kids who will benefit from the 10-year Children's Health Insurance Program, the scores of families who are going to benefit from the foster care dreams Marian Wright Edelman has been dreaming about, and the millions of seniors who will benefit from updating the Medicare guarantee, that came about because Chairman HATCH looked at Senator Kennedy's words, and he has continued that tradition in the Finance Committee today. I just want him to know how much we appreciate that work.

It is going to matter, Mr. Chairman, for millions of people from sea to shining sea, and I thank you for the opportunity to pursue those opportunities with you.

I yield the floor, and I look forward to hearing from my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is with mixed emotions that I stand today to honor my friend, my colleague, and my mentor, the senior Senator, the Senator from Utah, ORRIN HATCH.

This year marks the end of an outstanding 42-year tenure serving the people of Utah in the U.S. Senate. In that time, Senator HATCH has made an indelible mark on our State, on the U.S. Senate, and on this Nation.

People who follow Washington politics closely know, of course, what he has meant to this institution and also to his party, to his State, and to the Republic. But for those of us from Utah, ORRIN HATCH is more than just a prominent name in the news; he is a towering political figure, not only of his generation but also of the generations that have come along in his wake and that will follow.

Many Utahns can't remember a time before ORRIN HATCH was serving, leading, and speaking out for us in Washington. One of the great privileges of my young life was the opportunity to serve as his page when I was a teenager. He was then, as now, one of the leaders of the Senate—not only a political role model but a role model, period; outspoken but always thoughtful;

honest but always gentle; tough when he had to be and kind even when he didn't have to be.

One of my fondest memories of Senator HATCH was something that occurred a couple of years after I was his page. I was maybe 18 years old or so. I was in Salt Lake City attending the semiannual General Conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in the tabernacle at Temple Square. I happened to be sitting with my family—with my parents and siblings—just a row behind Senator HATCH and his family.

Toward the end of the meeting, it was time for Senator HATCH to catch his plane to go back to Washington, where he was representing our State so faithfully. When he turned around and saw me there, he stopped, recognizing me. He took the cuff links right off of his shirt—they had the seal of the U.S. Senate on them—and he handed them to me as a gift. I felt like and was at that moment the luckiest kid in the world. I felt just like a rock star had handed me his guitar after a sold-out concert. That is how I felt at the conference that day.

Of course, ORRIN HATCH's career stretches back much further than that. In 1976, the political landscape of the United States was very different than it is today. We were plagued at that time with double-digit inflation, high interest rates, growing unemployment, and a diminishing military. America was still reeling from the war in Vietnam and from the Watergate scandal.

At the same time, Congress was rapidly expanding the Federal budget with little or no regard for the future debt it was racking up. Washington was governed by the belief that government was the answer to every problem and that ordinary Americans could not be trusted to make decisions by themselves.

It was in this environment that ORRIN HATCH, without any previous political experience, without having held previous political office or, according to experts, much chance of success, stepped up, and he stepped up in a very big way.

As he wrote in one of his memoirs, "I could not escape the powerful and persistent belief that my state and country were in serious trouble, headed down a dangerous and destructive path, and that if given a chance, I could make a difference. I felt it was my duty, my responsibility, to run and at least give voice to my concerns and my ideas for remedying what was wrong. It was my obligation to give the voters another choice."

So ORRIN—the son of a tradesman, who grew up during the Great Depression in a ramshackle house built from recycled lumber—did just that. He defied the pundits, and he took the plunge. From his first campaign in 1976, ORRIN understood that Utahns wanted the country to go in a different direction, and he was ready to offer his service and the full energy of his heart

and devotion to that noble cause. Against all odds and with a whole lot of work from ORRIN, from his family, and from his faithful band of supporters, HATCH beat the incumbent Democrat by a solid margin. Thus began his long and now famous career in the Senate and his many years of striving to serve the interests of Utah and the Nation. For more than four decades, ORRIN has not only been engaging in the great debates of his time, he has been leading them.

As I see it, the thread that runs through Senator HATCH's politics is trust—his trust in the American people, his trust in the Constitution of the United States, his trust in this great institution that is the U.S. Senate. That trust of consumers, producers, workers, and families is why he is such an effective advocate for the free enterprise economy. It is why he sponsored a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution some 17 times and whence his nickname "Mr. Balanced Budget" from Ronald Reagan originated.

In shepherding the historic tax reform law we passed last year, Senator HATCH adopted an inclusive, open-minded approach that succeeded specifically because he trusted his colleagues, because he invited them into the process and he allowed them to make their own mark on that legislation. He trusted his colleagues, and it worked.

His work in the 1980s helping to create the modern generic drug industry was based on the same principle—trusting the American people and the American economy to make good decisions for individuals, for families, and for their healthcare.

We all know the honors and accolades. They include President pro tempore and being a recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom. But ORRIN would be the first to tell you that the real legislative legacy he leaves behind is the work of a Senator who has sponsored more bills that have become law than any other lawmaker alive today. Look at the stamp he leaves on the Senate Judiciary Committee alone, for example. Not just landmark legislation like the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which guarantees robust protections for all Americans to live, work, and worship according to their beliefs—this legislation itself leaves behind a solid, proud legacy, one that will last for generations. Just within the Senate Judiciary Committee alone, Senator HATCH has also been involved in the selection and confirmation of Federal judges not just in Utah but across the country, and every current member and many past members of the U.S. Supreme Court. That, too, is a legacy which will far outlast his time in the Senate still by many, many decades.

Yet, despite all the history ORRIN has made in Washington, his story is even more impressive. He has been a loving and devoted husband to his wife Elaine

for 61 years. Together, they have 6 children, 23 grandchildren, and 24 great-grandchildren. They are his proudest achievements, and he credits their love as his key to success.

Despite decades at the very pinnacle of American Government, ORRIN believes the most important years of his life were the two spent serving as a missionary in the Great Lakes Mission of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

As Senator HATCH mentioned in recent remarks, an article of our faith is that "if there is anything virtuous, lovely, or of good report or praiseworthy, we seek after these things." And this is, indeed, how ORRIN HATCH has lived his life and the way in which he has faithfully served God, family, his country, and his State.

Utah and the United States of America as a whole are better off for his service since he decided to run for the Senate all those years ago. I am grateful for all the time he has dedicated to the State of Utah and for the personal encouragement he has given me. And from the time that I was his page to the past years that I have also been his colleague in the U.S. Senate, it has been an honor to serve with him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have bad news and good news. The bad news is that it was suggested to me that there is some type of a rule at a time like this where the senior person in the Chamber speaks next, and that is me. The good news is that it is short, and the reason is because I didn't really think about this until I came down here to watch Senator HATCH.

I remember so well that long before I was in the House—ORRIN, long before then—you were the guy I always listened to. You would get phone calls from some obscure State senator out in Oklahoma who was complimenting you. You might even remember one time when you and I put something together where we were going to balance the budget and pass an amendment that we knew would pass because we were going to confirm everything before we got it passed, and that was a brilliant idea that didn't work. Nevertheless, we talked quite often about things, and you were the one I looked up to.

The same thing happened. You had a way. When I was in the House, I would see you more than anyone else during the annual National Prayer Breakfast. You would be active on that from the Senate, and I would be from the House. So you kind of had a way of saying things differently, the things you have heard many times before that you don't realize you have been wrong on all the time. You did it a few minutes ago when you talked about Lincoln. You talked about "the House divided against itself" and drew that relationship to what is happening today.

You said it. When you talk, you are talking history, and it meant something different than anything I had ever seen. The Scripture you have quoted, "To whom much is given, much is expected," I didn't think about that.

I just want to tell you, you have been given a lot and a lot was expected and you surpassed all expectations.

I am going to wind up here with an experience I had a week ago today that was, I think, a violation of our rules, but I occasionally do that anyway. I remember my junior Senator, JAMES LANKFORD, who said something at the conclusion of your remarks a week ago. He said: I have been here 3 or 4 years, and I don't remember one time that I have seen ORRIN HATCH when he didn't encourage me and tell me I was a very special person, and I will always remember that.

When he said that, I began thinking. I have been here about 24 years, and I can't think of one time you haven't been encouraging and an encouraging voice. I would come to a conclusion that there is a reason for this. You reflect, as much as anyone I can think of, the civility and love of Jesus, and I can assure you, Jesus is very proud of you this morning. I love you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President. This September, at the height of yet another contentious campaign season, Senator ORRIN HATCH authored an op-ed for Time magazine which we should all read. Its theme was reflected in the remarks he delivered today in his farewell address to the U.S. Senate and to our country.

With his combination of eloquence and straightforwardness that has enlightened this Chamber for more than four decades, our colleague from Utah called upon all Americans to embrace, as he put it, "the practice of true tolerance: respecting others' beliefs even, or perhaps especially, when they differ from our own."

Senator HATCH reminded us that our system of government, crafted by the Founders with great wisdom and understanding of human nature, only works when we recognize "that the majority of our political disagreements are not matters of good versus evil but good versus good," as he put it. He concluded his important essay with these words: "When we embrace these virtues fully, we can heal partisan divisions, reinvigorate the public discourse and begin to realize the full potential of American democracy."

To our friend and colleague ORRIN HATCH, those are not just words; rather, they have represented his guiding philosophy throughout his 42 years of service in the U.S. Senate. They are why he is such an admired statesman here in Washington, throughout our Nation, and around the world.

They are why he is one of the most effective legislators of modern times. As many of my colleagues have already

commented, Senator HATCH's record of having passed more legislation than any Senator alive today is one that demonstrates his commitment to bridging the partisan divides to achieve and advance the common good and to improve the lives of Americans.

I have known and admired ORRIN HATCH for nearly all of his time in the Senate. I was on the staff of Senator Bill Cohen, who joined the Senate in 1979, just 2 years after Senator HATCH. I saw from the start, as a staffer observing Senator HATCH, that this gentleman from Utah was brilliant, he was kind, and he was devoted to his duty to serve others. He truly is one who leads by example.

Senator HATCH has placed careful consideration and compromise above partisan politics, time and again. From the landmark legislation to create the State Children's Health Insurance Program, during my very first year in the Senate, to the recent tax reform law to strengthen our economy and grow jobs, I have had the great pleasure to work with this remarkable leader.

In fact, I remember my freshman year in the Senate when Senator HATCH came to see me in my office. He told me about his plan to expand health insurance for the unserved children of our country. He said he was authoring the bill with Ted Kennedy, and I thought, well, that is a surprising combination, but then I learned it was not; that he would work together with his colleagues on both sides of the aisle to accomplish the goals he set. He invited me to be one of the early cosponsors of that bill, and I was so flattered that this senior Member of the U.S. Senate would come to me, a mere freshman, and invite me to join in cosponsoring such legislation that has made such a difference for millions of American children.

In addition to his accomplishments as a legislator, Senator HATCH holds another record that is unsurpassed. In 32 of his 42 years in the Senate, he has been either the chairman or the ranking member of a major committee. He is held in very high esteem by his colleagues. The Presidential Medal of Freedom that he was awarded in November acknowledges the gratitude the American people have for his many contributions.

There is another side of Senator ORRIN HATCH. He is also a wonderfully talented musician and successful songwriter. The beautiful song he cowrote for the 2005 Presidential Inauguration, called "Heal the Land," includes this line that describes the mission to which he has devoted his life: "Keep us ever on the path of liberty."

Of all of his accomplishments, Senator HATCH is most proud of his family, as he mentioned today. He credits their love and support as the key to his success, and anyone who has met his wonderful wife Elaine will have to concede that Orrin has a point. His wife of more than 60 years, their 6 children, 23 grandchildren, and 24 great-grand-

children, by last count, have much to be proud of as well.

ORRIN HATCH has compiled an extraordinary record on issues ranging from tax reform, education, national defense, scientific research, criminal justice, and healthcare. In fact, it is difficult to think of an issue where he has not left his mark. He is a dedicated advocate of our Senate traditions and a fierce defender of our Constitution. His wide-ranging accomplishments are united by a commitment to always move our country forward.

ORRIN, our Nation is so grateful for your service, and I am so grateful for your wise counsel, mentorship, and friendship over the years. I offer my best wishes to you and to Elaine for many years to come.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, as this session of Congress draws to a close, it provides us with an opportunity to acknowledge and express our appreciation to those Members of the Senate who will be retiring in just a few weeks. One of those Senators who is retiring and whose leadership and institutional knowledge will be missed is my friend ORRIN HATCH of Utah.

I have known ORRIN since my first days 22 years ago in the Senate, and I much appreciated working with him over the years. His mentoring, his guidance, his love, and his sharing of his faith have made a tremendous difference to me.

He comes from a State that borders my own. We are neighbors. As a western Senator, he has an understanding of what is truly important to the people in our neck of the woods and has fought to make this country better during his time in the Senate.

Before I talk about his many accomplishments in public service, I want to acknowledge some of the other things about him that have also been mentioned, his life and role beyond the Senate.

So often it is easy to gloss over things that are important to Senators personally. Sometimes it is easy to forget the men and women we know have their lives that stretch beyond these Halls. ORRIN has been married to his wife Elaine for more than 60 years. He is a father of 6, grandfather of 23, and currently has 24 great-grandchildren. He is an author and a man of many talents. It has been mentioned that he is a talented composer and musician and has both a gold and platinum record from the Recording Industry Association of America. He has been instrumental in the musical world and has been awarded an honorary Grammy. He has been the main protector of copyrights.

ORRIN has dedicated his life to serving the people of Utah. He has always worked for the best interests of Utah, and that includes Americans nationwide.

He has served in the Senate since 1977 and since 2015 has been the President

pro tempore, where he can be seen presiding during the opening of the Senate for daily business probably more than any other President pro tempore of the Senate.

The numbers are in, and they are impressive. He has served under seven Presidents, been a part of both the minority and majority, and has served the people of Utah and the U.S. Senate for over 40 years. ORRIN has served in a variety of leadership roles and has helped America every step of the way. He has had the opportunity to serve as the chairman of three major Senate committees—the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee; the Judiciary Committee; and most recently, the Finance Committee while doing the tax bill. He has run for President. He has been considered as a potential nominee for the Supreme Court. He has played a role in confirming every Supreme Court Justice currently sitting on the bench. ORRIN is eminently qualified for so many positions, and America has been lucky to have his leadership through the years. The people of Utah, our Nation, and people of all faiths were fortunate to have him to rely on. ORRIN is a man of faith, one who defends others' right to worship in peace.

He has consistently fought to rein in the Federal Government. He has been a champion of responsible government spending and a leader of States' rights. He authored a constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget that received 66 votes, just one short of what was needed to amend the Constitution. One of those votes was somebody who had just run for election and said that was the most important thing and no matter how many times it came up, he would be voting for it. He voted against it, and that was the one vote that was needed. Just by virtue of his legislative triumphs, he has helped to author some of the most consequential pieces of legislation in our time. Many have been mentioned.

He paved the way for the sale of generic drugs and helped advance innovation for patients with rare diseases. He has contributed to the protection of children's health and well-being as well as the rights of Americans with disabilities. I know one of his proudest accomplishments is passing the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which protects individual Americans' right to exercise their religion. Most recently, he had the honor of having the Orrin G. Hatch-Bob Goodlatte Music Modernization Act named after him, which overhauled musical copyright law.

We both have a strong touch of the West in our hearts, which we express every day in what we do. That is why I wasn't surprised last year when ORRIN announced he would not be running for another term in the Senate. He said:

I've always been a fighter. I was an amateur boxer in my youth . . . but every good fighter knows when to hang up the gloves. . . . I look forward to spending more time with family, especially my sweet wife

Elaine, whose unwavering love and support made all of this possible.

ORRIN has been a great source of strength and a great support for our party, and he will be missed. My wife Diana joins me in sending our best wishes and appreciation to ORRIN and Elaine. We wish them all the best as they have time to spend with their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. Together, they have been great examples of the importance of public service, and we wish them the best in whatever adventure they choose to pursue next.

ORRIN, it will be said that it was well done, good and faithful servant. Happy trails.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I have been sitting here listening to all of the accolades being given to our friend ORRIN HATCH, and I didn't hear a word I disagree with. As a matter of fact, rather than offering my prepared remarks, I ask unanimous consent that they be made part of the RECORD following my verbal remarks.

Let me just spend a couple of minutes talking about the ORRIN HATCH that I know. I first met ORRIN HATCH in 1990, when I was a candidate for the Texas Supreme Court. We had an event in Dallas, TX, and, lo and behold, who would be the star attraction? It certainly wasn't me. Who would be the star attraction of this event? It was Senator ORRIN HATCH, famous for his work on the Senate Judiciary Committee, having served there for virtually his entire career in the Senate. Of course, he lent tremendous gravitas to that event, which would otherwise have been forgotten, including by me, in a short time. But it was indicative to me of the importance that ORRIN has always placed on the independent Judiciary in our country, and we heard how many judicial nominations he has participated in and how many Supreme Court Justices whose confirmation proceedings he has participated in.

What I will always remember about ORRIN is his generosity, his kindness, and his faithfulness when it comes to the rule of law and the role of our independent Judiciary.

Recently, we had a debate in our conference at one of our lunches. ORRIN is so famous for encouraging, as we heard from the Senators from Oklahoma, Mr. INHOFE and Mr. LANKFORD. He is famous for being an encourager. I can't think of any one of us who hasn't had ORRIN HATCH come up to us at some point during the day and say: You are doing a great job. Keep it up.

Actually, the joke was that ORRIN has told so many of us that he loved us, that one of our colleagues said: Well, he told me he loves me most—hoping we would be jealous, I guess.

But the truth is, ORRIN has a heart as big as all the outdoors. At a time when people wonder about the future of our country and the character of the people

who serve our country and government, he is a shining example of exactly what should cause them to keep faith for the future of this country. As long as we have men and women of the character of ORRIN HATCH serving in the U.S. Government, we have nothing to worry about.

Let me just say to my friend ORRIN, thank you for being my friend. Thank you for being a great example for all of us to emulate. There is nothing more powerful in life than a good example, as ORRIN has helped us realize.

We wish you and Elaine and your family all the best. As the Scripture says: You fought the good fight, you finished the race, and you kept the faith. We love you for it.

Today, I have the difficult task of trying to sum up the work of a great Senator, a valued colleague, and a great friend.

While this is a familiar reality every other December, it doesn't make the task any easier—especially when it comes to saying farewell to Senator ORRIN HATCH. It is rare to find such a combination of wit and grace, humor and humility. But we find that in him, and the combination works. He is the American Dream personified, a shining example of where hard work and determination can get you in life.

ORRIN's story starts in Pittsburgh from humble beginnings with parents who worked for every cent they earned. Back then, in his words, he had to "fight for everything," and he meant that both literally and figuratively. After a bully shoved a young ORRIN on the playground, he went home, stuffed a duffel bag with sand, and hung it from a tree in his yard. He punched that bag for hours, and when it came time to stand up to another playground foe, he won.

As he and his wife Elaine built their young family, he built a home for them himself, converting an old chicken coop. Elaine counts their time there as some of her happiest memories.

It is this drive to succeed no matter what the circumstance that lit a fire in ORRIN and made him a star in the courtroom and later, in this chamber. ORRIN has served as a mentor to me and to so many others in Congress.

Our friendship goes back before my time in the Senate to when I was running for the Texas Supreme Court. ORRIN came to Texas to headline an event for me and the Chief Justice. It was an outsized act of kindness for someone of his stature in the U.S. Senate, and an act I have never forgotten.

We have continued that friendship and partnership on a wide range of issue areas, but often on one topic we find increasingly important for both our states: trade. I have been fortunate to benefit from ORRIN's leadership on the Senate Finance Committee as chair of the trade subcommittee, especially as we worked to pass Trade Promotion Authority. Although these trade agreements are complex, they are not faceless: they affect whether or not

an American family can put food on their table.

ORRIN recognized that TPA is an integral trade tool to ensure American workers and businesses get the best deal possible in pending trade agreements. And passing it was a true team effort.

Nearly everything I have done with Chairman HATCH on the Finance Committee has been to help American families, and that is something ORRIN keeps at the forefront of his mind with each vote we take in committee or here on the floor. It drove his work during our efforts on tax reform, his most historic achievement to date. He led the entire conference masterfully, providing steady guidance and keeping our goal of putting more money back in the pockets of hard working Americans in mind.

ORRIN has also served as the Chairman of the Judiciary and HELP Committees and has had over 800 bills signed into law—more than any living Senator. He has not let party lines stop him from getting things done. He joined with Senator Ted Kennedy on the Children's Health Insurance Program. He worked to lower the price of prescription drugs. He pushed the Americans with Disabilities Act over the finish line.

A lot of his ideas for legislation come from his deeply held convictions and his passions in life. A devout Mormon and believer that all Americans should be able to practice the religion of their choice, he worked across the aisle to pass the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

His love of music led him to partner with fellow musician Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER on the Music Modernization Act, now law. It was the first sweeping update of our music copyright laws in 20 years, and it allows artists to get the royalties they are due.

ORRIN, a prolific songwriter, has had hits included in movies and his songs range from the serious, like a tribute to his brother Jesse who died in World War II, to the patriotic, like his ballad, "America Rocks!" Through all of his work, ORRIN has been driven by a belief that he would make a difference in the lives of Americans. It is this service mentality—guided by his strong faith—that continues to be an inspiration to us all.

Although he attributes his success to hard work, he also knows he has been given special talents by his Maker. ORRIN once said, "There's no question that God has helped me throughout my life, and I don't want to let him down." I believe our colleagues would join me in saying that ORRIN, you have not let him down.

I challenge my colleagues to outwork ORRIN HATCH. I am not sure it can be done, but we would be a better Chamber for it.

I think it is safe to say that my colleagues and I will miss the laughter and wisdom of this man, and we are be-

yond grateful for his countless contributions to this country, this institution, and to his beloved state over an outstanding career.

I want to thank him for his service and bid him farewell. Senator HATCH's legacy will live on through our work, we will make sure of it.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I just had the honor of presiding over Senator HATCH's farewell address to the Senate and to the country. I think for everybody who saw this—whether it is our colleagues on the Senate floor or, hopefully, millions of Americans—in his speech, they saw and heard, not only in his remarks but in the remarks that have followed from Democrats and Republicans who have served with him for many years, why he is so revered in this body as a statesman and as an example for all of the Senate. You just heard the accolades: civility, class, competence, effectiveness, patriot, kind, statesman. We could go on and on here.

I want to thank him for his example. As an Alaska Senator, I also want to thank him for being such a great friend to Alaska, my State. In my 4 years in the Senate, as so many others have said, he was always encouraging me but always asking me: What can I do to help, Dan? What can I do to help Alaska?

ORRIN, I want to thank you so much for that encouragement, for your exceptional example to all of us, for your exceptional example to America, for your exceptional service not only to the people of Utah but to the entire Nation. It has been a great honor to serve with you, sir.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, we will soon be voting in this Chamber on S. Res. 64, which is a Congressional Review Act resolution looking at a Treasury Department rule that I believe will promote dark money in politics.

Since the Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United*, our political system has been flooded—absolutely flooded—with money from special interest groups. According to the Center for Responsive Politics, independent expenditures on campaigns went from \$203 million in 2010 to \$1.48 billion less than 10 years later, in 2016. So it went from \$203 million in 2010, after the *Citizens United* decision, to \$1.48 billion in 2016.

This massive influx of money into our elections undermines the confidence of the American people in our political system. It creates an environment that is ripe for corruption and inappropriate influence. It sows further disenchantment among the electorate and impacts participation in our democracy. It allows voters to believe that their votes are less important

than businesses with a bigger checkbook.

That is why it is so important that we ensure transparency and accountability in campaign financing through robust disclosure requirements and oversight.

Unfortunately, instead of making it easier to identify individuals and organizations who are funding campaigns, the Treasury Department has issued a rule that will increase the amount of dark money in the political process. That is money that comes in, and we have no idea where it comes from and who is behind it. This ill-advised rule change from the Treasury Department will eliminate the requirement that social welfare organizations, or 501(c)(4)s, and business leagues, or 501(c)(6)s, report donor information to the IRS. That basically gives a blank check for anyone to come in and spend any amount of money, and we are not going to know who it is or who is behind the money.

The change risks impeding law enforcement efforts to track money laundering in our political system, and it makes it more likely that foreign money will illegally influence our elections. Under this new rule, organizations that made over \$197 million in independent expenditures during the 2016 election cycle would now be totally exempt from disclosing who those donors were to the IRS.

The door will now be open to hundreds of millions more in dark money from secret groups with hidden agendas, trying to buy an election with money and influence. These dark money groups have increased in size and scope since the *Citizens United* decision, as they recognize the opportunity to influence elections with no accountability.

Malicious actors at home and abroad will likely exploit the increased secrecy in this process, and the proliferation of these dark money groups will further influence our political system.

This Congress has a duty to ensure the integrity and security of our electoral process. We have to eliminate dark money contributions as we do this. Dark money has a corrosive influence on our Democratic process because it erodes trust in our institutions, it distorts the motives of our elected representatives, and, perhaps most importantly, the American people have a right to know if the candidates they choose to represent them are supported by foreign groups and shady special interests.

For these reasons, I strongly support attempts to stop the Trump administration's misguided attempt to allow more dark money into our political process, and I urge my colleagues to support the resolution that will be coming up shortly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete my remarks and

Senator TESTER be recognized at the conclusion of my remarks for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO ORRIN HATCH

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, before I begin addressing my opposition to the CRA, I want to spend a brief moment agreeing with all of the tributes and all of the accolades of Senator HATCH.

I wasn't able to get down here on the floor because I couldn't get down here in time—he started a little bit early—but I watched the entire speech from my office. It just showed the integrity, the patriotism, and the goodwill of this good man.

Like so many of my other colleagues, I don't know another Senator who offers more encouragement and more kind words to all of us than Senator HATCH. Again, I wish him and Elaine well in their retirement. I wish them the best.

God bless Senator HATCH for all of his faithful service.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Madam President, I rise to discuss the Congressional Review Act challenge put forward by the senior Senators from Oregon and Montana.

The CRA has been proposed in response to guidance on a revenue procedure recently announced by the Internal Revenue Service. As chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, I have written to the IRS twice asking them to take the very actions this CRA seeks to overturn.

Let me begin by reviewing some basic facts about the guidance—facts that are irrefutable, but facts that are apparently being ignored by those supporting this measure.

First, I want to make it clear that the guidance in question mirrors a proposal that was crafted under the Obama administration. While that proposal was never fully implemented, the fact that it was first proposed by the Obama administration proves its bipartisan nature.

Essentially, the guidance makes clear that personal identifying information of donors for certain tax-exempt organizations does not need to be filed on a form with the IRS. However, these organizations will still be required to keep that donor information on file. Simply put, the guidance is merely a change in where the information is warehoused.

In the past, it was kept on a form at the IRS, as well as in the records of each organization. Now, it will only be kept in the records of each organization.

It is important to note that the officials in the Obama administration said that the reporting of such information is no longer necessary for the efficient administration of the internal revenue laws. I am not actually sure it ever was required.

The one change being implemented that differs from the Obama proposal is

that the IRS also included in its new guidance needed privacy protections in response to recent government leaks and breaches. In order to protect taxpayer privacy, under this new guidance, the donor information in question is prohibited from being made public by the government no matter where it is warehoused.

So let me summarize. The donor information in question is not used by the IRS for the efficient administration of the internal revenue laws, as was noted by the previous administration. The information is required to be kept on file and on the books of the organization and to be available to the IRS or law enforcement, if needed, which was also as proposed by the previous administration. Finally, the information, no matter where it is housed, shall not be made public by the government.

These are clear and concise reasons for a simple change that was made—and let me reemphasize this point—in order to protect taxpayer privacy. Unfortunately, such protection is necessary because, when the IRS required that donor information be reported on a form to the IRS, there had been numerous times during which the returns of tax-exempt organizations were inappropriately and possibly illegally disclosed, whether through administrative sloppiness, carelessness, breaches, or other potentially nefarious or partisan reasons.

The reason tax-exempt organizations' donors may wish to remain anonymous is best illustrated in the 1958 Supreme Court case of the NAACP v. Alabama. The State of Alabama was attempting to force the disclosure of the members of the NAACP. The concern those members had in having their names revealed should be obvious. Fortunately, the Supreme Court decided unanimously to protect the identities of the NAACP's members.

Today, tax-exempt organizations that span the political spectrum and the supporters of those organizations deserve the same consideration and protection as the NAACP had. They deserve to remain anonymous so that they cannot be targeted by their political opponents.

A similar threat does exist today from the compelled disclosure of donor information that is held by tax-exempt organizations, including 501(c)(4) social welfare groups. If information about donors to these groups becomes publicly available, the information could be used in a way that would chill future speech and association—a basic First Amendment right.

Donor information is also susceptible to abuse by the Federal Government itself. In one egregious example in 2010, the IRS sent 1.1 million pages of tax-exempt return information, including donor information in some cases, to the Justice Department for potential prosecutions relating to political speech. More recently, some States have sought to compel the disclosure of

donor information from schedule B. The disclosure of donor information has led to the harassment of donors in some very well-documented cases.

In a court brief that was filed in January of 2017 in *Americans for Prosperity Foundation v. Becerra*, the NAACP warned against States' compelling the disclosure of donor information:

Forcing an organization to release [organizational membership and/or donor lists] to the State not only divulges the First Amendment activities of individual members and donors, but may also deter such activities in the first place. Specifically, individuals may legitimately fear of any number of negative consequences from disclosure, including harassment by the public, adverse government action, and reprisals by a union or employer.

This potential harm exists across the political spectrum regardless of donors' ideological beliefs.

Needless to say, the Congressional Review Act challenge to the recent IRS guidance on where to house private donor information is troubling, and its motivation is highly suspect. For anyone who truly cares about privacy and ensuring that the Federal Government does not use the tax system as a political targeting machine, a vote against the Congressional Review Act challenge is the obvious choice. I urge my colleagues to vote no.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, before I start, I thank Senator HATCH for his decades of service to this body, and I wish him well in retirement.

This CR is about one thing—transparency, sunlight, and making sure people know what is going on with their government. I rise on behalf of the millions of Americans who are tired of seeing their democracy undermined by mega-donors as they hide in the shadows. As my friend from Maine said, it would be like going to a public meeting with a bag over your head. That is what this is about. Take the bag off. Take them out of the shadows.

Since the Supreme Court's ruling in 2010 in a case called *Citizens United*, we have had our democracy and our elections for sale. Over the past 8 years, billions of dollars have been spent to influence our elections. Nobody knows where this money comes from. It could be coming from foreign countries.

Just 3 years after the unpopular *Citizens United* decision, these wealthy families once again used the Supreme Court to chip away at our democracy with the *McCutcheon* ruling. A handful of our Nation's wealthiest families have used this court ruling to hide behind political action committees with stoic names so they can build pipelines of cash to push their own agendas.

While we are still tallying the totals from this past election 5 weeks ago, we know that dark money groups in 2016 spent \$1.4 billion in that single election.

If we don't take an aggressive approach, more dark money is going to

flood our elections. It is going to mislead voters and turn people away from our elections, our democracy, and, quite frankly, will put our democracy at risk.

This is a very important joint resolution, and it is not the first time we have been here. During the Gilded era of the Copper Kings, this Nation's wealthy openly exercised their power over our democracy. Once again, they tried to buy it. In fact, in my home State of Montana, Copper King William Clark's solicitation for bribes during his campaign for the U.S. Senate was so blatant that Mark Twain called him "as rotten a human being as can be found anywhere under the flag." Today, I am concerned that the days of the Copper Kings have returned and are being ushered in, in part, by policies from this administration.

Back in July, the Treasury Department and the IRS took an unprecedented step and eliminated the requirements for certain tax-exempt organizations to report to the IRS the identities of their major donors.

I will say one thing about the Senator from Wisconsin's remarks—the Obama administration's view on this was that it opposed it because it would constrain the IRS in enforcing its tax laws. This administration's policy through the Treasury, through the IRS, created another safe haven for this country's wealthiest donors to hide in the shadows while they pulled the levers of power in our democracy.

Just like ordinary Americans took control of our government at the end of the days of the Copper Kings, when Senate seats were openly for sale—they acted—we have to act today. Today's vote will overturn that rule and shed more light on the folks who are trying to buy our elections.

In my reelection campaign over the past 2 years, over \$40 million of outside money was spent to influence just 500,000 voters. We will never know who those folks were. These out-of-State fat cats didn't know the State of Montana; they just wanted to write the large checks to try to influence and buy our State, just like the Copper Kings did 100 years ago. I guarantee that a lot of those dollars came from the same dark money groups that are opposing this vote here today. They don't want to see this joint resolution pass because it undermines their efforts to anonymously influence our elections—once again, taking away from the transparency of our government.

In addition to these wealthy few who are trying to buy our elections, these dark money policies open the door to foreign contributions to House, Senate, and Presidential campaigns. Of course, it is illegal for a foreign national to contribute to our Federal candidates for office, but when you do not know who is contributing the money, how do we know that it is not the Russians or that it is not the Saudis or other nations that are infiltrating our elections? Our adversaries are always look-

ing for the weakest link to try to destroy our country and destroy our democracy. One of our weak links today is our broken campaign finance system.

It is time to pass this bill, shore up the election infrastructure, and take a step toward eliminating the ability of our enemies to choose leaders in Washington, DC.

I thank the senior Senator from Oregon for his leadership and for helping to force a vote on this important legislation. Senator WYDEN and more than 30 Members of this body cosigned our discharge petition, and 35 Members of this body cosponsored this joint resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act to force today's vote.

The public needs to know where the Senators stand. Do they stand on the side of transparency and accountability, or do they side with the dark money special interests who flood our elections with television ads and our mailboxes with misleading ads? It is past time to wrestle our country back from the wealthy few who are fighting to drown out the voices of regular folks. I urge the support of this joint resolution of disapproval so as to help take our country back.

I will close with one thing, and then I will be quiet—and thank you for your tolerance. This is about transparency. Tell me one time when transparency has not been a good thing. It is the antiseptic for good government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 260 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Collins	Hassan
Bennet	Coons	Heinrich
Blumenthal	Cortez Masto	Heitkamp
Booker	Donnelly	Hirono
Brown	Duckworth	Jones
Cantwell	Durbin	Kaine
Cardin	Feinstein	King
Carper	Gillibrand	Klobuchar
Casey	Harris	Leahy

Manchin	Peters	Tester
Markey	Reed	Udall
McCaskill	Sanders	Van Hollen
Menendez	Schatz	Warner
Merkley	Schumer	Warren
Murphy	Shaheen	Whitehouse
Murray	Smith	Wyden
Nelson	Stabenow	

NAYS—49

Alexander	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Capito	Hoeven	Rounds
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Corker	Inhofe	Sasse
Cornyn	Isakson	Scott
Cotton	Johnson	Shelby
Crapo	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cruz	Kyl	Thune
Daines	Lankford	Toomey
Enzi	Lee	Wicker
Ernst	McConnell	Young
Fischer	Moran	
Flake	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—1

Tillis

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, as the 115th Congress winds down, I would like to reflect on the enactment of the historic tax legislation, which passed last year, and what is ahead for us in the new year.

In December of 2017, Congress passed, and the President signed into law, the most comprehensive reforms to the Nation's tax laws in more than three decades.

For years, both sides of the aisle have talked about the need for tax reform that would provide tax simplification, tax fairness, and increase America's economic competitiveness. With the enactment of the law called the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, we finally made all three of those goals a reality.

Significant simplification was achieved for individuals by nearly doubling the standard deduction. This means people will be able to pay less and avoid the tedious task of itemizing their taxes. Overall, roughly 90 percent of taxpayers will file their taxes by simply taking the standard deduction.

Moreover, thanks to a significantly higher alternative minimum tax, which we refer to as the AMT exemption, millions of middle-class taxpayers will no longer be faced with figuring out their tax liability two times: one time to calculate their regular tax liability and the second time to calculate their tax liability under the alternative minimum tax.

It also provided tax fairness by reducing taxes across every income group. In fact, middle-income families experienced the largest tax cut by percentage.

Additionally, the reforms made the Tax Code more progressive, with taxpayers earning more than \$1 million shouldering a larger share of the tax burden than they did under the previous law. In addition to nearly doubling the standard deduction, tax relief was targeted at middle-class families by doubling the child tax credit from \$1,000 to \$2,000 per child.

It also reduced the previous 15 percent tax bracket to 12 percent and the 25 percent tax bracket to 22 percent. As a result, a typical family of four earning \$59,000 a year will see a tax cut of more than \$1,600 in the year 2018.

A key motivation for tax reform was to boost economic growth and increase America's global competitiveness. America's Tax Code should favor American jobs, American workers, and American businesses. That means leveling the playing field so that we are not put at an economic disadvantage with other countries competing with us, so the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act brought the corporate and international tax systems into the 21st century. You can tell it is already working because other countries are looking at lowering their tax rates to compete with us.

Of course, what we did included lowering the corporate tax rate from 35 down to 21 percent. In one fell swoop, we went from a tax rate that was the highest in the developed world to below the world's average of 23 percent. How can you be competitive if you are a country at 35 percent and the average is 23 percent? This means global corporations will be more inclined to create jobs here, rather than in other countries.

We also modernized America's international tax system. We were one of the very last major countries to tax businesses on a worldwide basis. By moving toward a more territorial system, we freed up more than \$2 trillion for investment here at home that American companies were holding offshore.

These changes to the international tax rules don't just help U.S. companies that operate globally to compete in the worldwide marketplace, but they also help those companies grow their businesses here at home with more jobs, better wages, and increased investment.

Just as important, we worked to ensure that small businesses and pass-through entities received more equitable treatment compared to what a corporation gets. We have a new 20-percent qualified business deduction benefiting pass-through businesses of all sizes, down to the smallest family farmer or corner bakery. Enhanced expensing rules were included to help all businesses, spurring investments in new equipment and machinery.

Our efforts have contributed to a strong and growing economy. The unemployment rate is at a half-century low; wages are rising at the fastest rate in nearly a decade; and workers, employers, and small business owners are all very optimistic about the future—more optimistic than for a long, long time. America is working again.

As we look forward to a new year in 2019, with a new Congress and a new majority in the House, it is my hope that we can work in a bipartisan way to build upon this economic success I just described. I will be doing my part as the incoming chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and I see plenty—plenty—of opportunity.

Unfortunately, I hear increasing calls from the incoming House majority pledging to erase the progress made with the tax cuts and tax reforms I have just outlined.

The proof of tax reform's success is in today's economy. It is obvious to most people that it is in the best shape it has been in for a long time. Why would we want to go backward—toward stagnation, pessimism, and, obviously, joblessness?

Of course, no major piece of legislation is perfect. To the extent that there are legitimate efforts to perfect the law, then I want people to know that I am all ears. But to the extent that these efforts would undermine the strength of the American economy for the sake of ideology—and that ideology would be hiking taxes and undoing important reforms to modernize the tax system and increase America's global competitiveness—then they will be met with stiff opposition from this Senator.

Instead of playing politics, we should be focused on examining how the law is affecting individuals, families, and businesses in our respective States and districts. Where necessary, we should work together to take action and ensure the law is fulfilling its full potential.

We should also work toward providing tax certainty for individuals and small businesses. This would include making permanent marginal tax rate cuts for individuals and families, making permanent the doubling of the child tax credit from \$1,000 to \$2,000, also making permanent the innovative 20 percent deduction for small businesses to provide the certainty that is needed to make investment and to encourage that investment and also to encourage hiring decisions and, lastly, the ability of businesses to recover the cost of investment in property and equipment faster.

I hope my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in these efforts. I have yet to hear a good reason why we shouldn't make these and other tax relief measures permanent. It is the right thing to do for the economy, the right thing to do for job creation, and the right thing to do for wage growth.

I also wish to see us continue working on other important issues we start-

ed in this Congress. This includes improving retirement savings, bringing the IRS into the 21st century, protecting taxpayer rights, enhancing the competitiveness of U.S. businesses, and encouraging research, development, and innovation.

I also hope there will be plenty of opportunity to work on a bipartisan basis on tax issues involving everything from education to renewable and alternative energy, to consumer-directed healthcare options. I have heard a lot about the desire of the new House majority to engage in oversight of the current administration.

I will put my record of oversight up against anyone's record. However, I want my colleagues to know I do not intend to engage in political fishing expeditions. I think a person like me who has had an equal opportunity approach to oversight—treating Republican administrations the same as Democratic administrations—speaks for itself.

I will not go along with efforts to weaponize the authority of tax-writing committees to access tax returns for political purposes. Such an action would be unprecedented, but if Democrats are interested in doing non-partisan, good government oversight, count me in.

I hope they will join me in my efforts to hold the IRS accountable to the taxpayers; ensure the nonprofit sector is living up to the purposes of its tax-exempt status; that they will also help me stand up for tax whistleblowers who expose tax cheats; and track down, expose, and address tax shelters.

My hope is, in the new Congress, we will be able to work to address important tax matters in a bipartisan fashion. I am proud of my strong record of bipartisanship on the Finance and Judiciary Committees. I intend to continue my good working relationships with my colleagues across the aisle and hope to forge a few new ones, not only in the Senate but also with the new majority in the House of Representatives.

Senator WYDEN, who will be the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee, and I have had a good working relationship on so many different issues over a long period of time, and I think we will be able to work together as well. We have already started communication along that line.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it occurs to me that if Americans had any doubt that President Trump is fixated on

wasting billions of tax dollars to wall off our 2,000-mile southern border, all they had to do was watch his jaw-dropping press conference yesterday in which he demanded another \$5 billion of America's hard-earned tax dollars for his political pet project, which, throughout his whole campaign, he gave his solemn word that Mexico would pay for.

I have been here during the terms of eight different Presidents. I have never heard the words I heard from our President yesterday. I never thought that any President, Republican or Democrat, would use them. When President Trump boasted that he would be proud to shut down the government if Congress does not bow to his spending demands, I had to play it back, watching it two or three times, making sure that is exactly what he said. He was very proud of it. I must say it is one of the most reckless statements I have ever heard uttered by a President of the United States of either party.

The President's job, like yours and mine—all of us—is to keep the Federal Government operating for the hundreds of millions of Americans who depend on government services every day, from our national parks, housing services for the elderly, the disabled, our veterans, and for assistance to our Nation's farmers. Just yesterday, we passed a bipartisan farm bill, and I praise Senator ROBERTS, a Republican, and Senator STABENOW, a Democrat. They came together and passed a bipartisan bill by an overwhelming margin.

A lot of work went into that to protect our farmers, but if the President shuts down the government, there is not going to be anybody in local USDA—U.S. Department of Agriculture—offices to answer questions from farmers about what that new law means for them, just as farmers are making their plans for next year's planting season. They cannot just turn it on and turn it off. They have to plan months in advance.

When I first came to the Senate 44 years ago, the idea of threatening to shut down the Federal Government as a negotiating tactic was unheard of. Now it seems we go through this every year, and neither party is blameless. But before President Trump, no one bragged about it. No one seemed to relish it. No one was foolish enough to call it good for the country, no matter what party they were from. No one treated shutting down the government as if it is some kind of reality show, some kind of game, without the slightest concern for the consequences for the American people and hundreds of thousands of Federal workers and their families over the holidays or for the huge amount of the taxpayers' money that would be wasted as a result.

President Trump's performance yesterday amounted to throwing a temper tantrum on national television. He is either oblivious to what he is doing, does not know what he is doing, or he simply does not care about the real

world consequences of a shutdown. Hundreds of thousands of Federal employees would be furloughed or working without pay 3 days before Christmas, and millions of Americans would be cut off from critical government services. Instead, the President eagerly offered to "take the mantle" for shutting down the government over his pet project—a wall, which we do not need.

What could be the driving fixation for building medieval wall along the southern border? Maybe he has actually begun to believe his own fearmongering and lies about migrants, asylees, and refugees. After years of demonizing and vilifying migrants to rally his most ardent supporters, perhaps his own demagoguery has finally gotten to him. Maybe he is actually believing the things he has been saying. Only that—a self-made, alternate reality in which vulnerable women and children have miraculously transformed into hordes of gang members and terrorists—could explain such an irrational obsession for a wasteful wall that does absolutely nothing to stop actual threats to our Nation's security. Only in an altered reality would one act as though teargassing little children in diapers makes sense.

The President may not be able to tell fact from fiction, but he may be purposely blurring the lines between them. But as vice chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, it is my duty to ensure that taxpayer dollars go toward solving problems we know to exist in fact. So let's talk about the facts. It is time for a reality check.

President Trump, justifying a litany of anti-immigrant policies, has repeatedly claimed that there is a crisis at our southern border with a "drastic surge" of undocumented migrants attempting to flood into our country. That is false.

The truth is that illegal border crossings are at historic lows. At the end of 2017, arrests of people attempting to enter the United States illegally dropped to the lowest level since 1971. Between 2000 and 2018, border apprehensions fell sharply, from roughly 1.6 million in fiscal year 2000 to approximately 400,000 in fiscal year 2018—a 75-percent drop. Now, we all agree that illegal immigration is a serious problem, and we should address it, but saying that we are experiencing a crisis-level surge of illegal crossings at the border is pure fiction. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the President would use pure fiction as a scare tactic.

There is not a true crisis to point to, so the President is manufacturing one. Ever the reality TV showman, he opted to focus America's attention on images and videos of a caravan of migrants marching toward our southern border. In the runup to the recent elections, pointing at vulnerable migrants while they were thousands of miles from our border, President Trump immediately began warning of an imminent "onslaught," "invaders," an "assault on our country," and a "national emer-

gency." Inconveniently for the President, these people were 1,000 miles from our border. Thousands of them are defenseless women and children. Most Americans just do not think of the word "invaders" when they see barefoot toddlers being pushed in strollers by their mothers. The sad reality is that many of these people are fleeing desperate situations in their home countries and are looking for sanctuary. They are not coming here to perpetuate violence; they are running away from violence.

They do not want violence. They are not coming here to bring violence; they are trying to escape violence—violence against their children, violence against their families.

When the pictures on TV actually began to be shown and were defying the President's narrative, he changed course. He began making the case that hidden among these families are stone-cold criminals and unknown Middle Easterners, as if anyone from the Middle East is inherently a danger to us. What is his proof? He has none.

In fact, to quote the President's own words about the composition of the migrant caravan: "There is no proof of anything."

Just yesterday, President Trump even claimed we needed the wall because we recently captured 10 terrorists over a "very short period of time." This statement had fact checkers, actually people within his own administration, scratching their heads because nobody knew what he was talking about.

A Homeland Security official claimed that President Trump was referring to a government statistic indicating that 10 people suspected of terrorist ties are prevented from entering the United States every day "by air, sea, or land." What a multibillion dollar wall along our southern border would do to prevent a suspected terrorist from flying into JFK Airport I cannot figure out, but President Trump does not seem to know or care about the difference.

The conservative Center for Immigration Studies issued a report last month, concluding that only 15 suspected terrorists have been apprehended at the U.S.-Mexico border since 2001, and a suspected terrorist includes anyone coming from a handful of specific countries, like Syria. It does not mean they are, in fact, terrorists or have any connection whatsoever to terrorists.

So President Trump's unsubstantiated vitriol against immigrants is matched only by his flamboyance about the wall. Despite his claims yesterday that wall construction is under budget, the largest component of fencing that Congress has funded, a 25-mile barrier in the Rio Grande Valley, has ballooned in cost from \$445 million to \$787 million. That pricetag for fencing is \$31.5 million per mile. We American taxpayers are paying for that. Despite the President's claims that additional wall funding is an urgent need, the

Trump administration has spent only 6 percent of the \$1.7 billion Congress has appropriated over the last 2 years to build or replace fencing on the southern border.

Facts matter, Mr. President. The \$5 billion he is clamoring for would be better spent on real homeland security, such as Coast Guard boats that can save lives, grants to nonprofit churches and synagogues to secure themselves against shootings like those in Pittsburgh and Sutherland Springs, more Customs personnel and technology to seize the fentanyl that is fueling our Nation's opioid epidemic and actually killing our citizens. Let's remember, fentanyl is mostly coming through our legal points of entry and our mail facilities, not between the ports where the President wants to build his wall.

Perhaps in President Trump's alternate reality—where illegal crossings are at historic highs, migrant caravans of hardened criminals are invading our country, and terrorists are slipping past our Border Patrol agents every day—the need for a giant, concrete wall seems like an urgent necessity. But if, like everybody here, you live in the real world, where the facts and statistics mean something, his obsession with building a wall is exposed for what it is—a desperate attempt to please his base and protect his ego and to make us forget that he gave his word. He gave his word. He gave his word that Mexico was going to pay for it. Now we know that was a flatout untruth.

As stewards of American taxpayers' hard-earned money, we have a responsibility not to throw away billions of dollars in a project that is built on a foundation of fact-free fearmongering. To be clear, this is not the way we appropriate money. This is certainly not the way we fund and run the U.S. Government. If the President wants to shut down the government because he cannot muster the votes to fund his wall, as he says he does, the American people will see that he cares more about his misguided campaign promises and misstatements than he does about doing his job—the job of making the government work for the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, this is my farewell speech, and I thought it would do me well to think back to the very first speech I gave on the floor—my maiden speech.

My maiden speech was about a couple of months after my first time being sworn in. I had waited back then—this is 18 years ago. It was appropriate for freshmen Senators to wait a while, don't speak up right away. So I waited 2 or 3 months until it felt like it was the appropriate time, and I remember there was nobody out here. It was an empty Chamber. I picked a topic of the day. I think we were trying to balance the budget at the time—something that 18 years later we are still trying to do.

Then, in the course of the speech, I mentioned that it was my maiden speech. Nobody was out here except the Presiding Officer. All of a sudden, those doors swung open, and right then and there, in strides Senator Robert Byrd. I was standing at a desk over there on the other side, and Senator Byrd's seat was either here or here. So I finished my speech and he said: Will the Senator from Florida yield?

I said: Of course, I will yield.

Senator Byrd, for 30 minutes, gave an oration on the history of maiden speeches in the Senate. So you can imagine, nothing I said was memorable, but it was certainly memorable to this Senator that all of a sudden I would be treated to the corporate knowledge from one of the lions of the Senate in looking back on the history of this body.

I wanted you to know I am a Florida boy. My family came to Florida from Denmark in 1829. So many people come to Florida from the Northeast. Well, my great-great-grandfather was a sailor—a teenager on a sailing ship—and he ended up in New York in a barroom brawl. He was frightened that he was going to be arrested, so he ran to hide. He ran down to the wharf. He hid in a ship, and the ship cast off for Port St. Joe, FL, in 1829. So you see, my family came to Florida from New York also.

Five generations—on the other side of the family, I have a deed signed by Woodrow Wilson in 1917 to my grandparents after they had worked the land for the required 4 years. Under the Homestead Act, the government would deed you 160 acres of land. It is the act that pushed the frontier so much farther into the hinterlands, and we especially think of it westward, but that was also southward.

That 160 acres of land is, today, in the north end of the space shuttle runway at the Kennedy Space Center. I cannot imagine, in that 4-year period, my grandparents swatting mosquitos and fending off alligators and rattlesnakes, scratching out a living they could survive on out of the hard earth of the land. Yet that is the hardy stock from which this Senator comes.

Grace and I have been overwhelmed by the outpouring of support. I stand before you today, and I don't think anyone could have been more blessed. It is not easy when you take your leave from the people you love and the work you love, and it causes a time of intense reflection.

So I reflected back to the time in late 1985 and a series of events over the course of the next few weeks. It was a tense time in the first launch attempt of the 24th flight of the space shuttle. We went down to T-minus 8 seconds. I had braced my body for the ignition of the main engines at T-minus 6.6, and all of a sudden I heard them calling over the intercom: We stopped the count. We are recycling.

That launch was scrubbed that day. There was an indication by a sensor that a gimbal motor on the thrusters of the solid rocket boosters was malfunctioning. Had that been the case, 9 seconds later, we would not be going straight up. We would have been cartwheeled.

So we were let off for Christmas, came back into quarantine in the latter part of December, and tried the next launch attempt, only to go down to 31 seconds, and the count stopped. An alert supervisor on the consoles of the launch center had noticed the locks line was getting too cold. They checked, and a mistaken override of the computer had occurred and 18,000 pounds of liquid oxygen had been drained. Had we launched 31 seconds later, we would not have had enough fuel to get to orbit, and it would have taken the greatest ability of our commander, Navy Captain—now retired—Robert Gibson, to land a fully loaded spacecraft on a short runway at Dakar, Senegal, or Moron, Spain.

So we tried the third time. This time, the count was called off for some external reason. Each of these times, we were in the spacecraft strapped in, ready to go. At this point, I think the weather was not cooperating over in Africa and Spain. You have to have clear skies there in case you get into that transatlantic abort. So it was called off.

Well, that night, when they drained the tanks, they found that a temperature probe on the ground support equipment had flowed through the oxygen line and flowed into the vehicle and was stuck in a prevalue right next to one of the three main engines. Had we launched that morning—in this case, the third try—we would have gotten to orbit, it would have been time for the main engine cut off, and one of the three engines would not have cut off. It would have blown the rear end of the orbiter apart.

A few days later—it was a Friday—we tried for the fourth time. This time we are in the middle of a driving Florida rainstorm. We ran from the crew van to the launch tower to get into the elevator and out of the pouring rain. We were strapped in, ready to go, waiting for a hole to punch through. Now, the rainstorm had turned into a driving Florida lightning storm, and we were sitting on top of all that liquid hydrogen. They finally called off the launch the fourth try.

The fifth try was a Sunday morning. It was a beautiful day. We launched into an almost flawless 6-day mission,

only to return to Earth, and 10 days later, the *Challenger* launched and blew up high in the Florida sky, under circumstances of cold weather that almost exactly duplicated the first launch attempt back on December 19.

Intense reflection. Why was I spared? Now, upon intense reflection, I think I am beginning to see because it has been the great honor of my life to serve our country and the people of Florida—first in the Army, then in the State legislature, then in the Congress, then a State treasurer, and now, 18 years as Senator.

I have tried to serve our country admirably and with integrity because I believe a public office is a public trust. Through this journey, I have been so fortunate to have experienced so many neat corners of this country that all of us here love.

I have seen the Sun shine through the pine trees, the oaks, and the orange groves of Florida. I have hunted alligators and pythons in the Everglades. I have jogged the sands of just about every Florida beach from Pensacola to the Keys.

Of course, I strapped into a rocket, weighing 4½ million pounds, to launch to the heavens and see our planet from a way that very few others have. You have heard me talk about that as I describe our environment and how beautiful this planet is from the window of a spacecraft.

Of course, these experiences in this country—the American people, every one of us and our fellow citizens, the teachers, the soldiers, the factory workers, the moms, the dads, the students, the farmers, those are the ones who have inspired me to dedicate a life to public service. Those folks have been my strength as they are often your strength. It is the American people who have kept me going for the past 46 years of public service.

While I have experienced the highs and lows of serving in the Senate, it is often the small, unnoticed steps toward progress that have made this journey worthwhile. I am most happy with some of the work that has been done to help individuals. I want to mention just a few.

To Christine Levinson and her family, we have worked tirelessly to bring Bob Levinson home. I have come to this floor for 11 years and said that if Iran does not have Bob, they know where to find him. It is our responsibility to see that Bob—a man who served this country in the FBI for 30 years—is finally reunited with his wife and seven children and grandchildren.

In another example, it has been a pleasure to work with Rochelle Hamm, of Jacksonville, and with the families of the 33 crew members of the *El Faro* who perished at sea when their cargo ship sank while they sailed into the path of a hurricane in 2015. As a result of that terrible tragedy, we were able to enact into law key maritime safety reforms, including requiring ocean-going vessels to be outfitted with dis-

tress beacons and equipment to locate lost seafarers.

There are many ways to get things done around here. Sometimes it requires taking the bully pulpit and confronting people to correct an injustice. You will notice, as I said, that these are often little things that people don't notice.

Take the case of Bob "Peach Head" Mitchell, of Tampa, who was a part of the Negro leagues of baseball. For years, he fought to get Major League Baseball to provide compensation to former Negro leagues ballplayers, who were excluded from the majors because of their race. Yet they were some of the best players.

When Jackie Robinson integrated the majors in 1947, the rest of the majors were not integrated until 1959. All of those Negro leagues players had still been playing and had never gotten the compensation. It took 3 years of cajoling and haranguing to get the Major League Baseball Commissioner to do the right thing and give the elderly former ballplayers their due.

Sam Snow also comes to mind, who, for most of his life, had paid a terrible price for the injustice done when the Army had wrongfully convicted him and 27 other Black soldiers who had participated in a 1944 riot in Seattle that had resulted in the lynching of an Italian prisoner of war. Some decades later, when the Army had finally admitted its mistake, it had refused to give those soldiers compensation for their lost pay and for the time they had spent in prison. Once I heard about it, I kept on the Army until it paid the veterans their back pay plus interest.

We all deal in legislation. As for the business of legislation, think about some of the things that we wrote.

We in Florida wrote legislation to protect Florida's beaches, our tourism-driven economy, and our wildlife from the dangers of offshore oil drilling. We, the Democratic caucus, passed groundbreaking legislation that medically insured 22 million Americans in this country. In my State, it was over 1.7 million people. We ensured that they had healthcare and health insurance. Interestingly, because of our protecting preexisting conditions coverage, just in the State of Florida alone, 8 million people who have preexisting conditions are protected because of the law. It also eliminated the lifetime caps on coverage.

You know the fights that we have had ever since we started that day on the Finance Committee. It was after the dog days of August, when you couldn't have a townhall meeting in 2009 because of the disruptions. In September, we on the Finance Committee wrote that bill. It took every member of the Democratic caucus—60 strong then—to be able to pass it. Now millions and millions of people have health insurance who have never had it before, and untold millions more who have preexisting conditions are protected.

We wrote the blueprint that has reinvested our space program and brought new space companies and high-paying jobs to our country and to Florida. In our lifetime, we are going to see humankind set foot on other celestial bodies besides the Moon—legislation that could not have been passed without there having been a bipartisan effort.

We fought to help folks get the resources they needed to recover in the aftermath of the major hurricanes that savaged people's lives and property. We worked to make higher education more affordable by capping interest rates on student loans. We also secured billions of dollars in funding for projects all over America to preserve the environment and to help restore—and it is restoring—Florida's environmental treasure, the Everglades. The list goes on and on.

The setbacks temper the successes in that we have seen constant attempts to disenfranchise voters and to make it more difficult for all Americans to have their voices heard at the ballot box. Then, of course, the Court's 2010 decision opened the floodgates and allowed the wealthiest Americans to spend unlimited amounts of money to influence our elections and corrupt our democracy.

Also, what in the world has happened to civility and to humility in our Nation's public discourse? Where are our servant leaders who seek to serve instead of to be served?

So we still have much work to do. We need now, more than ever, to focus on building the kind of relationships here in Washington that can solve the great problems that our Nation faces. I caution our colleagues and caution those who will join this body to resist the pulls of partisan acrimony and the forces that seek to divide us. Tribalism is our problem, and if not corrected, it is going to take our country down.

I know I am just another Senator who is saying what a lot of Senators who are departing are saying. We all here remember—right over at that desk there—John McCain, in one of his last Senate addresses during which he could stand, saying the same thing.

Some of my fondest memories in the Senate have been with those who have sat on the other side of that center aisle. Because of this, I know that while Republicans and Democrats may disagree on policy, we have a lot to unify us in our values and principles that we share. My parting words are that there is no greater challenge for this Senate than to have the moral courage to choose country over party or over power, to choose justice for all instead of justice for the few, and to give others respect instead of condemnation.

Those of us who are fortunate enough to serve in this Senate are also confronted daily by a set of obligations that we have when we take on this title of U.S. Senator.

We have an obligation to the people of this Nation to do everything in our

power to uphold the country's democratic institutions and to insist that the truth guide our public discussions even if doing so comes at the cost of short-term political loss. As Senators, we have been uniquely given the responsibility to provide advice and consent to the executive branch, and we must take this charge seriously and with independence from another branch. We must uphold the rule of law. In doing so, we must affirm that no one person is above the law.

There are a great many challenges that our country faces. I call upon all of you who serve in this Senate to act with moral courage when these obligations come calling in the future.

As I depart, I am putting my trust in you. I trust you to work on behalf of the countless numbers who do not have a voice in this Chamber. I count on you to give a voice to our brothers and sisters in Puerto Rico, who are long overdue for representation. I trust you will fight to make healthcare more accessible and more cost-effective, keep rigs off of our coasts, and make higher education more affordable for everyone. I trust you will work to protect our environment from pollution and will continue the restoration of our Everglades. Above all, I trust you will act with integrity in uniting Americans for the common wheel.

For the people of America, you in this Senate must be a beacon of light at a time when it seems that darkness is increasingly gathering in our politics. You must remember that your voices and your actions will help to shape the future. You have the power to make our discourse more civil and to create change.

To our staff, both in the office and the Commerce Committee, you all are like family. You are like family to Grace and me, and I am grateful for the work you do day in and day out for the people of Florida. You are all hard-working. You are dedicated. You are loyal public servants. None of what we do around here would be possible were it not for each of you.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of all staffers who have been a part of our Senate family over these 18 years be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SEN. BILL NELSON PAST AND PRESENT
STAFF, FELLOWS & DETAILEES

Scott Aaronson, Alphonso Adams, Todd Adams, Meeran Ahn, Susie Ahn, Elizabeth Ahrens, Amy Akiyama, Stacey Albert, Sasha Albohm, Ihab Al-Dammagh, Artem Alekseev, Katherine Alexander, Amir Al-Kourainy, Kerry Allen, Jaime Allentuck, Amela Alomerovic, Sherry Alstatt, Melissa Alvarado, Digna Alvarez, Shakra Anderson.

Michael Anthony, Martine Apodaca, Barbara Arthur, Hazeen Ashby, Jill Ashton, Sheri Atkins, Rebecca Autrey, Yvonne Baker, Disha Banik, Jacquelyn Bannister, Michael Barbanera, Devon Barnhart, Jacob Barr, Matt Barranca, Jason Barrett, Michelle Barth, Peter Batty, Georges Bauer, Sean Beaudet, Anna Beecher.

DaMara Belson, Matthew Benham, Jeffery Benson, Kathleen Benway, Nicole Berckes, Lauren Berger, Owen Berger, Katherine Bergh, Hernan Betancourt, Jed Bhuta, LaWanda Billingslea, Renae Black, Danny Blum, Shawn Bone, Elizabeth Borders, Alex Borkholder, John Branscome, Lisa Brett, Jonathan Brill, Abbey Brown.

Alea Brown, Alicia Brown, Angela Brown, Celeste Brown, Ryan Brown, Ken Brummel-Smith, Kevin Brumback, Tiffany Bryant, Andrea Buck, Scott Bunce, Joy Burke, Douglas Bush, Philip Bye, Edly Calderon, Carrie Callaghan, Douglas Campbell, Lesley Campos, Christopher Caple, Catherine Carabine, Marie Carr.

Jessie Caudill, Jonathan Caverley, Kassandra Cerveney, Amanda Chadwick, Cheryl Chadwick, Richard Duane Chambers, Tom Chapman, Amanda Cherrin, Michael Chesnut, Courtney Chiles, Mary Chiles, Aurelia Chis, Myron Chivis, Taylor Christy, Courtney Christian, Randy Clarke, Sally Cluthe, Andrew Coates, Danielle Cohen, Rodrick Coleman.

Seth Collins, Julia Colvin, Mary Conklin Callow, James Connell, Peter Contostavlos, Jonathan Cooper, William Couch, Alec Coutroulis, Ana Cruz, Karen Cully, Michael Cully, Nicholas Cummings, Patricia Curran, Amin Cyntje, Roy Dalton, Paul Dampousse, Julie Dashiell, Holly Davenport, Joseph Davenport, Sherry Davich.

William Davich, Nona Dawson, Christopher Day, Edward Dean, Alison DeBose, Frank DeToma, Binita Devkota, Patrick DiBattista, Michael Dodson, Rachael Dollar, Ellen Doneski, Taylor Downs, Amy Drummond, Amanda Dugan, Martee Duhaney, Kate Dumouchel, Kirstin Dunham, Thomas Dunn, Shaun Easley, Casey Elbare.

Joel Eskovitz, Alexander Fabiszewski, Ryan Farris, Jeffrey Fatora, Monica Fernandez, Amanda Figueroa, Brandon Fisher, Stephen Fitzmaurice, Clare Flannery, John Flynn, Laura Forero, Janet Forlini, Erika Frantz, Melissa Fritsch, Mary Fritz, Scott Fuhrman, Erica Fuller, Christian Tamotsu Fjeld, Robert Gatehouse, Denton Gibson.

Celia Gisleson, David Gittess, Treon Glenn, Laura Glickman, Gregory Goddard, Ruben Goddard Jr., Laila Goharion, Adam Goldberg, Jonathan Goldman, Sara Gonzalez-Rothi, Ioana Gorecki, Jasmine Govan, Artena Greene, Ryan Grindler, Alexandra Grosswald, Jessica Gruse, Mary Guenther, Brendan Guess, Philip Guire, Bryan Gulley.

Peggy Gustave, LeAnna Gutierrez, Jessica Hafer, Daniel Hague, Kimberly Hall, Shawn Hall, Patrick Hanley, Christine Hanson, Michael Hardaway, Katherine Hardeman, Jonathan Hardy, Courtne Harris, Marcia Harris, Bryan Harrison, Caitlin Hart, Erin Hatch Neal, Nathanael Hauptkorn, Cathy Haverstock, Hilary Haycock, Alexia Heathcock.

Michael Henry, Lauren Herold, Mary Hester, Neal Higgins, Gretchen Hitchner, Andrew Holik, Tamara Holliday, Mary Tyler Holmes, Maria Honeycutt, Jason Hopkins, Aysha House, Felipe Hoyos, Robert Hubbard, Sharon Hudson-Dean, Andrea Hughes, Meghan Hunt, William Hupp, Dan Hurd, Eisele Ibarra, Jenny Jacobs.

Kalilah Jamall, Amy Jasperson, Naveed Jazayeri, Deborah Johann, William Johnston, Charlie Joughin, Madeline Joyce, Katy Kale, Erik Kamrath, Brandon Kaufman, Kelly Keefe, Matt Kelly, Ryan Kent, Christina Kilgo, Grace Kim, Oliver Kim, Elizabeth King, Jena Kingery, Sheril Kirshenbaum, Kenneth Kirtson.

Sarah Kleinman, Rachel Kline, Jesse Knapp, Harry Knight, Dolly Kobornat, Nancy Koepke, Mark Kopelman, Rhoda Krause, Pamela Krauss, Jessica Lamb, Rebecca Lange, Matt Lawrence, Willowstine Lawson,

Christopher Leacock, Carissa Lewis, Jeffrey Lewis, Julia Lee, Alexandra Lehson, Reginal Leichty, Jason Lemons.

Maria Lewis, Melissa Lewis, Andrew Lievense, Stephen Liles, Lauren Linsmayer, Kim Lipsky, Cynthia Lodge, Sue Loftin, Christopher Long, Juan Lopez, Kimberly Luckey, Robert Luke, Maureen Luna-Long, Greta Lundeborg, Anthony Lynn, Patricia Lynn, Doug MacIvor, Joshua Maddock, Peder Magee, Jillian Maggard.

Christina Mahoney, Keenan Mahoney, Corey Malmgren, Carlos Mancero, Josh Manning, Josiah Manzo, Arthur Maples, Lisa Marshall, Tom Marvit, John Maskornick, Ryan Matthews, Derek Mattioli, Connor Mautner, Leandra McComas, Ryan McCormick, Elena McCullough, Cornelius McFadden, Meredith McFadden, Carla McGarvey, Diana McGee.

Michelle McGovern, Jacqueline McGuinness, Candise McKeiver, Tyrik McKeiver, Daniel McLaughlin, Kenneth Meadows, Taleen Mekhdjavakian, Kathryn Melcher, Sydney Mengel, Jonathan Merlis, Stephanie Mickle, Deborah Miller, Helen Miller, Connie Mirrop, Anum Mirza, David Mitchell, Jack Mitchell, Pete Mitchell, Matthew Montgomery, Anne Morgan.

Patrice Morgan, Brenda-Lea Morrison, Carissa Moss, Lydia Mount, Colin Mueller, Joanelle Mulrain, Erin Strother Murray, Jonathan Murray, Courtney Mursell, Dorkina Myrick, Nadia Naviwala, Constantinos Nicolaidis, Beth Nielson, Sheila Nix, Brian No, Anna Normand, Mathew Nosanchuk, Mary O'Bannon, Clint Odom, Ryan Orgera.

Gilberto Osorio, Madeline Otto, Danny Pang, Steven Parker, Loren Parra, Kandi Parsons, Jeremy Parsons, Sydney Paul, Michael Pedersen, Brittany Penberthy, Christos Perez, Grace Pettus, Theresa Pezzeminti, Ingrid Piedrahita, Yariv Pierce, Hayley Pierre, Macline Pierre, Christian Pierre-Canel, Katherine Platt, Laura Ponto.

Karlee Popken, Sandeep Prasanna, Lizy Price, Matthew Price, Don Pride, Rachel Pryor, Samantha Purcell-Musgrave, Jean Quillo, Susan Perez Quinn, Shannon Rainey, Kaitlin Ramirez, Marcia Randolph, Matthew Rankin, Dawn Ratliff Ebony Reddick, Ilka Regino, Blair Reinerman, Timothy Rennie, Alexandra Riley, Jose Rincon.

Jessica Ritter, Samuel Ritzman, Valeria Rivadeneira, Charmaine Robinson, Kimberly Robinson, Laura Rodriguez, Maritza Rodriguez, Josie Rodriguez, Emily Rogers, Jason Rosenbaum, Anna Marie Ross, Katherine Ross, Kathleen Rubinger, Charles Runfola III, Nicholas Russell, Jessica Russo, Timothy Ryder, Benjamin Sack, Joshua Samek, Sheron Samuels.

David Sanchez, Sara Sanders, Edda Santiago, Jeff Scarpiello, Eugene Schlesinger, Grant Schnell, Michael Seely, Robert Seibert, Seth Seifman, Kelda Senior, Lea Shanley, Daniel Shapiro, Ben Sharpe, Lauren Sher, Kim Silverman, Karri Simpson, Rozann Skozen, Mara Sloan, Stacey Smith, Tiffany Smith.

Julia Snouck-Hurgronje, Christopher Snow, Nathaniel Sobel, Tristan Sola, Jennifer Solomon, Joseph Sophie, Connor Sorenson, Luis Soria, Jaime Soto, Michael Sozan, Robert Spasovski, Sue Speer, Maria Speiser, Stephen Stadium, Tim Standaert, Marin Stein, William Stein, Sean Stewart, Caroline Stonecipher, Christine Stowe.

Maria Stratienco, Brenda Strickland, Jennifer Suarez, William Sutey, Mohsin Syed, Charles Teague, Mary Templeton, Caroline Tess, Usha Tewari, Matthew Thomas, Petrina Thomas, Chris Thompson, Kareen Thompson, Kathryn Thorp, Kyle Thorp, Vanessa Thorrington, Monica Thurmond, Alexandre Tiersky, Alicia Tighe, Abigail Tinsley.

Bradley Torppey, Rebekah Torres, Joseph Towey, Wilson Trawick, David Troha, Yennie Tse, Mark Tucker, Alexander Tureman, Aprill Turner, Mayra Uribe, Maya Vaidya, Jackie Valladares, Mark Van Arnem, Jr., Mark Van Arnem, William Vaughan, Emilio Vazquez, Rupa Venkatesh, Darren Vierday, Pedro Villa, Patricia Wagner.

Carlie Waibel, Clarey Walker, Candace Walls, Dorothy Walsh, Mary Walsh, Alyssa Wang, Annie Wang, Kimberley Warden, Heather Wells, Shawn Whiteside, Laurence Wildgoose, Anthony Williams, Grant Williams, Matthew Williams, Michael Williamson, Kelsey Wilson, Desiree Wineland, Colleen Winstanley, Jennie Witherspoon, Joanne Woerner, Simone Wood, Brent Woolfork, Sue Wright, Muneera Zaineldeen.

Mr. NELSON. To my wife Grace and my children Bill and Nan Ellen, I am so grateful for the support you have provided throughout the years. The journey has been a joy.

I leave this Senate today filled with hope for the future and the fondest memories of my fellowship with great friends here, but I admit, it is hard to leave the friends and the work I love. I intend to keep fighting for all I have talked about in this short, final speech, and I intend to keep fighting for Florida.

When it comes down to it, I am just a country boy who has loved serving my State and our country for all of my life. It has been an incredible honor.

I yield the floor.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

TRIBUTE TO BILL NELSON

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, we have just heard the words of the senior Senator from my State, and I wanted to just take a moment because it reminded me of a truism that came to mind as I heard him speak and as I reflected back on our almost 8 years of service here together.

Political divisions have existed in our country since its very beginning. What has changed is, there was a time not so long ago when Americans knew each other; when Americans had political differences, but they also served on the PTA board together; when we disagreed about whom to vote for, but we coached each other's kids in Little League or we were members of the same church and worshiped together or we lived side by side as neighbors.

When all you know about someone is whom they voted for or what their political positions are, it is easy to dislike them, but when you know them as a fellow parent, as a neighbor, as your children's coach, as someone you live side by side with, then you know them as a person. It is a lot easier to dislike a political opponent than it is to dislike the whole person.

I raise that point with you because I am very proud of the relationship, the working relationship, we have had in our 8 years here together. One of the things that made that possible is that

I knew BILL NELSON as a person. If all I knew about him was that he and I did not always vote the same way on every issue—that is what most people know about us who serve here. That is one of the challenges we so often face. The men and women we represent in our representative parties and in our representative political leanings usually only know about our colleagues in the 3 minutes they may see us in a television interview, but we get to know each other as people. We get to know each other outside of politics.

I knew BILL NELSON, and I know BILL NELSON, as a person and as a man. I am an enormous admirer of his knowledge of Florida. He knows every nook and cranny of the State. He might not remember this, but we were together on a Coast Guard aircraft after one of our storms, and as we overflowed the State from above, he was pointing out and identifying down at the street level every corner of the geography of the State. I remember thinking: I have been in Florida politics for awhile. I know the State fairly well, but he knew it down to the street level. So to try to keep pace, I went back and opened up the Atlas and tried to replicate 25, 30 years of State service to try to at least be in the same neighborhood as he is in his knowledge of our State. It is incredibly impressive. It wasn't something he memorized by looking at a book. It was because he had been to all of these places at some point during his time of service to our State.

I would say that certainly in the last quarter century, there has been no greater champion not just for Florida's space industry but for the space program; not just for NASA but for all of it, for the belief that great nations do great things; that they explore the heavens. There has been no greater champion for it.

His leaving the Senate will be a tremendous loss and will require all of us to work harder to ensure that America remains a nation active and engaged in space.

Above all else, I knew him—and know him—as a good man. I emphasize the word “man” because I think oftentimes in our modern culture we have developed a warped sense of what it truly takes to be a strong and good person.

We live in an era in which we celebrate pride and arrogance, but I have learned, through the example of watching him up close, that BILL NELSON is a man with the kind of humility that our common faith tries to instill in us.

He is a man that, at a time when it is so easy to be indifferent to the suffering of others, in his service here, has been a man of compassion.

He told you just a handful of stories. There are so many more real human beings with whom he has stayed engaged in cases involving them, without cameras, without press, without bumper stickers, without documentaries, or any sort of recognition that so often people seek in the political process.

We live in a time where being crude and abrasive is celebrated as strength, while decency is oftentimes ridiculed as weakness. BILL NELSON has been an example of decency. I cannot recall a single time in our 8 years of service together in which he did anything to harm me, embarrass me, or in any way create unnecessary conflict—in fact, any conflict—on a personal level. In fact, I would say the worst thing he ever did to me was he once, in front of an audience, accused me of being a moderate.

It goes further than that. Our staffs would travel together across the State. Sometimes people would be shocked by it. They would gasp when my regional director and his regional director would share a ride to wind up at an event together, as if somehow Republicans and Democrats are supposed to be allergic to each other, when, in fact, in the end, no matter how we view our politics, we are all going to be in this Nation for the rest of our lives, so we better figure out a way to work together on the issues that will impact us all.

I will greatly miss the opportunity to continue to serve with him. I know his service to our Nation and our State is not finished. I know he will find new endeavors. I know this simply because he is not one who is going to sit back and rest and reflect. He is going to keep working. I am excited to see what God's plans are for the rest of his years. I believe there will be many more because, despite the differences in our dates of birth—I am not saying he is old; I am saying he is older than I am—he could probably still beat me—in a pullup contest or a pushup contest. This is actually not an exaggeration. It is true, which is why I have never challenged him to one. I will greatly miss working with him in the Senate, but I look forward to working with him beyond it.

I will say this, and I think this is no exaggeration. When the history of Florida politics is written, the name BILL NELSON will be among the giants of Florida's political history, for few who have ever served at any level have done more for a longer period in the service of the people of the Sunshine State than the senior Senator who, moments ago, bid his farewell to a place and a Chamber where he has done so much good for our State, for our Nation, and for the world.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise to honor our friend BILL NELSON.

As a member of the Commerce Committee, I have been able to see firsthand his leadership, and I have learned a lot from him.

I think we all heard his heartfelt remarks about what he loves. He loves his service. He loves Grace up there and his family. He loves his staff, and he loves everything about the State of Florida.

Service for him was, of course, service in the Army, service as an astronaut, service in the State government, service in Congress, and service in the U.S. Senate.

I first met BILL in Minnesota. I am not sure he remembers this, but I do because he was one of the first Senators I met other than a Minnesota Senator. He came to help my good friend Paul Wellstone. I remember what struck me immediately about him was how kind he was and how warm he was.

Part of that, of course, was the warmth he was bringing from Florida. Maybe you wouldn't think our States have a lot in common, but what you might not know is that there are entire beaches in Florida filled with Minnesotans in the winter months, perhaps even entire towns—but at this point, he had come to our State.

It was no surprise, then, when I first was elected and we got to Washington, that BILL and Grace were so welcoming to our family. They got me involved in the Prayer Breakfast, which has meant a lot to me through my years in the Senate. It has been such a comfort. I have gotten to know so many people, really, because of their encouragement.

I have gotten to know BILL's leadership firsthand, as I mentioned, on the Commerce Committee. I was talking to his staff about all of the things we did on that committee. I see Senator McCASKILL here who also served with us and Senator THUNE, the chairman.

I remember when BILL took on lead in toys. We both did that together. I remember him taking on all kinds of consumer issues, time and again—the 9-1-1 system, fraud and abuse—taking on the issues that matter to people in their daily lives. Then the bigger things—modernizing our space program, our aviation policies, responding to disasters, and climate change. I remember once he said: “I have seen the blue brilliance of the Earth from the edge of the heavens and I will fight on to save this planet.”

What I will most remember BILL by is his incredible marriage to Grace at a time when it is not easy to be in the Senate and make sure you keep your relationship strong. Grace, of course, was in leadership in her own way in the Senate's spouse club. When I was down there a few months ago, Grace told this really nice story, when we were in Jacksonville, about how my daughter had played piano at Grace's encouragement. They had the spouse event, and they smartly decided to have kids of Senators perform.

I remember it a different way. I remember the kids who were performing were, of course, their own daughter, Nan Ellen, who is a beautiful singer and sings “God Bless America” at major stadiums; I remember Trent Lott's son, who is a professional country western singer, performing; and then I remember that my husband had raised his hand and volunteered that our 13-year-old daughter would play

piano, when she is not even that good at it.

We got to the event. All of the Senators are there, and Grace is just smiling like we are about to see Liberace perform. Abigail was sitting there with her music with little Post-it notes on them. Harry Reid calls her up and says: The next to perform is Abigail Bessler. She has been playing piano since she was 6 years old. I wanted to say: But she only practices a half an hour a week.

She gets up there, pounds it out, stands up, and says: Now I am going to play a song that I made up.

I am like: No.

And she played this song, and it actually wasn't that bad.

The first one there to greet her was Grace. Grace said: That was so beautiful, Abigail. Perhaps tomorrow at the luncheon, you will just want to play the second song.

Grace was so sweet to her and to our family and to really all of the spouses and everyone she worked with.

So I think when we think of BILL, we also think of Grace. It has been my honor to work with both of them and to respect both of them. As Senator RUBIO said, we know there are many great things ahead.

Thank you, BILL. Thank you, Grace.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I rise today to thank and honor our colleague and ranking member of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Senator BILL NELSON.

As has been mentioned by some of our colleagues, BILL NELSON has served the people of Florida and our Nation with distinction in a career spanning more than four decades.

I have been honored to have BILL NELSON as a colleague from my first day in the Senate and for the last 4 years as a partner in an especially successful working relationship on the Commerce Committee. Over this time, we fostered a can-do spirit with committee colleagues and drove nearly 100 committee legislative accomplishments. Together, we worked on policy for our Nation's future in technology, aviation, ocean management, surface transportation, scientific research, space, and many other areas.

Senator NELSON exhibited an especially extraordinary passion for prioritizing safety, the future of manned spaceflight, and an unshakeable belief that powerful companies should be held to account when consumers aren't treated fairly.

Certainly in the instances when we used the authorities of our committee to demand answers about cyber security failures, troubling privacy violations, and the scourge of illegal robocalling, I always knew that Senator NELSON had my back. We are both passionate about serving the people of our respective States.

I won't soon forget my visit with BILL to the Everglades, where he—

clearly in his element—introduced me to some alligators and some unwellcome python squatters, which nonetheless love Florida too. I still have a photo holding on to one of those big snakes. It makes our rattlesnakes in South Dakota look small by comparison.

Certainly in the instances when we used the authorities of our committee to demand answers about all of these other important issues, we worked closely together.

I was pleased to not only join him in Florida but also to welcome him to South Dakota to see some of the issues that are important in our State. On a very, very cold October day, I had the privilege of showing Senator NELSON Mount Rushmore. I remember that as we walked up there, the wind was blowing—as it typically does in South Dakota—about 30 or 40 miles an hour, and the wind chills were very, very cold. I know that as someone who spends a lot of his time in the great State of Florida, where many of my constituents, like those of Senator KLOBUCHAR's, spend their winters, it probably felt especially cold to him. But we had a chance to go underground and look at some of the tunnels of the old Homestake gold mine that are now host to the National Science Foundation's Deep Underground Science and Engineering Laboratory. I remember thinking at the time that Senator NELSON is the only Senator in Senate office who has been in space, so he has been thousands and thousands of miles in space, and now he has been 5,000 feet underground, too, and there aren't many people who can say that.

BILL's work in the Senate and on the Commerce Committee has left a legacy. I also want to acknowledge his outstanding staff team who have supported his efforts. He mentioned them. My staff had the opportunity to work closely with his staff, and they are the very best and true professionals in every sense of the word. I am grateful for the work we have been able to do together.

As your colleague from Florida, Senator RUBIO, pointed out, as you not only leave this place but continue your life in Florida, you will continue to impact that State in the profound way you have so much in the past.

I just want to wish Senator NELSON and his wife Grace all the best as they head to more long, sunny days in their beloved home State of Florida.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today to recognize my distinguished colleague and friend, Senator BILL NELSON. He has represented the people of Florida in the U.S. Senate for 18 years now.

Today it may seem that there is very little that unites people of different parties in this Congress. It may seem a strange notion to say good things about your political rivals and opponents. But this is America. I think the

day will never come where men and women of honest hearts and good faith cannot come together and find common goals worth fighting for together.

BILL and I have served together on the Senate Armed Services Committee and on the Senate Commerce Committee, but the principal area where BILL and I have had the privilege of working closely together concerns space. BILL and I have worked hand in hand promoting and protecting America's program of space exploration and supporting the critical institutions in the State of Texas, the State of Florida, and throughout the country that have made our country a world leader in space. It has been a truly bipartisan partnership. Both BILL and I believe that America is and should be going forward the leader in space, that we have a responsibility, and that there are great and glorious things to accomplish for mankind through space exploration. In this time of bitter, partisan division, of nasty personal rivalries, we have been able to see truly bipartisan cooperation.

We worked together hand in hand on the 2015 commercial space bill, passed into law and signed into law by President Obama. We worked hand in hand on the NASA Authorization Act of 2017. We worked hand in hand and passed that into law, signed into law by President Trump. There are very few major, substantive areas that have major legislation, one signed by Obama and one signed by Trump. I think that is a reflection of the bipartisan cooperation we have seen.

We worked hand in hand on the Space Frontier Act, and we are working together to extend the operation of the International Space Station to 2030. That accomplishment, that cooperation is good for America, and it is good for our leadership in space.

I have to say that I am still jealous that, unlike Senator NELSON, I haven't been on an actual trip to space for a hands-on experience, but I suppose anything can happen.

BILL, I promise you, our work will continue. America's leadership in space will continue. We will persevere and constantly show those who say it can't be done that there is still the will to drive, to explore, to create, to learn, and to search the unknown for answers.

BILL, you are right—I believe that in our lifetime, a human being will step foot on the surface of Mars and that the first boot that lands on the red planet will be the American boot of an American astronaut planting the flag of the United States of America.

There is still a will in our Nation to tame the stars and behold the wonders of creation even closer. I will say that spirit of exploration also inspires generations of little boys and little girls who look to the skies and wonder, what if? We cannot limit our gaze on the Earth below us; it isn't in our nature.

I will say finally, in addition to his commitment to space leadership—and I would note that in addition to BILL's

bipartisan cooperation, his team worked hand in hand with my team, both committed to passing meaningful, important legislation, to finding compromises that would make it not just through the Senate but through the House and be signed into law, and the members of his staff were skilled and dedicated partners in producing those results.

But I will tell you, beyond that, on a very personal level, BILL is a good man. Just a moment ago, when I congratulated him on his farewell speech, he chuckled and said: I may be one of the only people who have taken you to dinner. And you know, that is right.

I remember back in 2013—my first year in this body—it was a tumultuous time. We were in the midst of battles where more than a few bare-knuckle punches were being thrown all around. Right in the midst of that, BILL said: Ted, why don't you come out and have dinner with Grace and me. The two of them took me to dinner, and we had a delightful, relaxing, engaging dinner. We didn't debate big policy; we simply talked as three human beings privileged to have the chance to serve our country. It was a gesture of friendship.

We all know that Harry Truman famously said: If you want a friend in politics, buy a dog. That has not been the approach BILL NELSON has taken to politics. He extended a hand of friendship, and that blossomed into cooperation, and it blossomed into accomplishments together for the United States and for the States of Florida and Texas.

BILL, it has been a privilege to work with you, and I look forward to continuing to work with you in the years ahead in your next chapter. It is an honor to serve with you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES IN THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I move to proceed to S.J. Res. 54.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 261 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Harris	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hassan	Paul
Booker	Heinrich	Peters
Brown	Heitkamp	Reed
Cantwell	Hirono	Risch
Cardin	Jones	Sanders
Carper	Kaine	Schatz
Casey	King	Schumer
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Lee	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tester
Crapo	Markey	Udall
Daines	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Moran	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden
Flake	Murphy	Young

NAYS—39

Alexander	Gardner	McConnell
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Hoeben	Rubio
Corker	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott
Cotton	Isakson	Shelby
Cruz	Johnson	Sullivan
Enzi	Kennedy	Thune
Ernst	Kyl	Toomey
Fischer	Lankford	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Tillis

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) to direct the removal of the United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I believe there are problems with the law governing the consideration of these types of resolutions. One of biggest is the consideration of amendments. I have a series of parliamentary inquiries that I think will help clarify the problems with the statute.

Parliamentary inquiry: Does this statute provide any guidelines for the consideration of amendments on this resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, it does not. The statute does not set forth the text to be used in the joint resolution, and this statute uses the expedited procedures from the Arms Export Control Act, a statute which does not allow amendments, so there are no parameters for the consideration of amendments built into the language.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I believe that most times the Senate uses expedited procedures, we have either a germaneness requirement for amendments or they cannot be amended. Can the Chair expound on what some of those are and what that concept means in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Generally speaking, when the Senate considers a measure under statutory expedited procedures, like the Budget Act, the Congressional Review Act, the Trade Act, or the Arms Control Act—or

even under the Cloture Rule—there are guardrails for the consideration of the measure and for amendments thereto. There are statutes and rules with prescribed text, limits on debate time, jurisdictional fences, filing deadlines, and germaneness requirements or a complete prohibition on amendments. Often, there are points of order and waivers written into the structure as well. The Senate trades its normal procedure of unfettered debate and amendment and the need for 60 votes to end debate and consideration for a more predictable, structured, and streamlined process of consideration and a majority threshold vote.

Mr. McCONNELL. In the opinion of the Chair, is a statute with no end point for consideration and no restrictions on text or amendments consistent with the other expedited procedures which the Senate often uses?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The construct is inconsistent with the concepts embodied in other expedited processes—even those that are themselves flawed—and the opportunity for abuse of this process is limitless.

Mr. McCONNELL. I agree with the Chair, and I think the Senate should speak to this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I think it is important when using expedited procedures, especially on matters of national security such as this, the Senate limit consideration to the matter at hand. Therefore, I raise a point of order that amendments offered under 50 U.S.C. 1546(a) must be germane to the underlying joint resolution to which they are offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The laws governing the consideration of this type of resolution do not prescribe what type of amendments can be considered. The Senate has not previously considered this question; therefore, the Chair submits the question to the Senate for its decision. Shall amendments offered under 50 U.S.C. 1546(a) be germane to the underlying joint resolution to which they are offered?

The question is debatable for 1 hour.

Mr. CORKER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I just wanted clarification. Was it section 1546 or 1446?

You are right. OK.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time is yielded.

The question is, Shall amendments offered under 50 U.S.C. 1546(a) be germane to the underlying joint resolution to which they are offered?

Mr. McCONNELL. 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. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 262 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Gardner	Murphy
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Barrasso	Graham	Nelson
Bennet	Grassley	Perdue
Blumenthal	Harris	Peters
Blunt	Hassan	Portman
Booker	Hatch	Reed
Boozman	Heinrich	Risch
Brown	Heitkamp	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Cantwell	Hirono	Rubio
Capito	Hoeven	Sanders
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Carper	Inhofe	Schatz
Casey	Isakson	Schumer
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott
Collins	Jones	Shaheen
Coons	Kaine	Shelby
Corker	Kennedy	Smith
Cornyn	King	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cotton	Kyl	Tester
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Leahy	Toomey
Donnelly	Manchin	Udall
Duckworth	Markey	Van Hollen
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Warren
Ernst	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Wyden
Flake	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—3

Cruz

Lee

Paul

NOT VOTING—1

Tillis

The point of order is taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to use an oversized floor display.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

YEMEN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about one of the great humanitarian crises facing our planet, and that is the horrific war in Yemen.

In March of 2015, under the leadership of Muhammad bin Salman, who was then the Saudi Defense Minister and is now, of course, the Crown Prince, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates intervened in Yemen's ongoing civil war. As a result of the Saudi-UAE intervention, Yemen is now experiencing the worst humanitarian disaster in the world.

According to the United Nations, Yemen is at risk of the most severe famine in more than 100 years, with some 14 million people facing starvation. In one of the poorest countries on Earth, as a result of this terrible war, according to the Save the Children organization, some 85,000 Yemeni children have already starved to death over the last several years, and millions more face starvation if the war continues.

Further, Yemen is currently experiencing the worst cholera outbreak in

the world, with there being as many as 10,000 new cases each week, according to the World Health Organization. This is a disease that is 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 because people there are no longer able to access clean water.

Last week, New York Times columnist Nicholas Kristof wrote an article, which I urge all Members to read, that describes his recent visit to Yemen.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the New York Times article, "Your Tax Dollars Help Starve Children."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 7, 2018]

OPINION—YOUR TAX DOLLARS HELP STARVE CHILDREN

(By Nicholas Kristof)

ADEN, Yemen.—He is an 8-year-old boy who is starving and has limbs like sticks, but Yaqoob Walid doesn't cry or complain. He gazes stolidly ahead, tuning out everything, for in late stages of starvation the human body focuses every calorie simply on keeping the organs functioning.

Yaqoob arrived unconscious at Al Sadaqa Hospital here, weighing just over 30 pounds. He has suffered complications, and doctors say that it is unclear he will survive and that if he does he may suffer permanent brain damage.

Some 85,000 children may have already died here in Yemen, and 12 million more people may be on the brink of starvation, casualties in part of the three-year-old American-backed Saudi war in Yemen. United Nations officials and aid experts warn that this could become the worst famine the world has seen in a generation.

"The risk of a major catastrophe is very high," Mark Lowcock, the United Nations humanitarian chief, told me. "In the worst case, what we have in Yemen now has the potential to be worse than anything any professional in this field has seen during their working lives."

Both the Obama and Trump administrations have supported the Saudi war in Yemen with a military partnership, arms sales, intelligence sharing and until recently air-to-air refueling. The United States is thus complicit in what some human rights experts believe are war crimes.

The bottom line: Our tax dollars are going to starve children.

I fell in love with Yemen's beauty and friendliness on my first visit, in 2002, but this enchanting country is now in convulsions. When people hear an airplane today in much of Yemen, they flinch and wonder if they are about to be bombed, and I had interviews interrupted by automatic weapons fire overhead.

After witnessing the human toll and interviewing officials on both sides, including the president of the Houthi rebels who control much of Yemen, I find the American and Saudi role in this conflict to be unconscionable. The Houthis are repressive and untrustworthy, but this is not a reason to bomb and starve Yemeni children.

What is most infuriating is that the hunger is caused not by drought or extreme weather, but by cynical and failed policies in Riyadh and Washington. The starvation does

not seem to be an accidental byproduct of war, but rather a weapon in it. Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, backed by the United States, are trying to inflict pain to gain leverage over and destabilize the Houthi rebels. The reason: The Houthis are allied with Iran.

The governments of Saudi Arabia and the United States don't want you to see pictures like Yaqoob's or reflect on the suffering in Yemen. The Saudis impose a partial blockade on Houthi areas, banning commercial flights and barring journalists from special United Nations planes there. I've been trying for more than two years to get through the Saudi blockade, and I finally was able to by tagging onto Lowcock's United Nations delegation.

After a major famine, there is always soul-searching about how the world could have allowed this to happen. What's needed this time is not soul-searching a few years from now, but action today to end the war and prevent a cataclysm.

The problem in Yemen is not so much a shortage of food as it is an economic collapse—GDP has fallen in half since the war started—that has left people unable to afford food.

Yaqoob was especially vulnerable. He is the second of eight children in a poor household with a father who has mental health problems and can't work steadily. Moreover, the father, like many Yemenis, chews qat—a narcotic leaf that is very widely used in Yemen and offers an easy high. This consumes about \$1 a day, reducing the budget available for food. The family sold some land to pay for Yaqoob's care, so its situation is now even more precarious.

A few rooms down from Yaqoob was Fawaz Abdullah, 18 months old, his skin mottled and discolored with sores. Fawaz is so malnourished that he has never been able to walk or say more than "Ma" or "Ba."

Fawaz's mother, Ruqaya Saleh, explained that life fell apart after her home in the port city of Hudaydah was destroyed by a bomb (probably an American one, as many are). Her family fled to Aden, and her husband is struggling to find occasional work as a day laborer.

"I used to be able to buy whatever I wanted, including meat and fish," she told me. Since fleeing, she said, war-induced poverty has meant that she hasn't been able to buy a single fish or egg—and that is why Fawaz suffers severe protein deficiency.

"They asked me to buy milk for Fawaz, but we can't afford it now," she said.

We think of war casualties as men with their legs blown off. But in Yemen the most common war casualties are children like Fawaz who suffer malnutrition.

Some will die. Even the survivors may suffer lifelong brain damage. A majority of Yemen children are now believed to be physically stunted from malnutrition (46 percent were stunted even before the war), and physical stunting is frequently accompanied by diminished brain development.

"These children are the future of Yemen," Dr. Aida Hussein, a nutrition specialist, told me, looking at Fawaz. "He will be stunted. How will he do in school?"

The war and lack of health care facilities have also led to outbreaks of deadly diseases like diphtheria and cholera. Half of the country's clinics and hospitals are closed.

In the capital, Sana, I met a child who was suffering both malnutrition and cholera. The boy was Saddam Hussein (he was named for the Iraqi leader), eight years old, and the parents repeat the mantra I hear from everyone: Life is much worse now because of the war.

"We don't know what we will eat tomorrow," Saddam's mother told me.

Yemen began to disintegrate in the aftermath of the Arab Spring, and then the Houthis, a traditional clan in the north, swept down on Sana and seized much of the country. The Houthis follow Zaydi Islam, which is related to the Shiite branch dominant in Iran, and the Saudis and some Americans see them as Iranian stooges.

In some ways, the Houthis have been successful. They have imposed order and crushed Al Qaeda and the Islamic State in the parts of Yemen they control, and in Sana I felt secure and didn't fear kidnapping.

However, the Houthis operate a police state and are hostile to uncovered women, gays and anyone bold enough to criticize them. They recruit child soldiers from the age of about 12 (the Saudi- and American-backed forces wait until boys are about 15), interfere with food aid, and have engaged in torture and attacks on civilians.

Still, the civilian loss of life has overwhelmingly been caused not by the Houthis but by Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and America, through both bombings and starvation. It's ridiculous for the Trump administration to be exploring naming the Houthis a terrorist organization. And while the Houthis are allies of Iran, I think the Saudis exaggerate when they suggest that the Houthis are Iranian pawns.

The foreign minister on the Houthi side is Hisham Sharaf Abdalla, a congenial American-educated official.

"I love the U.S.," Mr. Sharaf told me. "We look to the U.S. as the only force that can stop this war."

Peace talks are now beginning in Sweden—few people expect them to solve the crisis soon—and he insisted that his side was eager to reach a peace deal and improve relations with America.

After our conversation, he brought me over to his desk and showed me his assault rifle and two handguns. "When I was in the U.S., I was a member of the N.R.A.," he told me. "I would like to have an N.R.A. chapter in Yemen."

Mr. Sharaf talks a good game but is not himself a Houthi, just an ally, so I wondered if he was a figurehead trotted out to impress foreigners. Later I interviewed a man whose power is unquestioned: Muhammad Ali al-Houthi, the president of the Supreme Revolutionary Committee. As his name signifies, he is a member of the Houthi clan.

An aide picked me up and ferried me to him, for President Houthi changes locations daily to avoid being bombed by the Saudis.

President Houthi, a large, confident man with a traditional dagger at his belly, was friendly to me but also suspicious of the United States and full of conspiracy theories. He suggested that Washington was secretly arming Al Qaeda and that the United States was calling the shots for Saudi Arabia in Yemen, at the behest of Israel.

Still, he said that he wanted peace and that although the Houthis have fired missiles at Saudi Arabia, his side would pose no threat to Saudi Arabia if the Saudis would only end their assault on Yemen.

"There's no need for enmity with the United States," he told me in Arabic, and that seemed a message he wanted me to convey to Washington and the American people.

I asked President Houthi about the *sarkha*, the group's slogan: "God is great! Death to America! Death to Israel! Curses on the Jews! Victory to Islam!" That didn't seem so friendly, I said.

"It's nothing against the American people," he replied. "It's directed toward the system."

When I asked about Saudi and American suggestions that the Houthis are Iranian pawns, he laughed.

"That's just propaganda," he said. "I ask you: Have you ever seen one Iranian in

Yemen? Do we speak Farsi?" This was all a trick, he said, analogous to the allegations of weapons of mass destruction used to justify war with Iraq.

While the Houthis are called "rebels," they clearly rule their territory. In contrast, the Saudi- and American-backed "internationally recognized government" of Yemen is a shell that controls almost no territory—hence it is based in Riyadh. The "president" of this exile government, Abdu Rabbu Mansour Hadi, is said to be gravely ill, and when he is gone it will be even more difficult to sustain the fiction that this is a real government.

More broadly, I don't see any hint of a Saudi or American strategy. There's little sign that bombing and starvation will actually dislodge the Houthis, while the Saudi military action and resulting chaos has benefited the Yemeni branches of Al Qaeda and the Islamic State. In that sense, America's conduct in Yemen has hurt our own national security.

In one sign of the ineffectiveness of the Western-backed government, the hunger is now as severe in its areas as in the rebel-held north. I saw worse starvation in Aden, the lovely seaside city in the south that is nominally run by the internationally recognized government, than in Houthi-controlled Sana.

And while I felt reasonably secure in Houthi-controlled areas, I was perpetually nervous in Aden. Abductions and murders occur regularly there, and my guesthouse offered not a mint on the pillow, but a bullet-proof vest; at night, sleep was interrupted by nearby fighting among unknown gunmen.

What limited order exists in Aden is provided by soldiers from the United Arab Emirates and allied militias, and I worry that the U.A.E. is getting fed up with the war and may pull them out without alternative arrangements for security. If that happens, Aden may soon plunge into Somalia-like chaos.

Mohamed Zemam, the governor of the central bank, believes that there are ways to shore up the economy and prevent starvation. But he cautions that the risk of another Somalia is real, and he estimates that there may be two million Yemenis in one fighting force or another.

"What they have is the way of the gun," he said. "If we don't solve that, we will have problems for 100 years."

Another danger is that the Saudi coalition will press ahead so that fighting closes the port of Hudaydah, through which most food and fuel come.

I stopped in Saudi Arabia to speak to senior officials there about Yemen, and we had some tough exchanges. I showed them photos on my phone of starving children, and they said that this was unfortunate and undesired. "We are not devils," one said indignantly. They insisted that they would welcome peace—but that they must confront the Houthis.

"The most important thing for us is national security," the Saudi ambassador to Yemen, Mohammed Al-Jabir, told me. Dr. Abdullah Al Rabeeah, an adviser to the royal court and director of a fund that provides aid to Yemen, told me that Saudis don't want to see hunger in Yemen but added: "We will continue to do what it takes to fight terrorism. It's not an easy decision."

Saudi and U.A.E. officials note that they provide an enormous amount of humanitarian aid to Yemen. This is true, and it mitigates the suffering there. But it's difficult to give the Saudis much credit for relieving the suffering of a country that they are bombing and starving.

To avert a catastrophe in Yemen, the world needs to provide more humanitarian aid. But above all, the war has to end.

"You're not going to solve this long-term until the war is ended," said David Beasley, the executive director of the World Food Program. "It's a man-made problem, and it needs a man-made solution."

That solution will entail strong American backing for a difficult United Nations-backed peace process involving Yemeni factions and outsiders, aiming for a measure of power sharing. This diplomatic process requires engaging the Houthis, not just bombing them. It also means a cease-fire and pressure on all sides to ensure humanitarian access and the passage of food and fuel. The best leverage America has to make the Saudis part of the solution is to suspend arms sales to Riyadh so long as the Saudis continue the war.

In conference rooms in Riyadh and Washington, officials simply don't fathom the human toll of their policies.

In a makeshift camp for displaced people in Aden, I met a couple who lost two daughters—Bayan, 11, and Bonyan, 8—in a bombing in a crowded market.

"I heard the bomb and I went running after them," the dad, Ahmed Abdullah, told me with an ache in his voice. "They were dead. One had her skull burst open, and the other had no arms or legs left."

He told me that the family then fled, and he married off a 15-year-old daughter so that someone else would be responsible for feeding her. This is common: The share of girls married by age 18 has increased from 50 percent before the war to two-thirds today, according to Unicef.

Another son died of fever when the family could not afford to take the boy to a hospital. There are several other children, and none of them are going to school any more; a 10-year-old daughter, Baraa, who is next in line to be married, couldn't tell me what seven plus eight equals.

A bit hesitantly, I told Ahmed that I thought that my country, America, had probably provided the bomb that had killed his daughters. He was not angry, just resigned.

"I am not an educated person," he told me earnestly. "I am a simple parent." And then he offered more wisdom than I heard from the sophisticated policy architects in America and Saudi Arabia: "My message is that I want the war to stop."

Mr. SANDERS. Let me just take this opportunity to quote some of what he said in that December 7 New York Times article:

Some 85,000 children may have already died here in Yemen, and 12 million more people may be on the brink of starvation, casualties in part of the three-year-old American-backed Saudi war in Yemen. United Nations officials and aid experts warn that this could become the worst famine the world has seen in a generation.

"The risk of a major catastrophe is very high," Mark Lowcock, the United Nations humanitarian chief, told me. "In the worst case, what we have in Yemen now has the potential to be worse than anything any professional in this field has seen during their working lives."

Nicholas Kristof continues:

What is most infuriating is that the hunger is caused not by drought or extreme weather, but by cynical and failed policies in Riyadh and Washington. The starvation does not seem to be an accidental byproduct of war, but rather a weapon in it. Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, backed by the United States, are trying to inflict pain to gain leverage over and destabilize the Houthi

rebels. The reason: The Houthis are allied with Iran.

He continues:

The problem in Yemen is not so much a shortage of food as it is an economic collapse—GDP has fallen in half since the war started—that has left people unable to afford food.

Kristof continues, and I want you to hear this:

We think of war casualties as men with their legs blown off. But in Yemen the most common war casualties are children like Fawaz who suffer malnutrition.

He continues:

Some will die. Even the survivors may suffer lifelong brain damage. A majority of Yemen children are now believed to be physically stunted from malnutrition.

Let me repeat that:

A majority of Yemen children are now believed to be physically stunted from malnutrition (46 percent were stunted even before the war), and physical stunting is frequently accompanied by diminished brain development.

"These children are the future of Yemen," Dr. Aida Hussein, a nutrition specialist, told me, looking at Fawaz. "He will be stunted. How will he do in school?"

The war and lack of health care facilities have also led to outbreaks of deadly diseases like diphtheria and cholera. Half of the country's clinics and hospitals are closed.

That was written by Nick Kristof of the New York Times.

The fact of the matter is that the United States, with very little media attention, has been Saudi Arabia's partner in this horrific war. We have been providing the bombs the Saudi-led coalition has been using, refueling their planes before they drop those bombs, and 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 others. A CNN report found evidence that American weapons have been used in a string of such deadly attacks on civilians since the war began.

According to the independent monitoring group, Yemen Data Project, between 2015 and March 2018, more than 30 percent of the Saudi-led coalition's targets have been nonmilitary.

A few weeks ago, I met with several brave human rights activists from Yemen in my office. They had come to urge Congress to put a stop to this war. They told me, clearly, when Yemenis see "Made in USA" on the bombs that are killing them, it tells them the USA is responsible for this war, and that is the sad truth.

The bottom line is, the United States should not be supporting a catastrophic war led by a despotic regime with a dangerous and irresponsible military policy.

Some have suggested that Congress moving to withdraw support from this war would undermine U.N. efforts to reach a peace agreement, but I would argue that the exact opposite is true. It

is the promise of unconditional U.S. support for the Saudis that have undermined the efforts toward peace. We have evidence for this.

Just yesterday, we received news that U.N. Special Envoy Martin Griffiths made a breakthrough agreement for the exchange in that war of some 15,000 prisoners—a significant development. This is an important step in building the necessary trust for a broader peace agreement.

A piece published today in TRT World observes: "[T]here seems to be a firmer willingness to reach an agreement than in previous talks, as the Yemeni government realises that the international pressure on its backer, Saudi Arabia, is growing."

So our effort to move this resolution forward may have already made a positive impact. I thank all of my 18 cosponsors and all of the many civil society organizations—progressive and conservative—who have worked so hard to raise awareness of this horrific conflict.

Above and beyond the humanitarian crisis, this war has been a disaster for our national security and for 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 Houthis is of serious concern for me, and I believe for all of us, but the fact is, the relationship between Iran and the Houthis has only been strengthened with the intensification of the war. This war is creating the very problem the Trump administration claims it wants to solve.

Further, the war is also undermining the broader effort against violent extremists. A 2016 State Department report found the conflict has helped al-Qaida and ISIS "deepen their inroads across much of the country." This war, as I see it, is both a humanitarian and a strategic disaster.

Further—and I think it is important to state what everybody knows, although we don't talk about it terribly often—Saudi Arabia is a despotic regime, controlled by one family, the Saud family, one of the wealthiest and most powerful families on Earth.

In a 2017 report by the Cato Institute—a conservative think tank—Saudi Arabia was ranked 149th out of 159 countries for freedom and human rights. 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 not treated as second-class citizens; they are treated as third-class citizens. Women still need, in the year 2018, 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.

Earlier this year, Saudi activist, Loujain al-Hathloul, a leader in the fight for women's rights in Saudi Arabia, was kidnapped from Abu Dhabi and

forced to return to the country. She is currently being held without charges. The same is true of many other Saudi political activists.

Human Rights Watch recently reported that imprisoned women activists have been subjected to torture, including electric shocks, and other forms of physical and sexual assault.

Further, as every Member of the Senate knows or should know, there is now overwhelming evidence that Saudi Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman was responsible for the brutal murder of Jamal Khashoggi, a Saudi dissident who lived in the United States. He was a columnist for the Washington Post. He made the mistake of going into the Saudi consulate in Turkey and never came out alive. We believe his body was dismembered, and nobody knows where it is.

Unbelievably, President Trump continues—despite the overwhelming evidence of the Crown Prince's involvement in the murder of a man living in the United States, a Saudi dissident journalist—to proclaim his love and affection for the Crown Prince and the Saudi regime, but that is not how, in my view, the American people feel.

For too many years, American men and women in our military have put their lives on the line in the never-ending struggle for democracy and human rights, and we cannot and must not turn their struggles, their sacrifices aside in order to follow the military adventurism of a despotic regime. That is not what this country is supposed to be about.

Finally, an issue that has long been a concern to many of us—conservatives and progressives—is that this war has not been authorized by Congress and is therefore unconstitutional. Article I of the Constitution clearly states it is Congress, not the President, that has the power to send our men and women into war—Congress, not the President.

The Framers of our Constitution, the Founders of this country, gave the power to declare war to Congress—the branch most accountable to the people—not to the President, who is often isolated from the reality of what is taking place in our communities.

The truth is—and Democratic and Republican Presidents are responsible, and Democratic and Republican Congresses are responsible—that for many years, Congress has not exercised its constitutional responsibility over whether our young men and women go off to war.

I think there is growing sentiment all over this country from Republicans, from Democrats, from Independents, from progressives, and from conservatives that right now, Congress cannot continue to abdicate its constitutional responsibility.

I believe we have become far too comfortable with the United States engaging in military interventions all over the world. We have now been in Afghanistan for over 17 years—the longest war in American history. Our

troops are now in Syria under what I believe are questionable authorities. The time is long overdue for Congress to reassert its constitutional role in determining when and where our country goes to war.

If you want to vote for a war, vote for a war. If you want to vote against a war, vote against a war, but we as a Congress have to accept our constitutional responsibility; that it is ours, not the Presidents of the United States.

This resolution provides that opportunity. It finally says that in this one war in Yemen—this terrible, horrific war—that Congress is prepared to act, and I hope very much that all of us will seize this opportunity.

For the sake of starving children in Yemen; for the sake of what this country stands for in terms of democracy and human rights and not following the leadership of a despotic, authoritarian regime; for the sake of the U.S. Constitution and the fact that it is Congress and not the President who has the authority to make war; for all of these reasons and more, I ask strong support for this important resolution.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator for most of the comments he made. I think they were made very eloquently. I share many of the same concerns the Senator has.

I voted to cause this to come out of committee because I felt this discussion on the Senate floor needed to take place.

The Senator from Vermont knows I have concerns about using this vehicle to do it, but by causing this debate to take place, many of the concerns the Senator has expressed will be expressed by others, and I agree with many of those.

Saudi Arabia has not conducted this war in a manner, in my opinion, that takes into account the great harm that is taking place with civilians. I agree with that 100 percent.

I am more than nonplussed over the fact that I believe—and I have sat in a very detailed—very detailed—intelligence review of what happened with the journalist at the consulate in Turkey, and I absolutely believe that if the Crown Prince came before a jury in the United States of America, he would be convicted guilty in under 30 minutes. I absolutely believe he directed it; I believe he monitored it; and I believe he is responsible for it.

I have had concerns about using this vehicle, and I have concerns about what this may mean as we set a precedent about refueling and intelligence activities being considered hostilities. I am concerned about that.

I think the Senator knows we have operations throughout Northern Africa, where we are working with other governments on intelligence to counter terrorism. We are doing refueling activities in Northern Africa now, and it

concerns me—he knows I have concerns—that if we use this vehicle, then we may have 30 or 40 instances where this vehicle might be used to do something that really should not be dealt with by the War Powers Act.

I will say, the strong passage of the germaneness issue we just dispensed with helps. It helps a great deal. So now, in the future, if this particular vehicle is utilized, we now know we have set the precedent that only germane issues can be brought up.

I did have concerns—and we have now solved those—that other issues might be brought up and all of a sudden, the leaders would lose control of the floor. I would like to see Members have more votes. I agree with that. But I think we have now narrowed this in a very appropriate way.

The Senator and I have discussed a resolution that is separate and apart from this. I have agreed with Senators on the other side of the aisle that I will not introduce that resolution until this issue has been dispensed with. I do hope we will have a unanimous vote on it to strongly condemn the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia for the actions he has taken relative to killing the journalist—who was a resident of the United States and has children living here—in the consulate in Turkey. That is a separate issue that I hope we will take up almost immediately after we dispense with this.

I want to thank the Senator for his concern. I share many of those concerns. We have some legal concerns right now about using this vehicle, and the Senator knows that. I am concerned about where this goes down the road. We will have some amendments we will deal with over the next day or so that may clear that up to a degree.

I just want to say to him that even though we have legal concerns about this particular process, I thank him for his concern for the citizens there, for his admonishment, for his demarching of a Crown Prince in Saudi Arabia who I believe is out of control, doing things on top of killing journalists—blockading Qatar without even thinking, arresting a Prime Minister in Lebanon—things that no one would think would be appropriate for international norms.

I know we will have other speakers coming to the floor. We may disagree on process, but many of the issues the Senator has brought up today I agree with wholeheartedly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss S.J. Res. 54, a pointed statement from the U.S. Senate that the status quo in Yemen is not tenable, that we will not stand idly by as the President lends our country's name to the calamitous military forays of another nation, and that our security partners across the world do not have a blank check.

To my knowledge, this is the first time the Senate has considered a joint

resolution under this provision, which is directly derived from the Wars Powers Resolution. This is an important step to reasserting Congress's role in authorizing the use of force. I was proud to see a strong show of support for the procedural vote to move this resolution forward, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle continue to embrace that moral fortitude.

I am also pleased to support Senator YOUNG's amendment to this resolution, which I understand Senator SANDERS also supports. This language would clarify that refueling operations definitively constitute U.S. support for hostilities in this context, and I know he has been very focused on this issue of Yemen and a critical voice in the Senate on this crisis.

Some may have been holding out hope that the administration would show a good-faith effort to hold the Saudi coalition accountable for its actions in Yemen or to hold the Saudi Government and the Crown Prince accountable for all of their actions. Well, we haven't seen that leadership. On the contrary, I believe that, in spite of concrete evidence, the Trump administration is intent on doing nothing to hold the Saudi Government or the Crown Prince responsible for their actions.

As we debate a path forward to address the tragic humanitarian crisis in Yemen and to hold the Saudi coalition and the Houthi combatants accountable for their actions, children in Yemen continue to starve, people continue to die, and more reports about gruesome torture of detainees continue to emerge. Sadly, we don't actually know the extent of the devastation. Some humanitarian organizations on the ground estimate that as many as 50,000 people have died, with more than 14 million on the brink of starvation. Save the Children recently posited that as many as 130 children are dying each and every day.

We may not know the exact numbers, but we know enough to know that the conflict in Yemen has produced the world's worst humanitarian crisis. The Saudi coalition must take responsibility for its actions, and, likewise, the Houthis and their Iranian backers also bear the burden of this tragedy.

The United States can take concerted and strategic diplomatic steps to ensure that our involvement—any involvement—promotes a net positive outcome for regional stability, for our own security interests, and for the Yemeni people. We can invest in the U.N.-led talks in Sweden. We can wholeheartedly promote diplomacy as a path forward to solve this conflict, which our own defense and diplomatic leaders concede has no military solution.

But let's be clear. This resolution is very important, and I wholeheartedly support it. I have worked so that it can be preserved with only germane amendments. But the resolution itself will not stop the war in Yemen, nor will it somehow stop the immense human suf-

fering, nor put an end to human rights violations.

What this resolution does do, however, is send a strong message to the Saudis about U.S. global leadership. It is a message that says the United States will not stand by as countries—even those with which we have important security relationships—flagrantly violate international norms.

The United States must assert moral leadership on the global stage. We must proudly embrace the immutable fact that our strongest relationships are those rooted in shared values, such as respect for human life, respect for basic democratic freedoms, respect for international institutions and norms that we have shaped to promote a safer and more prosperous future.

When we fail to call out egregious offenses—the slaughter of innocent civilians, the murder of American resident and journalist Jamal Khashoggi, the effective kidnapping of heads of state, just to name a few—we contribute to the steady erosion of fundamental freedoms and values that have driven us to a position of global strength.

This resolution is a clear message that if the President of the United States will not stand up in defense of our values, we in the U.S. Senate will. When this President selectively condemns some violations one day and then inexplicably ignores them and condones them another day, the Congress will act as an effective check and balance. As a coequal branch of government, we will defend American values, and we will work to promote our long-term security interests.

At the end of the day, the Saudi Government must take responsibility for its actions, for this ugly war does not serve Saudi Arabia's own long-term interests.

Achieving a path toward stability and prosperity demands that the Saudi Government hold itself to a higher standard. It must treat its citizens with dignity and respect. It must engage its partners in the region in responsible efforts to protect its borders from ever-growing Iranian threats. Shortsighted, capricious actions will not serve Saudi Arabia's long-term interests.

Yes, the United States has an important relationship with Saudi Arabia. But we must also be true to our own long-term interests, and that means we cannot sit idly by, waiting for the Crown Prince and the Saudi Government to act. It should be clear to everyone in this body that the resolution we are considering today is just one part of this effort.

I am proud to have worked across party lines with Senators YOUNG, REED, GRAHAM, and others in introducing the comprehensive Saudi Arabia Accountability and Yemen Act. This bill calls for a limited suspension of offensive weapons sales to Saudi Arabia, prohibits U.S. refueling of Saudi coalition aircraft engaged in Yemen, sanctions persons blocking humanitarian

access in Yemen, sanctions persons supporting the Houthis in Yemen, mandates Global Magnitsky sanctions on persons responsible for the death of American resident Jamal Khashoggi.

Unfortunately, we have not been able to get to this legislation in the timeframe that we have, but let me be clear. We will continue to work at it, and we do not want to see a weak substitute that degrades the intent of tangible action from the Senate.

I hope, after we get through this important vote on this resolution, at the end of the day—whether it be in this Congress or the next—that the only thing we do with reference to Jamal Khashoggi is not simply an expression of our outrage. We need to do something far more than that if we are going to send a global message. The time for waiting and posturing is over.

This administration has made abundantly and disappointingly clear that it will not act unless we force it to. President Trump has made clear over and over again that the only way he takes the high road is if he is dragged up to it, kicking and screaming. Taking their cue, the Saudis at this moment see no incentive to change their behavior. It is time for the Senate to act. It is time to stand up for the very values that define us as a nation.

The passage of the Sanders-Lee resolution should signal to the world that the U.S. Senate should hold Saudi Arabia accountable—including the royal family. We will continue to demand that we consider additional measures to make clear what we stand for as a nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his concern about this issue. I voted to dispense with this out of the committee. I have concerns about the particular legal issues that are being created here, but I wanted this debate to take place on the floor.

I thank him for his concerns about the way the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia is conducting himself, about the war itself, and how ham-handed the Saudis and others have been, having shown so little concern for the citizens who live in Yemen. So I appreciate his efforts.

I know we are very unlikely to come to an agreement on the bill he has offered, and I can understand why he would rather start the next year with a bill that he feels is stronger. I have some operational concerns, but I like the thrust of it very much.

I understand that, knowing we are not going to come to a conclusion this year, he would rather start this next Congress with the strongest message and bill that he can put forth. But I do want to thank him for offering it. I hope that—again, with some operational concerns worked out from my perspective—it comes along. I hope the thrust of it comes along.

So I thank him for that, and I thank him for his concern for the people of Yemen. I thank him, in particular, for his tremendous disdain for what the Crown Prince has done relative to the journalist.

The Senator is right that expressing outrage in itself is not enough; I agree with that 100 percent. I do hope that once this is done, so we don't confuse that with what is happening here on this particular message, if you will, that is taking place—he is right that it is not going to change policy. The only thing that will change policy is a refined Menendez-Young bill that will be dealt with next year. But I do hope we will have the ability, after this is over, after this is dispensed with tomorrow—I hope we can speak to that outrage. I think it helps us. As it relates to the second Magnitsky letter that we sent, I think it helps reinforce the fact that we hold him accountable, and I think there could be some good there.

I also think, as it relates to Saudi Arabia, a strong admonishment of the Crown Prince—I think they care about that a whole lot more than we might think.

So I wish the Senator well as we move ahead with the other piece. I would like to see some changes. I will not be here to make those happen, but I thank him for the thrust. I appreciate the message that is being put forth now. I do hope that, collectively, before we leave here this year, we can admonish strongly what we believe the Crown Prince has been involved in, and that is the murder of a journalist.

Mr. MENENDEZ. If my friend the distinguished chairman of the committee will yield for a moment, let me just say first that I appreciate his good intentions and commitment to having a process in which the Sanders-Lee resolution could move forward. To keep it within a germane sphere, I know that was one of the things the Senator said very early on, which I embrace, and I am glad for his leadership in that regard. I think passing this will be important, and I urge all of our colleagues to vote for it.

I look forward to when he presents the resolution he has talked about with reference to the Crown Prince. I do think that if he brings that forward, it is likely something I will support because I think it is important to make it very clear that you cannot kill with impunity just because you are our ally and that human rights and democracy are still values that we—at least in the U.S. Senate—believe are an integral part of our foreign policy. Countries that observe human rights and democracy and share our deepest values at the end of the day are our most reliable allies and are less likely to drag us into conflicts in other places. So I look forward to that debate and discussion when the distinguished Senator offers that.

But I will reiterate—and I appreciate the Senator's somewhat endorsement with some reservations. It is critical—

I know Senator YOUNG is standing; I will cease in a moment—that we need to do more—even though I will probably embrace what the Senator is doing—than just say we are outraged that the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia is complicit in the killing of Jamal Khashoggi.

There is a long list of things the Crown Prince has already done beyond that, some of which I mentioned in my remarks. But at the end of the day, if all we do is express our outrage, then anybody in the world, any leader in the world, any country we have a relationship with could say: Well, they will publicly slap us on the wrist, but that will be the total consequence.

If that is the total consequence, then at the end of the day, people will act with impunity. When they do that, we go down a dangerous path, not just for those who live in those countries and may be subjected to those types of indiscriminate executions and other gross violations of human rights; we send a global message that is a downward spiral. That is what I and some of my colleagues I am going to join briefly to talk about—we intend to pursue this in the next Congress—want to see happen. I appreciate that the Senator supports that sentiment, and I look forward to continuing to work with him until the very end of this session.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, before yielding to Senator YOUNG so he can make his amendment pending, I just want to follow up and say—look, I do want to go on record and say that I support the provisions of the Senator's bill that block for a period of time offensive weaponry sales to Saudi Arabia. I support that. I also support provisions of the bill that sanction people who are blocking humanitarian aid for the people there.

The Senator and his staff know we have some operational issues, and I know those are going to get worked out. I know that the way to start legislation and get it to where we really want it to be is to start out strongly. I know the Senator knows he is not going to pass it this year, and if I were the Senator from New Jersey, I would go about it exactly the way he is going about it.

So I do appreciate the thrust, and I do hope we pass those into law with some of the other provisions so that there is a price to pay for what has taken place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 4080

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 4080.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. YOUNG] proposes an amendment numbered 4080.

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4080

(Purpose: To clarify that this resolution prohibits United States Armed Forces from refueling non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen)

On page 4, line 21, add after the period at the end the following: "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."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 4080 to S.J. Res. 54. I introduced this amendment this morning, and I am proud to report that Senators Shaheen, Collins, and Coons are now cosponsoring this important bipartisan amendment.

Amendment No. 4080 would amend S.J. Res. 54 by simply defining the term "hostilities" to include "in-flight refueling of non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen." In other words, this amendment would prevent the resumption of U.S. air refueling of Saudi coalition aircraft in Yemen—those very aircraft that, in too many instances, have been responsible for indiscriminate bombing and violations of international human rights law. That is all this amendment would accomplish. It does not define the term "hostilities" more broadly for the War Powers Resolution or in any other instance.

Before discussing the amendment in more detail, allow me to zoom out for a moment and explain how I see the broader picture related to Saudi Arabia and Yemen.

The civil war in Yemen, as so many now know, is an unmitigated national security and humanitarian disaster. The longer the civil war continues, the more influential Iran and various terrorist groups will become in Yemen. Meanwhile, approximately 14 million people are on the verge of famine, and it is getting worse by the day.

Famine and the indiscriminate targeting of civilians by the Saudi-led coalition will only push more Yemenis toward Iran and toward its proxies, giving terrorists increasing opportunities to threaten Americans, our partners, and our interests. So it is essential to America's national security interests, as well as our humanitarian principles, that the administration use all available leverage to end the civil war in Yemen without delay.

The only way to end this civil war and make significant and durable progress on the humanitarian crisis is through an inclusive political process. Everyone agrees on this. It is positive that the parties to the conflict are talking in Sweden as part of the U.N. envoy-led peace process. We want that process to succeed. I know the administration supports these talks, and I commend them for the encouragement of these talks. There are many potential pitfalls in the peace process, though, so we have to do all we can to support this effort here in Congress.

Since March of 2017, I sought to underscore the importance of the humanitarian crisis in Yemen and to provide this administration leverage that it can use to pressure the Saudis to support an urgent and good-faith effort to end the civil war and to stop using food as a weapon of war.

In that effort, I have used every available tool at my disposal as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That has included, for example, a resolution that was passed by the Senate, legislation passed into law, subcommittee hearings, letters, and even a hold on the nomination of our former Secretary of State's top lawyer at the Department of State. That was before the administration understood, as they do now, the importance of having a negotiated political settlement between all the parties.

But as I have provided additional leverage to the administration over a period of time, we have to acknowledge that the civil war has continued, the world's worst humanitarian crisis has deteriorated further, Iran's influence has only increased, and the Saudi Crown Prince has, unfortunately, been left with the impression that he can get away with almost anything, including murder.

To be clear, with or without amendment No. 4080, S.J. Res. 54 may never become law. Even in that case, I believe adoption of amendment No. 4080 today would send an even stronger message at a critical moment to our Saudi partners that we expect them to do everything in their power to end this civil war.

Some may argue that no additional pressure is needed. I have heard that argument. I reject that argument, and here is why. On October 30, Secretaries Pompeo and Mattis called for a ceasefire in Yemen within 30 days. Those 30 days—for those who are checking your calendar—came and went on November 29. Yet the Saudi coalition has continued airstrikes.

I have a hard time believing that if Secretary Mattis picked up the phone and told Riyadh to knock off the airstrikes in Yemen, the Saudis would ignore him. If that call hasn't occurred, there may be a problem. If it has and the Saudis have ignored that demand, then, that may be a problem. Either way, we may have a big problem on our hands.

It is not in our national security interest to sit idly by as the Saudis ignore the clear demands of our Secretaries of Defense and State, especially when we are members of the coalition. Our taxpayers are funding these military exercises that are exacerbating the worst humanitarian crisis in generations and that are destabilizing a country where Iran, al Qaida, and ISIS have a foothold.

Let's support our Secretaries of State and Defense. Let's support them in their efforts. Let's give this administration yet more leverage vis-a-vis the Saudis.

The number of innocent people confronting famine is growing by the day. Innocent people are being bombed. Iran and terror groups are benefiting from the status quo. The Saudis have ignored our Secretaries' call for a ceasefire. My question to my colleagues here on Capitol Hill who are still undecided about how they might vote with respect to this amendment that I am bringing up is this: What are we going to do about it? What are you going to do about it today, because you have an opportunity to do something about it?

I will say that today, even if this resolution does not become law, we can take an important step and send the right message to Riyadh. There is no doubt that the Houthis have engaged in absolutely abhorrent behavior in Yemen, and, then, it takes two sides to negotiate.

We don't have much leverage over the Houthis. We have significant leverage over the Saudis, and we must utilize it. If S.J. Res. 54 does become law, my amendment would ensure that it accomplishes its stated purpose with respect to air refueling.

Some may continue to argue that the United States is not engaged in hostilities in Yemen. It is a war. Our taxpayers are providing funding. There is intelligence support and logistical support and refueling of aircraft carrying bombs, but some will argue that we are not engaged in hostilities in Yemen. In other words, this Senate joint resolution, absent my amendment, risks leaving the status quo in place in Yemen. With my amendment, the legislation would ensure that the administration cannot resume refueling of Saudi aircraft conducting missions related to this civil war.

To those principled colleagues—and there are a number of principled colleagues on this issue—who are conversant on the issue and have been studying it for a great deal of time, I have great respect for them. I know there is at least one who is concerned about any precedents we may be creating relating to the War Powers Resolution or other situations. Let me be clear. My amendment explicitly says this definition for hostilities only applies to this resolution we are considering today and only to this case.

I will also reiterate that my amendment would not restrict U.S. refueling on our own aircraft and would not restrict refueling of other aircraft for missions focused on al-Qaida and associated forces. We have it covered. Either way, Senators looking to send the right message today to the Saudis and those looking to change the situation in Yemen should support amendment No. 4080.

For a very quick word on the War Powers Resolution—the underlying resolution—here again, principled and serious people are on both sides of the War Powers Resolution debate, and I see merits on both sides of that argument. The President is indeed the Commander in Chief. That said, the Found-

ers also establish clear article I constitutional war powers and responsibilities for Congress.

For me, today, in this situation, and only with respect to Yemen, I believe a reasonable reading of the Constitution leaves plenty of room for a “yes” vote on this resolution. Our humanitarian principles and national security interests require it. With that, I urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 4080 and to support passage of the underlying resolution and send a message to Riyadh.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, through the Presiding Officer I wish to ask the Senator from Indiana, what you are saying is that you are doing everything you possibly can do to ensure that if your amendment passes, never in the future will your amendment be relied upon to say if we are refueling, that means we are involved in hostilities; is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the chairman for the clarification so that I can further clarify for the record that this amendment only applies for purposes of this resolution and in the section I offered it.

Let's say in Mali, for example, that our country in the future were involved with refueling operations of our partner or our ally's aircraft. This wouldn't apply. This would establish absolutely no precedent.

We have had national security legal counsel look at this. We have taken a belt-and-suspenders approach. No reasonable reading of this could construe this to establish any legal precedent that ought to cause concern for anyone concerned.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask again the Senator: For those of us, many in this body, including the Senator from Indiana, who worry that the mere refueling that may take place in Mali, where maybe we are supporting French troops, or the refueling in other places—the mere refueling in another country, the mere refueling itself—you are saying that by voting for your amendment, you have no intention of ever creating a precedent that another Senator could use the War Powers Act simply because of refueling taking place; is that your intention?

Mr. YOUNG. My intention is to only address the situation in Yemen, and that is precisely what this amendment does—nothing more, nothing less.

Back to the example of Mali and French aircraft, there would be absolutely no application of this amendment to that conflict, to the refueling of those aircraft or to our own aircraft. That is why we have doubled up on clarifying precautionary language, so that no one could conceivably construe that in any legal analysis that makes any level of common sense or legal sense, because the two don't always seem to be consistent. But we have had attorneys look at this, and it applies narrowly only to this context.

I will entertain any more questions, but I feel as though I am restating this. It is a very important matter. So I am glad the Chairman gave me an opportunity to answer it.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Indiana answering those questions. Today, we are, as you know, establishing precedent on a number of things. No. 1, we overwhelmingly decided that if the War Powers Resolution is used in this matter, only germane amendments can be put forth. I think that was a big step forward as it relates to this type of debate and in using the War Powers Resolution as it is being used.

I did want to get the Senate record to be very clear that the Senator from Indiana, should his amendment pass, was in no way trying to create a scenario where if we are refueling someplace, that automatically means we are involved in hostilities. What he is trying to do is address this specific issue.

Since we have been able to have this in the RECORD and since, hopefully, future Senates will rely upon the RECORD to look at what is taking place today, I want to thank the Senator for his amendment and tell him that I plan to support it.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, this has been the center of a lot of discussion, and it is a little confusing. I think there are a lot of things that everyone in here agrees with, but how we are going to express ourselves has to come down to all possibilities of the options that are there.

I want to start off by saying that I oppose the Sanders-Lee provision. I think the resolution would have us find that since March of 2015, members of the U.S. Armed Forces have been introduced into hostilities in Yemen between the Saudi-led coalition and Houthis, including providing to the Saudi-led coalition aerial targeting assistance, intelligence sharing, and midflight aerial refueling.

If enacted, Lee-Sanders could ultimately pull all U.S. support from the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen. The Sanders-Lee resolution is, I think, fundamentally flawed because it presumes we are engaged in military action in Yemen. We are not. We are not engaged in military action in Yemen.

There has been a lot of discussion about refueling. I don't see any stretch of the definition that would say that falls into that category. The truth is that with the exception of the defense strike in October 2016, the U.S. Armed Forces are not engaged in direct military action in Yemen.

The limited military support and intelligence sharing being provided by the United States to the Saudi-led coalition does not involve the introduction of U.S. Forces into hostilities, nor is the U.S. involvement in hostilities imminent given the circumstances at hand.

U.S. forces in support of the coalition do not currently command, coordinate, accompany, or participate in the movement of Saudi coalition forces in the counter-Houthi operations.

As of November 11 of this year, the U.S. Armed Forces ceased refueling support. That is no longer an issue. Even if it were an issue, this is not one that would constitute the category we have been talking about.

As for the Saudi coalition, the counter-Houthi operations in Yemen, even if the refueling support we were providing were going on today, it would not constitute involvement in hostilities. For that reason, I do oppose it.

I don't know which of these resolutions is actually going to be on the floor for a vote and in what order they would be on the floor, but the resolution that has been put together by Senator CORKER and our leader I think is the best solution to the problem we are confronted with now.

Like many of my colleagues, I was deeply disturbed by the killing of the Saudi journalist Jamal Khashoggi at Saudi Arabia's consulate in Istanbul in October. I deplore everything in conjunction with that. While it may not be a smoking gun as such, I believe that Saudi Arabia's leadership is responsible for Mr. Khashoggi's death.

Those responsible are going to have to be held accountable, and we must condemn this terrible and unacceptable event. That is clearly what the resolution says.

The resolution also acknowledges the Trump administration's important decision to sanction 17 Saudis for their roles in Mr. Khashoggi's murder.

At the same time, Saudi Arabia is an important Middle Eastern partner. Its stability is vital to the security of our regional allies and our partners, including Israel, and Saudi Arabia is essential to countering Iran. We all know that. We know how tenuous things are in that part of the world. We don't have that many friends. We can't afford to lose any of them.

While we must be frank with our partners and let them know when they have done, in our opinion, something wrong, we must be cautious and avoid steps that would damage a strategic relationship that goes back over half a century. For this reason, I am hoping that the resolution will be introduced, in which case I will be supporting the resolution the leader and Senator CORKER have introduced. It criticizes the Saudi Government for its recent behavior and encourages it to get on the right path—the right path to redouble its reform efforts, the right path to respect the rights of its citizens, and the right path to work toward a peaceful resolution in Yemen.

You know, I don't like any of the choices we have. This is clearly the best choice that is out there.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to join many of my colleagues in support of passage of the underlying resolution. I was pleased to be one of the original cosponsors, along with the Presiding Officer and Senator SANDERS, amongst many others.

This is clearly not the first time I have been to the floor to talk about the crisis inside Yemen and the broader crisis with respect to our relationship with Saudi Arabia that has grown worse and worse, especially in the last several months.

I want to thank Senator MENENDEZ and Senator CORKER for taking this incredibly seriously, especially since the death of Jamal Khashoggi, who was a resident of the United States here, ostensibly under our protection. I am hopeful that we will get another big bipartisan vote when this comes up for final passage.

I want to reiterate some of the reasons I think this is incredibly important.

First, let me state what I hope is obvious even for those of us who have been critics of Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia is a very important ally of the United States. It is an important partner for stability in the region. We continue to engage in an important counterterrorism, intelligence-sharing relationship with Saudi Arabia. They have helped us track down some very bad people. We have helped them track down some very bad people. Sunni extremists—separate and aside from the argument as to where that movement gets some of its seed funding—are out to get the Saudi regime, just as they are out to get the United States.

Second, it is important to note something that we take for granted in the region—this now long-term detente that has existed between the Gulf States and Israel, which did not used to be something you could rely on. In fact, one of the most serious foreign policy debates this Senate ever had was on the sale of AWACS to Saudi Arabia back in the 1980s. The objection then was that by empowering Saudi Arabia, you were hurting Israel and Israeli security. No one would make that argument today because Saudi Arabia has been a good partner in trying to figure out a way to calm the tensions in the region and, of course, provide some balance in the region, with the Iranian regime on the other side continuing to this day to use inflammatory and dangerous rhetoric about the future of Israel.

So this is an important partnership, and I have no interest in blowing it up. I have no interest in walking away from it. But you are not obligated to follow your friend into every misadventure they propose. When your buddy jumps into a pool of man-eating sharks, you don't have to jump with him. There is a point at which you say enough is enough. I came to this floor 3 years ago and suggested that time had already come.

Muhammad bin Salman, who is the Crown Prince, who is the effective leader of the country, has steered the foreign policy of Saudi Arabia off the rails. Folks seem to have noticed when he started rounding up his political opponents and killing one of them in a consulate in Turkey, but this has been ongoing. Look back to the kidnapping of the Lebanese Prime Minister, the blockade of Qatar without any heads-up to the United States, the wholesale imprisonment of hundreds of his family members until there was a payoff, the size of which was big enough to let some of them out.

This is a foreign policy that is no longer in the best interests of the United States and cannot be papered over by a handful of domestic policy reforms that are, in fact, intended to try to distract us from the aggressive nature of the Saudis' foreign policy in the region.

Of course, the worst example of their regional behavior going off the rails is Yemen. And I don't want to restate the case here; I think Senator SANDERS did a great job of it.

I have stood here before with posters of malnourished children with distended bellies. Some 85,000 of them have died from malnutrition or disease. The world's worst ever outbreak of cholera is happening right now as we speak. Ten thousand Yemenis have died from warfare, from bombings, or from siege campaigns. About two-thirds to three-quarters of those were as a result of the Saudi side of the civil war, but let's make clear that there are some really bad actors on the Houthi side as well. Part of the reason the humanitarian aid can't get to where it is needs to get to is because the Houthis are stopping it from getting into the areas they control today. So the Saudis bear the majority of the responsibility for the humanitarian nightmare, but there is enough to be spread around.

I am appreciative that many of my colleagues are willing to stand up for this resolution today to end the war in Yemen. I wish that it weren't because of the death of one journalist, because there have been tens of thousands who have died inside Yemen, and their lives are just as important and just as worthwhile as Jamal Khashoggi's life was, as tragic as that was. But there is a connection between the two, which is why I have actually argued that this resolution is in some way, shape, or form a response to the death of Jamal Khashoggi, for those who are primarily concerned with that atrocity. Here is how I link the two:

What the Saudis did for 2 weeks was lie to us, right? In the most bald-faced way possible. They told us that Jamal Khashoggi had left the consulate, that he had gotten out of there alive, that they didn't know what happened, when of course they knew the entire time that they had killed him, that they had murdered him, that they had dismembered his body. We now know that the Crown Prince had multiple con-

tacts all throughout the day with the team of operatives who did it. Yet they thought we were so dumb or so weak—or some combination of the two—that they could just lie to us about it.

That was an eye-opener for a lot of people here who were long-term supporters of the Saudi relationship because they knew that we had trouble. They knew that sometimes our interests didn't align, but they thought that the most important thing allies did with each other was tell the truth, especially when the truth was so easy to discover outside of your bilateral relationship. Then, all of a sudden, the Saudis lied to us for 2 weeks—for 2 weeks—and then finally came around to telling the truth because everybody knew that they weren't.

That made a lot of people here think, well, wait a second—maybe the Saudis haven't been telling us the truth about what they have been doing inside Yemen.

A lot of my friends have been supporting the bombing campaign in Yemen. Why? Because the Saudis said: We are hitting these civilians by accident. Those water treatment plants that have been blowing up—we didn't mean to hit them. That cholera treatment facility inside the humanitarian compound—that was just a bomb that went into the wrong place, or, we thought there were some bad guys in it. It didn't turn out that there were.

It turns out the Saudis weren't telling us the truth about what they were doing in Yemen. They were hitting civilian targets on purpose. They did have an intentional campaign of trying to create misery. I am not saying that every single one of those schoolbuses or those hospitals or those churches or weddings was an attempt to kill civilians and civilians only, but we have been in that targeting center long enough to know—to know—that they have known for a long time what they have been doing: hitting a lot of people who have nothing to do with the attacks against Saudi Arabia.

Maybe if the Saudis were willing to lie to us about what happened to Jamal Khashoggi, they haven't been straight with us as to what is happening inside Yemen, because if the United States is being used to intentionally hit civilians, then we are complicit in war crimes. And I hate to tell my colleagues that is essentially what the United Nations found in their most recent report on the Saudi bombing campaign. They were careful about their words, but they came to the conclusion that it was likely that the Saudi conduct inside Yemen would amount to war crimes under international law.

If it is likely that our ally is perpetuating war crimes in Yemen, then we cannot be a part of that. The United States cannot be part of a bombing campaign that may be—probably is—intentionally making life miserable for the people inside of that country.

So I would argue that this resolution is an appropriate response if you are

only concerned about Jamal Khashoggi because it is a way to make clear that if you lie to the United States, there are consequences. It is also a way to say to the Crown Prince: We are not going to be partners with you in your most important foreign policy endeavor—the war inside Yemen—if you are not being straight with us about this or other matters.

If you care just about what happened to that journalist, this is still an important vote for you to cast. And I get it that some people have issues with the mechanism by which we get here, the War Powers Resolution. I understand that it is new, that it hasn't been tested before. But I believe this is the right moment to have this debate and to have this vote.

I am hoping that we are going to come to a conclusion here as quickly as we can in which we maintain bipartisan consensus. I just joined several of my colleagues upstairs to express our desire—this isn't the beginning and the end of our debate about what to do with Saudi Arabia moving forward. I support Senator MENENDEZ and Senator YOUNG's legislation to take some additional steps to halt arms sales. I support imposing sanctions on the individuals who are responsible for this crime. But I would also hope that all of us take a little bit of time over the holidays to really think about how we reset this relationship in the region and how we send a signal to the world that there is no relationship in which we are the junior partner—certainly not with Saudi Arabia.

If Saudi Arabia can push us around like they have over the course of the last several years and in particular the last several months, that sends a signal to lots of other countries that they can do the same thing—that they can murder U.S. residents and suffer almost no consequences; that they can bomb civilians with our munitions and suffer no consequences.

This is not just a message about the Saudi relationship; this is a message about how the United States is going to interact with lots of other junior partners around the world as well. Saudi Arabia needs us a lot more than we need them, and we need to remind folks of that over and over again.

Spare me this nonsense that they are going to go start buying Russian jets or Chinese military hardware. If you think those countries can protect you better than the United States, take a chance. You think the Saudis are really going to stop selling oil to the United States? You think they are going to walk away from their primary bread winner just because we say that we don't want to be engaged in this particular military campaign? I am willing to take that chance.

We are the major partner in this relationship, and it is time that we start acting like it. If this administration isn't going to act like it, then this Congress has to act like it. As Senator GRAHAM said, sometimes Congress has

to go its own way. Sometimes Congress has to reorient American foreign policy when an administration will not.

With respect to this bilateral relationship, with respect to this egregious, unconscionable military operation inside Yemen, it is time for Congress to step up and right something that today is very, very wrong.

I appreciate all of the great work that Senator SANDERS and Senator LEE have done as partners in this, and I thank the chairman and ranking member for helping guide us through this debate as painlessly as possible. I look forward to coming to the floor again before final passage and look forward to another big bipartisan vote at the end of this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I take this time to support the passage of S.J. Res. 54. I commend my colleagues who have brought this resolution forward. The impact of this resolution would be to end the U.S. military engagement in Yemen, and I believe that military engagement should end for several reasons.

First, let me comment on what others have already pointed out, and that is that the humanitarian crisis in Yemen is one of the worst, if not the worst, in the world. That is saying a lot because there are a lot of areas around the world where we are seeing humanitarian challenges.

In Yemen today, 10,000 people have been killed due to the war, and 22 million-plus—75 percent of the population in Yemen—are at grave risk today. It is estimated that there are 400,000 children under the age of 5 who are at the risk of starvation due to hunger and malnutrition, and 85,000 children have died, according to Save the Children, from starvation.

The U.S. military engagement has really not assisted in ending this humanitarian crisis. There are 1 million people with cholera and 8.4 million people on the verge of famine. For a long time, we have been, focused on the Port of Hodeidah, saying that it had to be opened in order to be able to deliver humanitarian assistance. I think many of us thought that because of our military involvement in Yemen, at a minimum, we could get the port open. We find we are not able to have safe routes for the delivery of humanitarian assistance, so through our military we have not been able to impact the horrible tragedies that are taking place because of this humanitarian disaster.

Secondly, I think most experts will tell us there is no military solution to the war that is taking place in Yemen that dates back to 2014. The warring sides are not going to end as a result of the military. It is going to take diplomacy, and our military involvement has not assisted in a diplomatic answer. We have not made the progress I think many of us would have expected.

So, yes, I do believe America needs to be engaged in Yemen, just not from our military. Let's do an all-out press on diplomacy and bring the parties to the peace table and end this horrible conflict.

Yes, make no mistake about it, the Houthis are not nice people. I understand that, but we are not going to win this by our military. So let's concentrate on diplomacy. I think many have pointed out that, yes, we have been in this region since the attack on our country on September 11. Nothing in this resolution would affect our ability to fight against al-Qaida and its associated forces.

The resolution specifically exempts—specifically exempts—from the withdrawal of American military our campaign against al-Qaida and associated forces.

There is also no question that since the Saudis have engaged in this conflict, there have been many violations of human rights. Yes, we are facilitating and helping. I am not saying we are committing, but we are certainly part of the Saudi effort. We are supposedly helping them with targeting. That means giving them intelligence information to minimize civilian casualties. I am certain the American military is helping in that regard, but the bottom line is, we are told that 61 percent of casualties are due to coalition strikes. There is tremendous civilian loss as a result of this campaign, and the United States is one of the honest brokers in trying to minimize that. We have not been successful through the use of our military.

The use of our military has never been authorized by Congress. Now, this is a debate we have had many times. I know the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been part of that debate and has wanted us to come to grips with a congressional authorization for military use in Yemen. I applaud the chairman. I am very proud to be on that committee. I think if it were left up to our committee, we may have been able to agree on a resolution, but it was clear we couldn't get it through the Senate, couldn't get it through the Congress. That was clear. I am not saying we are culpable for not passing authorization, but we have not passed authorization, and there is no authorization for the use of military force in Yemen, despite the fact that article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution of the United States gives the Congress the sole power to declare war.

We are responsible for the military, and if you can't get that authorization, there should at least be a presumption that we shouldn't be using our military. If you can't get the support of Congress—if the President, Commander in Chief, can't get the support of Congress for the use of force, there should not be a sustained use. We know about emergency situations. We expect it of the Commander in Chief. This is not an emergency situation. This is a situa-

tion where there should be an authorization for the use of force if we are to remain. I don't believe we should remain.

We have had our disagreements with the President on the use of force. Congress passed the War Powers Act in 1973. The President didn't like it. We passed it anyway. We believe the President should not only notify but respect the will of Congress's power under article I to declare war and authorize our military presence.

Section 5(c) gives the power to Congress to pass a joint resolution to remove our troops where there has been no authorization. So what is being done today—the resolution that is before us—is the vehicle that we determined to be the appropriate way to remove our troops from unauthorized war. Therefore, it is an appropriate action by the Congress—probably the only action we can take in order to end the war in Yemen with U.S. participation.

I want to make a comment about the relationship between the United States and the Saudis. I heard many of my colleagues talk about it. I think it is a very important relationship. I think the Saudis are a strategic partner of the United States. I had many opportunities to visit with the Saudis. I know about a lot of the things they are doing, but make no mistake about it, that relationship is important to the United States, but it is very important to the Saudis. It is more than just our military support for a war in Yemen. It has a lot to do with security issues generally. It has to do with intelligence sharing. It has to do with economics.

Our relationship should always be wrapped in our values. Our foreign policy should always be based upon our values as Americans, and our values in regard to what is happening in this war in Yemen tell us we should not be participating in it.

I haven't even mentioned the tragic death of Jamal Khashoggi. When taking a look at what happened there and the involvement of the royal family and the Crown Prince, that clearly cannot go unchallenged. Human rights violations and the military campaign, all of that cries out for the United States not to be engaged in the military aspects of what is happening in Yemen, and the passage of S.J. Res. 54 will, in fact, make that a reality, and I urge our colleagues to support that resolution.

TIME MAGAZINE'S PERSON OF THE YEAR

Mr. President, it is a related subject.

I am going to talk about TIME magazine for their selection of their Person of the Year, the "Guardians and the War on Truth." I say it is related because Jamal Khashoggi is one of the figures that is on the cover of TIME magazine as one of the guardians.

In making their selection, TIME magazine wrote: "For taking great risks in pursuit of greater truths, for the imperfect but essential quest for

facts that are central to civil discourse, for speaking up and for speaking out, the Guardians" are the Person of the Year.

TIME magazine wrote:

As we looked at the choices, it became clear that the manipulation and abuse of truth is really the common thread in so many of this year's major stories . . . this ought to be a time when democracy leaps forward, an informed citizenry being essential to self-government. Instead, it's in retreat. And the story of this assault on truth is, somewhat paradoxically, one of the hardest to tell.

TIME magazine wrote in this week's issue:

In Annapolis, Md., staff of the Capital, a newspaper published by Capital Gazette Communications, which traces its history of telling readers about the events in Maryland to before the American Revolution, press on without the five colleagues gunned down in their newsroom on June 28. Still intact, indeed strengthened after the mass shooting, are the bonds of trust and community that for national news outlets have been eroded on strikingly partisan lines, never more than this year.

"I can tell you this," declared Chase Cook, a reporter for the Capital Gazette [on that fateful day]. "We are putting out a damn paper tomorrow." Cook's promise . . . came just a few hours after five of his colleagues were killed. The man charged with their murders had been obsessed with the paper since it wrote about his harassment of a high school classmate—part of its routine coverage of local legal proceedings. He made the office a crime scene. To put the damn paper out, staffers set up laptops in the bed of a pickup in a parking garage across the street.

When the next edition arrived—on schedule—the opinion page was blank but for the names of the dead. Gerald Fischman. Rob Hiaasen. John McNamara. Rebecca Smith. Wendi Winters. Beneath their names was . . . written with a goose quill: "Tomorrow this page will return to its steady purpose of offering our readers informed opinions about the world around them, that they might be better citizens."

I must tell you I am very proud of what the Capital Gazette has done. They continued through very difficult times with the quality reporting and opinion pages they have been known for, for a long time—a real treasured institution in our State's capital.

One of the four TIME magazine covers includes the journalists of the Capital Gazette, the Annapolis, MD, newspaper where five employees were murdered by a gunman last June.

I spoke about this shooting on the Senate floor last June, and the Senate unanimously adopted S. Res. 575, which I authored and which was cosponsored by all Members of the Senate. This Senate resolution commemorates the lives, careers, and service of five victims of the Capital Gazette shooting in Annapolis, MD; honors the survivors of the attack and the families of the victims and pledges to continue support for their recovery; thanks law enforcement officers and other emergency first responders for their heroic actions; and reaffirms the commitment of the Senate to defending the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Wendi Winters was among the five Capital Gazette employees killed in the June 28 shooting. According to eyewitness accounts from survivors, Wendi armed herself with the closest weapons at hand—her trash and recycling bins—and charged the shooter, shouting for him to stop. It is believed Wendi's actions distracted the shooter enough to enable several of her coworkers to escape.

We think of violence against reporters as something that happens in other countries, in war zones and the like, but not here, not in the United States of America. All around the world, reporters work to gather facts, ask questions, and report the news in the spirit of free, open, and transparent societies and governments that all people deserve. Too often, reporters are harassed, jailed, and even killed simply because of the nature of their work, which often exposes cronyism and corruption.

Jason Rezaian, a reporter with the Washington Post who was falsely imprisoned in Iran for doing his job as a journalist, had this to say earlier this year. He talks about the attack I referenced earlier in Annapolis.

Mostly I have covered attacks on the media taking place on the other side of the world, usually in countries where the flow of information is restricted or conditions are such that a sense of desperation or political or tribal affiliation can compel individuals to take heinous action. . . . Writing about a deadly attack that happened less than 30 miles away, in an idyllic town that I recently visited with relatives from overseas, is a new experience for me. And I have to say that I don't relish the task.

We Americans have certain rights and responsibilities granted to us through the Constitution, which established the rule of law in this country. Freedom of the press is one of those most basic rights, and it is central to the First Amendment of the Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press." This precious freedom has often been under attack, figuratively speaking, since our Nation's founding.

Today, attacks on the American media have become more frequent and more literal, spurred on by dangerous rhetoric that has created an "open season" on harassing the media for doing its job—asking the questions that need to be asked, investigating the stories that need to be uncovered, and bringing needed transparency to the halls of power, whether they are in Annapolis, Washington, DC, or elsewhere.

Then-candidate and now-President Trump's rhetoric—calling the media "a stain on America" and "the enemy of the American people"—certainly has caused damage. At the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the President said to the audience that they are "not to believe" what they see and hear. The President of the United States told a crowd of veterans:

Stick with us. Don't believe the crap you see from these people, the fake news. . . . What you're seeing and what you're reading is not what's happening.

That is the President of the United States saying those comments—again, demeaning the press and the importance of the free press.

Why is the President doing this? Earlier this year, CBS "60 Minutes" correspondent Leslie Stahl, an icon in the news business, shared comments from President Trump from an interview she did with him soon after the 2016 election win. Stahl recalled that she said to Donald Trump about his attacks on the media:

Why are you doing this? You're doing it over and over. It's boring and it's time to end that.

The candidate's response was straightforward and shocking. He said:

You know why I do it? I do it to discredit you all and demean you all so that when you write negative stories about me no one will believe you.

Let that sink in for a moment. A man who was about to assume the position of President of the United States explicitly acknowledged he was purposefully working to diminish the integrity of the free press.

After the Capital Gazette shooting, Donald Trump said: "Journalists, like all Americans, should be free from the fear of being violently attacked while doing their job." But how do we interpret his sincerity when, more frequently, he is calling the media "fake news" or "totally unhinged" and telling the people of America that reporters are truly bad people?

Donald Trump's constant dismissal needs to end. He needs to accept that one of the press's most important roles is to speak truth to power—truth to power, including to the President of the United States.

Here at home, we are left to wonder whether Donald Trump is more inclined to agree with Russian President Vladimir Putin's view of the press—where journalists are routinely jailed and physically attacked—than with Thomas Jefferson, who famously said: "Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

Journalists, like all Americans, should be free from the fear of being violently attacked while doing their job—both figuratively and literally. The right of journalists to report the news is nothing less than the right of all of us to know. Media freedom and media pluralism are essential for the expression of, or ensuring respect for, other fundamental freedoms and safeguarding democracy, the rule of law, and a system of checks and balances.

Every one of us in this body—Democrats and Republicans—has sworn an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. As leaders of this great Nation, we have a responsibility to defend the rights of our

citizens, including the freedom of press.

Yesterday, *TIME* magazine featured three covers in addition to the *Capital Gazette*. One is Jamal Khashoggi, the *Washington Post* contributor who was killed at the Saudi Arabian Consulate in Istanbul in October. I would note that this is the first time that a *TIME* Person of the Year is a deceased person.

The United States of America must stand up for justice and human rights at home and abroad. I agree that Saudi Arabia is a strong ally in a variety of important areas, but that should only strengthen their understanding of America's commitment to the rule of law, and we as a Nation cannot sanction extrajudicial killings. America's national security is harmed, not helped, when dictators and strongmen believe they can get away with such heinous actions as the killing of journalist Jamal Khashoggi.

Congress must act to demand accountability for those responsible for Jamal Khashoggi's murder and to send the right signal to the world that America will continue to be a beacon of justice and defender of human rights.

Another cover features Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo, two Reuters journalists who were arrested 1 year ago in Myanmar while working on stories about the killings of the Rohingya Muslims. These journalists remain behind bars, but their wives were photographed for the cover. From this floor, I stood in solidarity with these Reuters reporters who were detained in Burma for shining a light on the horrific abuses that occur in the Rakhine State.

I have stood in solidarity with Ethiopian journalists and bloggers who are routinely arrested for criticizing the Ethiopian Government and exposing human rights abuses in that country. I have talked frequently about China, a country that engages in routine censorship and online blocking, harassment, reprisals, and detention of journalists, visa delays, and denials for journalists.

Another *TIME* cover shows Maria Ressa, the chief executive of the Philippine news website, *Rappler*, who was indicted on tax evasion charges by President Duterte's administration as part of a crackdown on free speech and dissent.

According to the Committee to Protect Journalists, an independent, non-profit organization that promotes press freedom worldwide, more than 600 journalists and media workers have been killed in the last 10 years while doing their job.

Of the member States of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Russia remains the deadliest country for journalists.

Turkey is the largest jailer of journalists in the world, and scores of media outlets have been closed since the attempted coup there. The heavy-

handed measures used against media freedom in Turkey, both before and during the recent elections, illustrates the lengths to which the government went to control the information available to voters. It also serves as a reminder of the essential role of a pluralistic media for free and fair elections.

I have also worked on many other countries that have infringed upon the freedom of press in my role on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a ranking Democrat on the Helsinki Commission. I could give you examples of what we have done in Malta, what we have done in Slovakia, what we have done in Belarus—and the list goes on and on.

I therefore ask the Trump administration and my colleagues in the Senate to redouble their efforts to protect the freedom of the press, both at home and abroad. We must lead by example as the very foundational legitimacy of a democratic republic is at stake.

America's leadership is essential to protect the freedom of the press—an essential institution for a democratic state. We must lead by first setting an example by our commitment to the freedom of press here at home. We must demand that freedom of the press be a priority in our global affairs, recognizing it is important to our national security.

TIME magazine got it right by naming the "Guardians and the War on Truth" as persons of the year.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARASSO). The Senator from Utah.

YEMEN WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the Senate is currently considering S.J. Res. 54. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation—lead cosponsor, along with my distinguished colleague from Vermont, Senator SANDERS. He and I, along with Senator MURPHY and a number of other Members of this body, have engaged in this bipartisan effort, in a concerted endeavor to make sure that the separation of powers among our three branches of government is respected.

There is perhaps no more morally significant decision made in government than the decision to go to war. Whenever we take an action as a government that puts American treasure and, especially, American blood on the line, we have a sacred responsibility to evaluate and carefully weigh the relative risks and advantages of acting and the relative risks and advantages of not acting.

To make sure that kind of analysis takes place, the Founding Fathers wisely put this power squarely within the branch of government most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals—the Congress. This was a big distinction from our former National Government, based in London, where the chief executive—the King—had the power to commit troops to war without going to Parliament.

Alexander Hamilton explained this principle in *Federalist* No. 69. He ex-

plained that it was no accident that this power was put in the hands of Congress. To be sure, the power Congress has to declare war means more than simply to state something in the abstract. It is something that has to happen before we put American blood and treasure on the line.

It is something that should never happen in the absence of some type of dire emergency—some set of exigent circumstances in which the President must protect the United States of America from an imminent attack. It needs to be declared by Congress.

This isn't a mere formality; this is the only thing that guarantees that this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It is the only thing guaranteeing that we will actually have a debate about the relative merits of the conflict in question. There are a number of reasons why.

In addition to the fact that there is an obvious economic expense associated with war, there is a tremendous human cost associated with war on our side, on the side of those among whom we might be fighting, and on the side of those against whom we might be fighting.

This particular conflict in Yemen provides one of many examples of the moral perilousness associated with war, of the many moral questions brought about as a result of war. We are involved in a conflict half a world away. We are involved in providing targeting assistance, midair refueling, reconnaissance, and surveillance. We are involved in this conflict as cobelligerents.

As we are involved in that, we are responsible in one way or another not only for the American lives that might one day be directly implicated in this conflict—more than they are today because we know how wars go; we know how they tend to spread. We know that once we put the good name of the United States of America on the line, we are understandably reluctant to walk away from it because of what that might say to the rest of the world.

But in order to make it legitimate, in order to make that decision authentic, in order to make it sustainable, it has to be done in the appropriate way, which means it first has to go to Congress.

Many of my colleagues will argue—in fact some of them have argued just within the last few minutes—that we are somehow not involved in a war in Yemen. My distinguished friend and colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma, came to the floor a little while ago, and he said that we are not engaged in direct military action in Yemen.

Let's peel that back for a minute. Let's figure out what that means. I am not sure what the distinction between direct and indirect is here. Maybe in a very technical sense—or under a definition of warfare or military action that has long since been rendered outdated—we are not involved in that, but

we are involved in a war. We are co-belligerents. The minute we start identifying targets or, as Secretary James Mattis put it about a year ago, in December 2017, the minute we are involved in the decisions involving making sure that they know the right stuff to hit, that is involvement in a war, and that is pretty direct. The minute we send up U.S. military aircraft to provide midair refueling assistance for Saudi jets en route to bombing missions, to combat missions on the ground in Yemen, that is our direct involvement in war.

Now, if you don't agree with me, ask any one of our armed services personnel who is involved in this effort. I would imagine that he or she would beg to differ. I would imagine that the parents, the children, the family members, the loved ones of these brave men and women who have been involved in this effort would beg to differ when told that we are not involved in a war in Yemen.

In any event, regardless of how you define war, regardless of what significance you might attach to direct versus indirect military involvement in a civil war half a world away, it still triggers the constitutional requirement that Congress and not merely the President decide that we are going to get involved in this war.

Look, I understand that there are some competing powers in the Constitution. It was set up deliberately that way. There is some arguable gray area between, on the one hand, the outer limits of the President's Executive authority as the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and, on the other hand, the power enjoyed exclusively by Congress to declare war. Because there is some gray area, some matters on which people of reasonable minds might disagree as to where a war begins, Congress, several decades ago, adopted the War Powers Act in an effort to try to delineate the respective powers of these branches. Congress decided, among other things, that it would be significant any time we got involved in hostilities.

Many of my colleagues will argue and many of them have argued on this very day, in fact, that we are not involved in hostilities in Yemen and therefore the War Powers Act is not triggered. Yes, there are a couple of problems with that argument.

One, it is just categorically untrue for the reasons I mentioned a minute ago. We are helping them get to the bombing sites. We are telling them what to bomb, what to hit, what to take out. That is rather direct involvement in war.

Increasingly these days, our wars are high-tech. Very often, our wars involve cyber activities. They involve reconnaissance, surveillance, target selection, midair refueling. It is hard—in many cases, impossible—to fight a war without those things. That is what war is.

Many of my colleagues, in arguing that we are not involved in hostilities,

rely on a memorandum that is internal within the executive branch of the U.S. Government that was issued in 1976 that provides a very narrow, unreasonably slim definition of the word “hostilities.” It defines “hostilities” in a way that might have been relevant, that might have been accurate, perhaps, in the mid-19th century, but we no longer live in a world in which you have a war as understood by two competing countries that are lined up on opposite sides of a battlefield and engaged in direct exchanges of fire, one against another, at relatively short range. War encompasses a lot more than that. War certainly encompasses midair refueling, target selection, surveillance, and reconnaissance of the sort we are undertaking in Yemen.

Moreover, separate and apart from this very narrow, unreasonably slim definition of “hostilities” as determined by this internal executive branch document from 1976 that contains the outdated definition, we ourselves, under the War Powers Act, don't have to technically be involved in hostilities. It is triggered so long as we ourselves are sufficiently involved with the armed forces of another nation when those armed forces of another nation are themselves involved in hostilities. I am speaking, of course, in reference to the War Powers Act's provisions codified at 50 USC 1547(c).

For our purposes here, it is important to keep in mind what that provision reads: “For purposes of this chapter [under the War Powers Act], 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 become engaged, in hostilities.”

In what sense, on what level, on what planet are we not involved in the commanding, in the coordination, in the participation, in the movement of or in the accompaniment of the armed forces of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia-led coalition in the civil war in Yemen? I challenge anyone to explain that to me—how it is that we are not involved in the way described by 50 USC 1547(c). We are. Because we are under this power-sharing agreement that was reached in the War Powers Act that has been in place over the last four or five decades, we need to follow those procedures. It is one of the reminders we have that we need to respect the separation of powers.

We first brought up this resolution—or one like it—earlier this year. It was about 8 or 9 months ago. At the time we brought it up and got it to the Senate floor, we utilized a privilege status accorded to resolutions like these in order to secure a vote on the Senate floor to try to bring this bill out of

committee. At the time, sadly, we received only 44 votes to get it out of committee. That was not enough.

Fast-forward a few months to the week before last when we voted on it again. It was, actually, the same vote, and it resulted in 63 Members of this body supporting the idea of advancing it out of committee.

Then, today, we moved to the consideration of this bill, and we got, if I am not mistaken, about 60 votes for that. I am thrilled, I am ecstatic that we had that result, and I look forward to my colleagues passing S.J. Res. 54 in the coming days. I urge my colleagues to vote for it. I suggest, however, that it would have been even better had we done it sooner.

What, you might ask, changed? What changed between when we voted for this a few months ago and we fell short of the votes we needed and when we brought it up the week before last to discharge it out of committee and then voted today to move to the bill? Well, a number of things have happened.

First, the war in Yemen has continued. We have had a whole lot of people killed in Yemen as a result of this civil war. We have had a whole lot more people in Yemen die as a result of causes related to that war. There has been starvation. There have been all kinds of atrocities that have accompanied that war.

Now, I know—this is war, and war inevitably involves atrocities. War inevitably leads to some people dying as a result of a direct kinetic attack, and it almost inevitably leads to other people dying as a result of starvation or their being subjected to other violent acts or tragic outcomes. I get it. That is what war does. That is precisely why it is unconstitutional and morally bankrupt for us to get involved in a war without the people's elected representatives in Congress voting to do so, without our having the ability to debate it, to discuss it, and to vote affirmatively to put our brave young men and women in harm's way to engage in that war.

What else changed in addition to the fact that this war has gone on and on with a lot of death and suffering and misery by a whole lot of innocent people?

We have also seen that when we pulled back the mask a little bit, when we pulled back the curtains and looked into exactly who we were fighting for and why we were fighting, the people, understandably, got a little freaked out. The death, the murder of a journalist got a lot of people's attention.

I completely agree with the comments that have been made by several of my colleagues that every life is sacred, that every human soul has inestimable worth in the eyes of God and should be respected by each and every one of us. It is therefore sad that it has had to take this long for us to care about it. It shouldn't be the case that we had to wait for a journalist to be murdered for us to care about this unconstitutional, unjustified, and, I believe, immoral war.

Regardless of how we got here, we are here. The murder of Mr. Khashoggi caused us to think long and hard—with good reason—about the fact that we have gone somewhat blindly into war, first under a Democratic President and then under a Republican President, where it has been continued, following, somewhat blindly, the leadership of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The fact that the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia has been implicated in the murder of Mr. Khashoggi has caused a lot of people to stop and say: Wait a minute. Maybe this doesn't make sense. Wait a minute. Perhaps this is a regime that we ought not be supporting or at least, at a minimum, regardless of the fact that we may have some interest, some reason to be allied with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in some ways, maybe—just maybe—this is enough of a reason for us not to be fighting a war on behalf of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. We know this to be true.

Those of us who serve in this body or who serve down the hall in the U.S. House of Representatives know something very significant, which is that if we went to almost any one of our constituents in any part of the country and asked them “Why should we, the United States of America—the greatest military power, the greatest republic, arguably, the greatest civilization the world has ever known—be putting American blood and treasure on the line to fight as cobelligerents in a civil war half a world away in Yemen?” we know that 99 times out of 100—perhaps 999 times out of 1,000—that it would not result in a confident answer. We know that it would result in an answer full of uncertainty, ambiguity, grave concern, and well-justified fear for the fact that we are involved in somebody else's civil war—in a civil war in which we have no business fighting, in a civil war in which we have blindly followed the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia into conflict.

This is our decision to make. That war results in bloodshed and the shedding of blood that will be on our hands if we fail to exercise our constitutional prerogatives under a system of government in which we have taken an oath to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. I hope and expect that we will do our duty. I hope and expect that we will respect the lives of those who put their lives on the line to protect us.

I urge my colleagues, with all the emotion and all the compassion I am capable of summoning, to vote for and pass S.J. Res. 54.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise to condemn the Saudi military campaign in Yemen, which is causing the worst humanitarian crisis since World War II.

Tens of thousands of young children have already died of starvation, and millions more in Yemen remain threat-

ened by famine and disease. Yemen is experiencing the worst cholera outbreak in history with there being over 1 million cases. In recent months, the crisis has accelerated and grown at a rate of 10,000 cases each and every week.

The air campaign in Yemen, led by Saudi Arabia, is now in its third year, and every day, it makes the humanitarian crisis in Yemen worse. Bombs dropped by Saudi Arabia are killing women and children, destroying roads and bridges, disabling electricity and water services, and leveling schools, hospitals, and mosques.

Meanwhile, the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman stand credibly accused of ordering the murder of a U.S. resident journalist known for his critique of the regime.

Currently, we are debating a resolution that directs the President to remove the U.S. military from hostilities in Yemen and end our Nation's unauthorized participation in this conflict.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 54. I voted to bring it to the floor because the United States should not be providing aerial refueling to Saudi jets bombing Yemen indiscriminately.

The U.S. Senate should pass this resolution and send a clear message that our military will not prolong and will not worsen a humanitarian tragedy led by an increasingly brutal regime.

This is also why I voted against arms sales of additional air-to-ground munitions to Saudi Arabia. More arms sales and more military support for Saudi Arabia are not how we are going to end this crisis. We need meaningful, diplomatic, and political solutions to alleviate human suffering in Yemen.

This is an issue that is deeply personal to me and many Michiganders. I am proud to represent a vibrant and dynamic Yemeni community in Michigan, and I share their heartbreak over the tragic situation impacting innocent Yemenis.

Our Nation must show real leadership and take action to ensure that food, water, medicine, and all necessary humanitarian supplies are made available to those who so desperately need them.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting S.J. Res. 54.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

TRIBUTE TO AARON MURPHY

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I am going to change pace a little bit here. I want to talk about a couple of people on my staff who are going to move on to greener pastures, you might say, and I want to acknowledge them.

First of all, I want to acknowledge a man who has always been there for me when I have needed him. Day or night, hell or high water, yes, even during the first few weeks of his fatherhood, my chief of staff, Aaron Murphy, has given himself to Montana and to this Nation.

For years, he and his wife Patience and their children Mira and Wes have

dedicated nights and weekends to ensuring that our State remains the best place to live and raise a family.

Dating back to my first U.S. Senate campaign in 2006, Aaron has been an integral part in shaping my message, crafting my political policy, and ensuring that every word matters. He takes the job seriously, but he never loses the ability to laugh at himself—the mark of a true leader.

One 4th of July, he tasked his communications team to write a statement honoring Independence Day. My team wrote:

We can't be consumed by our petty differences anymore. We will be united in our common interests.

Aaron was appalled by the hyperbole, and he began editing the statement, only to find out that his team had pranked him by copying and pasting lines from the Hollywood blockbuster movie “Independence Day.”

Aaron's no-nonsense style has kept us focused on what really matters, and that is the people. His ability to see the big picture and the end goal is one of his greatest gifts.

His work ethic is second to none. He is the first person in the office in the morning, and he is the last one out at night. He is rooted in his desire to create opportunity for the next generation, and his passion drives him to excel every day—never settling for second best.

He has worked as my press secretary, as my communications director, and now he wraps up his time as my chief of staff.

I want to tell him, on behalf of my entire family and team Tester: Thank you for your service.

Aaron has been at my side through three grueling elections and countless national media appearances.

I remember the first time I met this man. He was working at a local TV station. I was informed by my then-communications director that we had this guy who wanted to work for my campaign. At the time, I said to Matt McKenna: Why would he want to work for me? He has a good job.

Matt responded: Maybe he actually thinks you can win this election.

That is exactly what Aaron Murphy believes. He believes in the future of this country. He believes in the future of Montana.

There was another time, before the 2012 election, when Aaron was driving to my farm. He took the wrong road, and he ended up stuck in the mud. He buried the car up to the frame, and, fortunately, he found a spot where his cell phone worked and got ahold of me. I went out with the tractor and pulled him out of the mud. I was laughing at the time, making fun of his inability to navigate a muddy road, but Aaron saw an opportunity. He later told that story to a national reporter, who used it in a story to show that I hadn't lost my roots.

Thanks for getting stuck in the mud, Aaron.

Here is the thing about Aaron Murphy. He sees things differently. He has the ability to connect with people and drive an agenda that matters to everyday Americans. He is genuinely creative, full of passion, and good for a terrible pun or a dad joke.

Aaron, on behalf of my family, on behalf of the entire staff—both here in DC and in State—I want to thank you for your hard work, your service, your dedication, and your willingness to come back to the political fray and help me for the last 2 years.

Thank you very much.

TRIBUTE TO DAYNA SWANSON

Mr. President, I also want to talk about my State director, who is also leaving for greener pastures. I guess that is what happens when you get re-elected.

My State director's name is Dayna Swanson. She is an incredible woman. She is a leader, wise counsel, and friend. Anybody who knows Dayna knows she is a package of dynamite.

A few years back, Dayna wanted to get an old pickup. She looked around, and she found an old pickup. She found a 1949 Chevrolet pickup that had a pretty, fresh, green paint job. In fact, it was a paint job that also included part of the chrome bumper painted green. It looked good to Dayna, and she bought it. Needless to say, it probably needed a little work. When you went around the corner, the doors would fly open, and sometimes it would start, and sometimes it wouldn't.

I figured, what the heck. It is an old pickup. It is a great parade vehicle. We had a homecoming parade coming up in Missoula, so I asked Dayna if we could use her new 1949 pickup in the parade. We were in the parade with the vehicle and, as usual—it is what you would think—it overheated, the hose blew, and before we knew it, the Lieutenant Governor was pushing the rig down the road with me driving it, which was kind of nice.

That is Dayna. She is not afraid to take a risk. She inherited these traits from two marvelous people, her parents, Butch and Kathy.

Dayna and I come from different parts of the State of Montana, but we still have some things in common. I come from North Central Montana, where agriculture is the business. It is done there, and we dig in the Earth to make a living. She comes from just east of the Continental Divide, where hard-working miners dig in the Earth to find minerals and, consequently, are able to put food on their table.

Her Anaconda roots—her Irish roots—define her, as evidenced by her love of Jameson Whiskey, but it is her heart that makes her so special.

Dayna has compassionately lead my Montana team in the State, guiding them through difficult times, overcoming government bureaucracy, and putting some big wins on the board for the State she loves—Montana.

When a Montanan walks into one of my offices, regardless of what the prob-

lem is, Dayna goes to work to make sure the problem is solved. Dayna's team bends over backward to get them the help they deserve.

Her leadership skills literally save lives. When I first got elected 12 years ago, Dayna designed our constituent casework process. She knew that my No. 1 goal would be to help the people of Montana, and every day since then, she has committed her heart and soul to that mission.

She has ushered Cabinet Secretaries across the State, showing them what rural America looks like. She has worked with county commissioners, State legislators, and everyday Montanans to ensure that Montana remains the last best place.

She has flown in the dead of winter with me when it has been so cold you couldn't see the ground, and when you did land, you could see that the wings of the plane were covered with ice.

For 12 years, she has been my eyes and ears on the ground in Montana. We have spent hundreds of hours together—windshield time—from places like Wibaux to Libby and all along the way. We have shared countless laughs and have worked to make the State a better place.

While her time in my office comes to a close, I know there are great opportunities on the horizon for Dayna and her partner Denise, who just took over as superintendent of schools in the Seattle school system. She will be heading out to Seattle, where she will make Seattle a better place, just as she has made Montana a better place.

In Dayna Swanson's particular case, on behalf of my wife, the entire Tester team, and the people of Montana, I say: Thank you for a job well done.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. MENENDEZ. 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. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ZIMBABWE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, last week I chaired a hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health that focused on Zimbabwe.

As a young man, I fell in love with the continent of Africa and, specifically, with the country of Zimbabwe, where I served part of my Mormon mission. The year was 1983, and the country had recently gained its independence. A man by the name of Robert Mugabe was serving as Prime Minister at the time. I don't think anyone could have predicted back then that Mugabe would serve as leader of Zimbabwe until November of 2017, nor could anyone have imagined the damage that he would do to this beautiful country.

Jubilation erupted in the streets of Harare in November of 2017 when

Zimbabweans heard the news that Mugabe had been ousted by his own party and forced to retire. The people of Zimbabwe burst into spontaneous celebration, hoping that with Mugabe finally removed from power, the country might begin to move forward after nearly 40 years of his reign.

I had the opportunity to visit Zimbabwe in February of 2016, where I led a delegation to southern Africa. Mugabe's misrule of the country was certainly evident at that time. The devastation had taken its toll on the capital city of Harare. Yet, somehow, the people of Zimbabwe were so capable, so resilient, and had persevered and were looking to a brighter future.

I was able at that time to reconnect with friends whom I hadn't seen for 30 years, including one of my missionary companions, Peter Chaya, who despite severe physical disability brought on by polio as a child, managed to raise four children and contribute a great deal to his church, to his community, and to his country.

Zimbabwe's greatest potential has always been its people, and it is time for the government to take steps to ensure that this potential can finally be realized.

I want to work with Zimbabwe to make this happen, and that is why I introduced the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Amendment Act, along with Senator COONS, last March. Senator COONS has been a valued partner in efforts to bring better governance to Zimbabwe, and I am sure that we can play a constructive role.

The ZDERA Amendment Act, signed into law in August, reiterates that in order for sanctions on Zimbabwe to be lifted, the government must restore the rule of law, it must hold free and fair elections, and it must demonstrate a sincere commitment to land reform, but—and this is different from the prior statute—our changes send a signal to the Government of Zimbabwe, to the opposition, and to the Zimbabwean people that the United States is interested in improving the state of our bilateral relationship, including in the areas of trade and investment.

The bill asks that the government of Zimbabwe take concrete, tangible steps toward good governance and the enactment of economic reforms. It asks that all statutes inconsistent with Zimbabwe's 2013 Constitution are either replaced or amended to bring them in line with that Constitution. Finally, it underlines the need for a robust civil society that is allowed to function freely and without government interference.

The conditions outlined in the ZDERA Amendment Act are reasonable and will not take too long to achieve. I urge President Mnangagwa to move ahead and repeal troublesome statutes and engage in meaningful economic reform along the lines of what Finance Minister Ncube has already recommended.

I remain concerned that a lack of momentum for reforming Zimbabwe

will squander the opportunity presented by the former President's ouster. We can't expect Zimbabwe to flip a switch and reverse nearly four decades of misrule in a few months' time, but we should expect more urgency to reform the economy and to expand the political space for the opposition.

There is no more outward sign that Zimbabwe has yet to turn the page than the government leveling charges against opposition figures like Tendai Biti and others. There is no purpose served by going after one's political opponents, especially in the wake of a contested election.

The new government of Zimbabwe bears much of the responsibility for forging a positive path forward, but the opposition party needs to play a constructive role there as well. The leader of the Movement for Democratic Change, Nelson Chamisa, is young and capable. He has a long career ahead of him. It would be to his benefit and to the benefit of all Zimbabweans to recognize the legitimacy of the new government and to help create an inclusive process moving ahead.

As in any democracy, Zimbabwe needs a loyal opposition in the form of an opposition party or parties to hold the government accountable within the framework of the rule of law. There will be new elections to contest and more chances to make the case to voters. Now is the time to unify the country.

During this past few months, I have thought often about my friends, like Peter Chaya and others in Zimbabwe, whom I know deserve far better from their government than they have received in the past four decades. They deserve a government that represents them, a government that provides an environment that allows them to follow their dreams and to realize the dreams of their children.

Zimbabwe deserves a government worthy of its people, and I encourage my colleagues to look for ways to engage constructively with Zimbabwe's new government moving ahead. The new ZDERA presents a good, worthy framework.

By next month, my role will change, but I will remain involved, and I will still be committed to a strong partnership between the United States and Zimbabwe.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Alaska.

S.J. RES. 54

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, we have been debating for quite some time on the Senate floor the Yemen war powers resolution introduced by my colleagues Senator SANDERS and Senator LEE, which would cut off support for the Saudi-led war in Yemen—support that began under President Obama.

Surrounding this vote today, many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have expressed extreme frustration with the Saudi Crown Prince, Muham-

mad bin Salman, especially regarding the death of Jamal Khashoggi, an American-based Saudi journalist murdered in Turkey. I have a lot of respect for the Senators weighing in, making their arguments all day today, including Senators YOUNG, LEE, CORKER, PAUL, GRAHAM, MURPHY, MENENDEZ, and CARDIN—many. We do need to understand what happened, what our intelligence and our government have surrounding this death. I am glad the CIA Director came to the Hill to brief Members. But this debate has taken something of a much more complex turn.

Certainly, the heinous murderers need to be held accountable. There is no doubt about that. But what we have been discussing, and what is really being implicated here on the floor—which hasn't really been talked about too much—is the broader issue of U.S. or American presence in the region, not just regarding the current conflict in Yemen but also our broader strategic relationship with Saudi Arabia and our national security interests in the region.

My colleagues are justified in their frustration—no doubt I share it as well—with the Saudis, with what is happening, but removing American leadership and oversight from this conflict through this resolution is not the way we should go about addressing this issue. We are trying to execute a policy that both reflects America's values and our national security interests. That is what is being debated here today. We need to send a strong message to the Saudis, but that message cannot undercut our own national security or those of our allies. The message cannot strengthen what clearly is the biggest threat in the region; that is, Iran, the largest state sponsor of terrorism, which almost nobody on the Senate floor has been talking about over the last several weeks. I intend to.

Today's vote has meant different things to different Senators. I have watched and listened to floor speeches. I have participated in debates with my colleagues within the Republican Conference and when all the Senators have met when we were briefed by administration officials.

I thought I would try to unpack a little bit of some of these different arguments as I have seen them and provide my views.

Generally, this debate is focused in three different areas: One, about the constitutional authority—the War Powers Act—that we have actually been undertaking these kind of operations with the Saudis in Yemen. The other is limiting and ending U.S. assistance to Saudi operations—U.S. military assistance—in Yemen. Finally, some Senators have been focused on downgrading the U.S. relationship with the Saudis because of what has been happening both in Yemen and with the Khashoggi murder.

First, let me talk about the constitutional arguments on the War Powers

Act; that the Trump administration needs congressional authority, either pursuant to the War Powers Act or, more important, pursuant to article II of the U.S. Constitution, to conduct military operations in support of Saudi Arabia's military goals in Yemen.

Senator LEE has done a great job of pressing this issue. There are many issues on which I agree with Senator LEE of Utah. He is clearly one of this body's most knowledgeable and passionate Members in safeguarding constitutional prerogatives, but in this case, I simply disagree with him and the other Senators whose views I view as way too restrictive on the Commander in Chief's ability to utilize our military.

If we set the precedent that even an operation such as the refueling of aircraft of allied countries, not even occurring in a war zone, needs congressional authority either through the War Powers Act or article II, we would severely limit the executive branch's ability to direct international crises and safeguard our global national security interests. I believe the notion that refueling allied aircraft constitutes hostilities would be an unworkable precedent and is a stretch of the term.

I have also been skeptical of Senate attempts to vote to remove Presidential authority on our military operations once those operations have begun. For example, we had a debate on military operations and the authority of our military to operate in Afghanistan, which I believe sends the wrong message to our troops. It is a precedent that once hostilities begin, we don't have the backs of our forces. I think that is also a dangerous precedent.

That is not to say this is not an important debate. It is certainly an important debate. Other Members such as Senator Kaine have talked about the importance of the issue of military authority, but with regard to this discussion, I think it is too limiting.

Let me talk about the second major issue involved that most Senators have been focused on: whether to vote to affirmatively end U.S. military assistance to Saudi Arabia and their actions in Yemen and whether and how, in doing so, it will help end the humanitarian disaster going on there.

I compliment Senator YOUNG and Senator MURPHY, who have been making the case passionately on this topic with much expertise. Clearly, they and this body have been focused on two goals: We all want a peaceful resolution to the conflict in Yemen, and we all want an end to the humanitarian disaster in Yemen.

The reason I voted against the resolution today is because I do not believe that either of these goals will be made easier or advanced by less American involvement in the conflict. To the contrary, if the United States no longer has the ability to help guide the Saudis militarily in Yemen, I believe these

two important goals—ending the humanitarian crisis and bringing a peaceful resolution—will actually be harder to reach.

That is not just my view; that was the view of Secretary Mattis and Secretary Pompeo when they came to brief all 100 Senators 2 weeks ago. In particular, Secretary Mattis knows the region and certainly knows about how hostilities end and begin in the region.

The basis of their arguments—with which I agree—was, first, there is no doubt the Saudis have prosecuted the war badly, but both the Obama administration's Department of Defense and the Trump administration's Department of Defense have worked hard to minimize casualties.

Does anyone actually believe the situation in Yemen will improve without U.S. assistance and guidance? The question almost answers itself. Having our military involved has helped the Saudis improve their coordination and improve their targeting to minimize civilian casualties. Having our military involved has helped the Saudis manage disagreements between them and their Gulf coalition partners. These partners also play an important role in helping to bring an end to this war.

Having our military involved has also helped provide critical leverage as we move into the hopeful peace negotiations underway in Sweden as we speak. Yemen's Government and the Houthi rebels have evidently agreed to a prisoner swap, which could include thousands of prisoners and could be the beginning of a diplomatic breakthrough.

I had the opportunity to talk with Secretaries Mattis and Pompeo this weekend. Both said this would be exactly the wrong time, at a key diplomatic moment, to have the United States limit and end its military assistance to Saudi Arabia.

I know sometimes people don't like to think this way, but military strength and leverage is often critical—critical to successful diplomatic negotiations. For the first time, there is promise—promise in negotiations in Sweden. All of us want that to succeed. However, I believe we undermine our chances of success in these diplomatic efforts if Congress forces the United States to end military assistance to the Saudis.

We also have an even more direct and real national security interest in the region. Yemen is an important front in the war on terror: It is the home to al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, AQAP. They have attempted multiple times to directly attack our homeland. They were responsible for the attack on the USS *Cole* that killed 17 sailors and severely wounded 39 others, and they were responsible for the 2015 massacre at Charlie Hebdo's offices in Paris. Limiting our military involvement in Yemen could pose significant risk with regard to AQAP that I believe would be unacceptable for the American people.

The third line of argument we have seen on the floor and many have been

discussing goes much broader than just the relationship between our military involvement in Yemen and really implicates the entire U.S.-Saudi strategic relationship. It is the desire of a number of my colleagues to use this debate and the despicable Khashoggi murder as an opportunity to fully downgrade this decades-old strategic relationship.

The Saudis are difficult partners, no doubt. They have been for decades. Last week, when I was presiding, Senator RUBIO gave an excellent speech saying that he believed the Saudis are testing the limits of their relationship with the United States and that we should look to draw some hard lines and recalibrate elements of our relationship while demanding improvements in other areas. I agreed with much of Senator RUBIO's speech, including his conclusion, like mine, that we should not be cutting off our military assistance to the Saudis in Yemen because it would do much more harm than good.

Nevertheless, some Senators have argued for much more downgrading of the U.S. relationship with Saudi Arabia. In fact, so much of this has been exclusively focused on the Saudis, with no other reference to any other country in the Middle East, that it seems this debate on the floor has been in a vacuum, but as we know, there are a lot more countries in the region, including the world's biggest sponsor of state terrorism, Iran, which nobody is talking about. We should be talking about them because, in fact, the war in Yemen began when Tehran-backed Houthi rebels seized power in 2015. Again, there is not a lot of discussion about how it began.

Tehran is trying to establish a Hezbollah-like entity on the Arabian Peninsula in Yemen, including increased 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—whether Saudi Arabia, Gulf Arab States, and of course Israel—with proxy fighters throughout Syria, Lebanon, Yemen, and close relationships in Iraq. Yet no one in this debate seems to want to talk about Iran. I thought I would do so for a minute.

Let's talk about the humanitarian crisis in Yemen. U.S. humanitarian aid has totaled almost \$697 million in the past 14 months. Yes, Saudi Arabia could do a much better job, but they have invested well over \$1 billion to try to end the suffering. Iran—the country which started the war, the country nobody on the Senate floor is talking about—not a dime to relieve the suffering. Sure, they have supplied weapons and ballistic missiles in the tens of millions of dollars but nothing to relieve the suffering.

If we cut off U.S. military assistance to Riyadh and Yemen, you had better believe the one capital in the Middle East that will be cheering the loudest is Tehran—again, the world's largest

state sponsor of terrorism. Such an action would further embolden Iran and no doubt embolden its proxies, while at the same time our allies, including Israel, would feel less secure.

As this debate has carried on in the Senate, with no one talking about the largest state sponsor of terrorism, I have found it very troubling because the lens through which we need to view security in the Middle East is through Iran. Although we have dissatisfaction and frustration with some of our allies, we must remember the most significant and serious threat in the Middle East continues to be Iran.

There has been a lot of focus on the horrible death of Mr. Khashoggi. Any death is horrible, but let me talk about some other deaths.

In the Middle East, in Iraq, we have had over 500 American military members killed and almost 2,000 wounded by improvised explosive devices supplied to Iraqi Shia militias by the Iranians. Let me say that again: Over 2,000 Americans killed and wounded by the largest state sponsor of terrorism. Yet nobody seems to talk about that. Yes, one death of an American journalist is horrible. Over 2,000 American dead and wounded is really horrible. Where was the outrage about those deaths? Where was the outrage about those murders? Where were the editorials about those murders of American citizens? The previous administration wasn't focused on those because they were focused on the Iran nuclear deal.

All I am saying is, in this debate, nobody is talking about the real enemy of the United States—the Iranians, who are watching this debate and smiling because no one is talking about them. So I thought it was important to come down and say: Some of us are. Some of us know you are behind the war in Yemen. Some of us know you continually say you want to wipe Israel off the face of the Earth. Some of us know the Iran deal only emboldened you.

What we need to keep in mind is, yes, we have difficult partners. No doubt the Saudis are difficult. They are not perfect by any sense of the word.

But this is a difficult region, and these are difficult issues, and if we think we can debate Yemen and our help there without talking about the Saudis and the Iranians, who started the war and are trying to circle our different allies, including Israel, and think somehow that this debate is not emboldening them more, I think we are misguided.

I voted against this resolution because I still think it is important to keep in mind that the lens through which we need to assess our security interests and those of our allies in the Middle East is through what helps or undermines Iran. I am concerned that this resolution can help them, and that is not good for the United States, it is not good for the war in Yemen, it is not good for the humanitarian catastrophe in Yemen, and it is certainly not good for all allies like Israel.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I want to begin by thanking a number of my colleagues who have contributed so much to bringing us to this point on S.J. Res. 54. I have been very pleased and honored to work with them in co-sponsoring these measures in the past—most recently in March and now today—to end all U.S. involvement in the Saudi-led war in Yemen that is killing innocent civilians and murdering children and committing, arguably, war crimes.

The United States should have no complicity in these actions that betray our values and our national interest, so this resolution would direct the removal of all U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities.

There are many to thank—Senators SANDERS and LEE, Senator MENENDEZ, and my colleague from Connecticut, Senator MURPHY—but I want to thank some people who have not been mentioned during this proceeding.

Before Yemen and before the killing of Khashoggi—that is, before the civil war in Yemen and the Saudi involvement in it and before the brutal, heinous killing of the American journalist Jamal Khashoggi—there was 9/11. The victims and loved ones of those victims are remembered by me. They are friends. They are heroes. They have fought relentlessly to hold the Government of Saudi Arabia accountable for its culpability—not yet proven in court, but they are seeking to hold the monarchy accountable for its possible involvement.

They have been largely absent from the discussion on this floor, but they are the original champions of holding the Saudis responsible for any and all possible involvement in supporting the 9/11 attack on our Nation. Make no mistake—their loved ones were victims, but it was an attack on our Nation, on the Twin Towers, on our Defense Department, on a plane that was forced to crash in Pennsylvania.

I am pleased that the U.S. Senate is pursuing justice for Jamal Khashoggi. He was a journalist, an opinion writer for an American newspaper with two young children who are U.S. citizens.

The United States has a moral obligation to end support for a government that engages in this kind of heinous, murderous action. There is intelligence that points directly to the highest levels of the Saudi monarchy—namely to the Crown Prince, Muhammad bin Salman.

The United States ought to end its support for the humanitarian crisis caused by the Saudi-led war in Yemen. Make no mistake—it was and is a Saudi-led attack, and the Kingdom is responsible for it, but this monarchy was doing bad things and engaged in bad behavior well before the Yemen civil war and Khashoggi's tragic death. The Saudis have a long record of violating human rights and international

norms. They have funded extremism that led to the rise of terrorism. They may well have provided financial support and even training for the Saudis who went to the United States and thereafter enabled and led and participated in the attack on this Nation.

We should never forget the survivors and the loved ones of 9/11. We should never overlook the Saudi role in that horrific attack. We should never relent in supporting those 9/11 families.

Fortunately, we have made progress in holding Saudi Arabia accountable for its culpability in 9/11. In 2016, this Congress unanimously passed the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act—JASTA—to allow terrorist victims their day in court, their fair opportunity to hold accountable state sponsors of terrorism, including the Saudi Arabian Government. This September, the Senate unanimously passed my resolution to release all classified documents related to the 9/11 attack. These documents are absolutely essential to giving those families their day in court because they are the evidence that is needed to establish the link the United States has—intelligence dating from those days now seemingly long ago—that inculcates the Saudis.

We must support the continued investigation into 9/11 by our law enforcement and intelligence agencies, and we must support those 9/11 families to ensure that the facts are made public and that the necessary individuals, entities, and governments are held accountable.

The families of victims who perished on that horrific day deserve answers about those events and circumstances surrounding the terrorist attack. We know their pain and grief are very much with them. We should respect their loss and honor it with action.

We should recognize those heroes like Brett Eagleson of Connecticut and the families of Connecticut and New York and New Jersey and all around the country—and so many are from our area of New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey—who continue to demand justice and have done so year after year—well before this resolution came before us.

I say to my colleagues today, we need to keep our resolve alive and well to never forget, never yield to hopelessness, never allow our support for these 9/11 families to diminish, never cease our quest for justice in the name of Brett Eagleson's dad and his family and every family who still suffers the pain and grief from 9/11.

Given the role of the Saudi Government in perpetrating the 9/11 attacks, the brutal murder of Jamal Khashoggi, and the Saudi-inflicted humanitarian crisis, this reevaluation of the U.S. relationship with Saudi Arabia is long overdue.

The Saudi-led war has consisted of an aggressive campaign as brutal as the murder of Jamal Khashoggi, indiscriminately killing civilians and

Houthis alike. Day after day, the humanitarian crisis of famine, cholera, other medical afflictions, and simple trauma to those children trying to grow up in the midst of exploding bombs continues to get worse. The United Nations warns that 14 million Yemenis could face starvation—14 million—14 million innocent people facing starvation.

Diplomatic efforts, in coordination with the United Nations and European allies, are vital to establish a peace framework and ensure civilian access to humanitarian aid.

In the absence of meaningful action from the United States, the humanitarian crisis in Yemen will only worsen. Regional instability will be exacerbated. America's standing in the global community will be further undercut and enduringly diminished.

In March of this year, I led a letter to the Department of Defense with my colleague Senator JACK REED of Rhode Island, along with many of our colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee, stating our concern regarding U.S. support for Saudi military operations against the Houthis in Yemen and asking about the DOD's involvement, apparently without appropriate notification of Congress, and its agreements to provide refueling support to the Saudis and the Saudi coalition partners. We were concerned that the DOD had not appropriately documented reimbursements for aerial refueling support provided by the United States.

Eight months later—just days ago—the Department of Defense responded to our letter and admitted that it has failed to appropriately notify Congress of its support agreements; it has failed to adequately charge Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates for fuel and refueling assistance. That admission 8 months after our inquiry is a damning indictment. These errors in accounting mean that the United States was directly funding the Saudi war in Yemen. It has been doing it since March of 2015.

In November, the administration announced an end to U.S. aerial refueling support for Saudi military operations in Yemen, but we still must determine whether the Department of Defense was incompetent or disingenuous—or both—in failing to charge the Saudis and Emiratis for previous refueling assistance. We need accountability, a full explanation from the Department of Defense.

The Department will be seeking reimbursement for its refueling support, but I will continue to demand and conduct oversight to get to the bottom of this apparent negligence. I have made the DOD aware of my concerns, and I will evaluate whether an inspector general investigation is necessary to determine the extent to which U.S. taxpayer funds—potentially millions and tens of millions of dollars—were used to fund the Saudi war and used to fund it without the legally required acknowledgment and approval from the Congress of the United States.

Very simply, the United States should not be funding this war. We should not be supporting this war. We should not be providing intelligence or logistics support. We should not be complicit in the indiscriminate targeting of civilians in Yemen, the murder of children, the famine and humanitarian crisis that are ongoing right now. That is why today we should pass this resolution.

It is all the more important today, as well, that the Senate take a stand, given the Trump family ties to the Saudis and the President's habit of undermining the intelligence community. In the absence of leadership from the President, Congress must reassert its constitutional responsibility to authorize the use of U.S. military support.

We must take action to uphold the Constitution, as well as American values and interests. Intelligence assessments indicate with high certainty that members of the Saudi royal family, including the Crown Prince MBS, ordered and orchestrated the murder of Jamal Khashoggi. But both President Trump and his son-in-law Jared Kushner have undermined these findings and tried to stifle the intelligence community conclusions. They have undermined not only these conclusions but more broadly the intelligence community itself.

President Trump has debased and dishonored brave intelligence professionals by demeaning their fact-based conclusions as "feelings." President Trump has falsely claimed that "we may never know all the facts surrounding the murder of Mr. Jamal Khashoggi."

His Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, unfortunately, have further demeaned those findings by saying that there is no direct evidence or there is no smoking gun. The fact is that there is powerful and compelling evidence.

We know from public statements of my colleagues coming from briefings by the intelligence community, and we recently learned that the White House Middle East adviser—I should put "adviser" in quotes—Jared Kushner offered advice to his close friend Muhammad Bin Salman about how to "weather the storm" during the warranted backlash of Saudi Arabia after the murder of Jamal Khashoggi. Rather than ensuring accountability, Jared Kushner is inexplicably offering support.

There is also stunning evidence that the Saudi Government lobbyists reserved blocks of rooms at the Trump hotel in Washington, paying for an estimated 500 nights in the luxury hotel just 3 months after President Trump was elected, bringing veterans to Washington to lobby against JASTA, the bill I mentioned earlier—the bill that enables the 9/11 victims to have their day in court, the bill that upholds American interests and American values and American people.

The effort of the Saudi Government to bring those veterans to Washington

and fund their stays in the Trump hotel was a despicable irony and insult to America, but it yielded the Trump Organization \$270,000 and millions of dollars, by the President's own acknowledgment—indeed, his boasting—go to the Trump organization from condos, apartments, and offices rented or bought in New York, Chicago, and Washington, DC, to say nothing of deals that may be contemplated by the Trump Organization now or after Donald Trump leaves office. These kinds of payments and benefits directly implicate the emoluments clause of the Constitution. They are part of the reason that I have enlisted almost 200 of my colleagues in the U.S. Congress in a lawsuit called *Blumenthal v. Trump*, and I believe this lawsuit, which claims that the President violated the chief anti-corruption provision of the U.S. Constitution, will shed even more light on those payments and benefits from Saudi Arabia and other countries around the world. These friendships and conflicts of interest demonstrate the very flawed and likely corrupt basis for the Trump administration's foreign policy with Saudi Arabia.

American credibility is at stake. We must end all U.S. involvement in the Saudi war. We must sanction the top levels of the Saudi monarchy under relevant statutes like the Global Magnitsky Act. We must ensure that the President removes U.S. forces from any hostilities against the Yemeni people.

There are countless reasons to vote for this resolution. I call on my colleagues to support it and to make sure that U.S. support for this unacceptable conflict in Saudi—the aggression and attacks by Saudi Arabia on innocent civilians—is ended now.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, under our Constitution, we have article I, which addresses the powers of Congress, and article II, the powers of the Presidency. Our Founders were so concerned that the President would take us into war without justification that they made sure to explicitly place the power to go to war with Congress—with the House and Senate.

But here we are, debating the issue of how the President took us into war in Yemen as a facilitator of Saudi Arabia, providing intelligence, providing advice, refueling planes, providing armaments. It is time for us to take a powerful and clear stand and change this and end this.

Here is what has been going on. For multiple years now, Saudi Arabia has been bombing the civilian infrastructure of Yemen, indiscriminately slaughtering civilians, destroying schools and hospitals and neighborhoods and water systems. What is the result of destroying the water systems? The largest outbreak of cholera in the history of humankind. We now have

well over 100 children under the age of 5 dying of hunger and starvation each day. We are told by the experts that 8 to 14 million people are at risk of starvation, but many are already starving, and not just children under 5—the whole spectrum of society.

We have been directly involved in ways that, in my mind, violate the War Powers Act by directly facilitating the movement of armaments and assisting Saudi Arabia in this assault, and this assault must end. We have to send a strong message, and we can do that through this vote we are facing ahead of us. That is one piece of the conversation regarding Saudi Arabia.

The other piece is that the Saudi Government has assassinated an American resident—an American resident who is also an American newspaper columnist. What do we have as a response? We have the weakest possible response from President Trump, with President Trump saying that we don't know what happened. The Saudi Crown Prince may have been involved; he might not have been involved. Who will ever know?

We need a strong watchdog for American values. We need the President to stand up to Saudi Arabia. We don't need to hear that we are going to be weak in the face of an assassination of an American resident because they happen to buy armaments from the United States. Yet that is what we are hearing from President Trump—weakness, selling out American values because they buy some American products.

What more trouble can we invite around the world if we don't stand up for human rights and we don't stand up for our residents and we don't stand up for our journalists, all tied in together here?

Let's be forceful in how we vote on this resolution. Let's send a strong message.

This challenge of the President in ignoring the article I powers in our Constitution, in which the power to be involved in war is vested in this body, Congress, is not the only problem we have. We also have core corruption of our Constitution in the form of gerrymandering and voter suppression and dark money, all of which erode the fundamental vision, the vision in our Constitution of a "we the people" government, one that serves as President Lincoln so eloquently said, to operate "of the people, by the people, for the people." Instead, we have the government operating of, by, and for the powerful in this country—the 1 percent in this country.

It certainly wasn't done in 2017 with a tax bill that took \$1.5 trillion—or call it \$2 trillion, if you include the interest on the \$1.5 trillion—out of our Federal Treasury and gave it to the very richest Americans. Boy, that is not a "we the people" action.

We didn't invest in healthcare. We didn't invest in education. We need apprenticeship programs. We need technical education. We need better public

schools. We need affordable colleges. We didn't invest in education. We didn't make our healthcare system more affordable. We didn't take on the drug companies. We didn't proceed to invest in the challenge of unaffordable housing. We didn't invest in infrastructure and create living-wage jobs. Those are the four foundations of a thriving family—healthcare, housing, education, and living-wage jobs. We ignored all of that and had the government of the powerful giving \$1.5 trillion or \$2 trillion, if we include the interest, to the richest Americans—government by and for the powerful.

Voter suppression is a key strategy in this. What did President Reagan have to say about that? President Reagan said: "For this Nation to remain true to its principles, we cannot allow any American's vote to be denied, diluted or defiled."

Now, there is a statement by a man who understood that voting is the foundation of our democratic republic—a core right of Americans—and he believed we needed to stand up and make sure that core value remains fully intact. But so often in our Nation we have seen those who wield power for the powerful proceed to deny or dilute or defile the power to vote, particularly in poor communities, particularly in communities of color.

We have seen everything. We have seen poll taxes. We have seen literacy tests. We have seen post-Civil War good character tests. We have seen the use of felony charges to make it impossible for African Americans to vote in the South. We have seen voter intimidation, and we have seen it sometimes through racist dog whistling and political postcards. We have a long history of these types of actions to deny, dilute, and defile the power to vote.

I would like to say there is something of our past that we saw with the 1965 Voting Rights Act, but that act was struck down by the Supreme Court. We are seeing all kinds of forms of voter suppression emerge in 2016 and 2018.

In 2018, thousands of Native Americans in North Dakota living on Tribal reserves and using their P.O. boxes for their mail address were kept from casting a ballot because of a law that came into effect in 2018. It said you can't vote without a conventional address—the North Dakota "conventional address" effort to dilute or deny or obstruct the power to vote.

In Georgia, the then-secretary of State, Brian Kemp, who was himself running for Governor, attempted to block 53,000 Georgians from voting—70 percent of whom were African-American voters—because of minor differences in the wording of the way they filled out their registration form. If the name wasn't exactly identical or had some other slight variation, he was sitting on those voting registration cards—the "identical name" gambit from Georgia.

In Ohio, a county elections board proceeded on the orders of Secretary of

State Jon Husted to purge thousands of Ohioans from the voting rolls. If you are not on the voting rolls, you can't vote when the election comes. Again, who were disproportionately affected? African Americans—the Ohio voting roll purge strategy of voter suppression.

What did we see in North Carolina? Thanks to a law passed by the Republican State legislature, nearly 20 percent of North Carolina's early voting locations were closed, forcing voters to travel longer or wait in long election-day lines to cast their vote. I will give you one guess on who was impacted the most. Who was this target aimed at? Well, it was aimed at African-American voters—the long line strategy from North Carolina and Kansas, as well.

In Kansas, the county clerk in Dodge City, citing construction, moved the only polling place in a town that is 60 percent Hispanic from a spot downtown to an arena built for rodeo and farming shows outside the city limits. This was a location that had no sidewalk and is separated from the rest of the city by train tracks, making it as difficult as possible for voters to get there. It was targeted at a Hispanic community.

We saw voting suppression aimed at college students, too. In Iowa, the legislature passed a bill to cut 11 days off early voting this year in order to make it harder to vote. It also had a tricky little deal on an ID requirement, which will not now go into effect until next year, but it created a great deal of confusion about this year because it made people think they weren't eligible to vote because it said your ID had to have an expiration date on it. Why was this tricky little thing done? Because college IDs often don't have an expiration date on them.

Well, it is a total violation of the vision Ronald Reagan laid out, and really, of the foundation—the vision—of our Constitution and the power to vote.

In New Hampshire, a bill was signed into law this past July aimed at suppressing college-age voters as well. It says students and other part-time residents have to become permanent residents in order to cast a ballot? You have to buy an in-State license. If you have a car in another State, you have to reregister it in New Hampshire, which means registration fees, fees for license plates, and possibly separate State and municipal fees. It is like a poll tax placed on college students. So there we have this 21st century poll tax coming back aimed at college students.

Why are all these voting suppression strategies aimed at poor communities, aimed at communities of color, African-American communities and Hispanic communities? Why are they aimed at college students? They are aimed at these three populations because those three populations vote primarily on the Democratic side of the ballot. It is wrong for any official in this country to simply target voters of

the other party to try to prevent them from voting. It is un-American. It goes against the essence of what our Constitution is all about.

It is wrong, and yet, since the Voting Rights Act was torn down by the Supreme Court of the United States, we see it time and again. We don't just see it before the election. We see it during the election day.

In Georgia, we saw hours-long lines to vote in majority-minority districts, either because machines didn't happen to be working or they didn't have the extension cords to turn them on.

In Arizona, one polling place didn't exist on election day because even though people were told to vote there, it was in a building that was locked up. Voting machines were inside, but the doors were locked. The building had been foreclosed on, but they didn't bother to move it next door or somewhere close by, enabling people to vote.

In Texas, we heard about the machines that were changing people's votes from a Democratic candidate to Republican candidate.

All the while, President Trump was working to cast doubt on the legitimacy of our normal election processes—tweeting out that ballots coming in after election night shouldn't be counted. What was he talking about down in Florida, about ballots that shouldn't be counted? We are talking about the absentee ballots for our soldiers overseas. But because the President was concerned that they might change the outcome, he didn't want them counted.

If only Ronald Reagan could spend a few minutes with President Trump and remind him of what our Nation is all about, what our Constitution is all about, how important voting is, and that it should never be denied or diluted.

None of these efforts are unique. We saw these efforts back in 2016, as well, in the first election after the Voting Rights Act was torn down by the Supreme Court. That was the Shelby County v. Holder decision. The Court thought this wasn't necessary any more. Maybe they should ask Congress whether it was necessary. Now that we find out it was necessary, maybe they should reverse their decision. We need to put a new issue before them. Maybe we need a new Voting Rights Act. Maybe it should apply to every State, rather than just the States that were in the 1965 Voting Rights Act bill.

In 2016, that first election after the Voting Rights Act was torn down by the Supreme Court, we saw 900 fewer polling places open to voters than in 2014—2 years earlier. Most of that change was in the States that previously were under the regulation, the oversight of the Voting Rights Act. We saw that in Texas, Arizona, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, South Carolina, and North Carolina. When you reduce the number of polling places in poor communities and communities of color, you create long wait lines, and you deny the vote.

Nearly 17,000 Wisconsinites—disproportionately minorities—were kept from the polls because of Wisconsin's voter ID law. The State saw its lowest turnout in two decades. This law had nothing to do with security. It had everything to do with voter suppression because it is a known fact that residents in low-income and minority communities are less likely to be able to access the IDs that are required for polls. This is keenly targeted.

In fact, after North Carolina's voter ID law was struck down in 2016, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals decision noted that it targeted African Americans with "almost surgical precision." The State resorted that year—after it was struck down—to eliminating early voting days, severely curtailing the number of polling places, and affecting their hours of operation in communities of color.

By the way, the lead plaintiff in the case that challenged the voting suppression strategy of the voter ID law passed away this weekend at age 97. Ms. Rosanell Eaton was once described by President Obama as a beacon of civil rights. She was a life-long devotee of and advocate for voting rights. Now, that is a patriot.

It is because of unsung heroes like her that our Nation has come far and why we must continue pushing ourselves forward to ensure justice and equality for all.

In a "we the people" nation, can any of these efforts to suppress the vote be allowed to continue? The answer is no—not if we want the vision of government of, by, and for the people. How can any of us sit by and allow citizens of this country—citizens like Rosanell Eaton—to be systematically denied the most fundamental right?

We have to work together—Democrats and Republicans—to honor and to strengthen the vision of the ability to vote. We need a fierce and formidable voting rights bill for the 21st century, ensuring in every way possible that every single American can exercise his or her right to vote freely and fairly. We need a voting rights bill that bans the type of shenanigans and the types of deceptive strategies that target poor communities, communities of color, and college students that I talked about today.

But we also need a voting rights bill that requires preapproval for changes to voting procedures to make sure that they are not being changed in order to take away the ability to vote and to make it more difficult for some communities than for other communities within a State. We need a voting rights commission with the power to ban new voter suppression practices as they evolve because, surely, people will try new strategies from people who do not believe in the vision of our Constitution.

From the 15th amendment of 1870, which recognized African-Americans' right to vote, to the 19th amendment of 1920, 50 years later, which recognized a

woman's right to vote, and all the way up to the civil rights marches of the 1960s and the 1965 Voting Rights Act, America's story has been of expanding opportunity for every American to have a say in the direction of our government.

But we are far from ensuring that today every American has that opportunity because the strategies of voter suppression are rampant, they are extensive, and they are targeted. Voter suppression and voter intimidation must end, and we need to ensure that every American has the unfettered right to have a voice in their government, that every American has the unfettered right to cast a ballot during the election.

President Reagan had it right back in 1981. He supported the expansion of the Voting Rights Act. He said: "For this Nation to remain true to its principles, we cannot allow any American's vote to be denied, diluted or defiled."

Let's make it so.

Thank you, Mr. President.

(Mr. GARDNER assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). The Senator from Colorado.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar Nos. 1154 through 1169 and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John N. T. Shanahan

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Kevin B. Schneider

IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Stephen J. Hager

Brig. Gen. Mary K. Leahy
Brig. Gen. Gabriel Troiano
Brig. Gen. Jonathan Woodson

To be brigadier general

Col. Tina B. Boyd
Col. Brian T. Cashman
Col. Walter M. Duzzny
Col. Eric Folkestad
Col. Ernest Litynski
Col. Nelson G. Rosen

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Laura L. Yeager

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Michael M. Gilday

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be major general

Brigadier General Jeffrey W. Burkett
Brigadier General Jessica Meyeraan
Brigadier General Russ A. Walz

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Colonel James R. Camp
Colonel Wesley J. Clare
Colonel James T. Demarest
Colonel John M. Green
Colonel Peter T. Green, III
Colonel Robert C. Korte
Colonel Darrin P. Leleux
Colonel Mark A. Maldonado
Colonel James P. Marren
Colonel John R. Mulvey
Colonel John F. O'Connell
Colonel Matthew J. Peterson
Colonel Robert A. Schulte
Colonel James G. Silvasy

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Darrin K. Anderson
Colonel Mark D. Auer
Colonel Buel J. Dickson
Colonel Kenneth S. Eaves
Colonel Steven S. Lambrecht
Colonel Toni M. Lord
Colonel Glen A. Martel
Colonel David W. May
Colonel Gary A. McCue
Colonel Thomas H. Mora
Colonel John W. Pogorek

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Thomas A. Dukes, Jr.

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Christopher L. Montanaro

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brigadier General Vito E. Addabbo
Brigadier General Maureen G. Banavive
Brigadier General Brian K. Borgen
Brigadier General John P. Healy
Brigadier General John A. Hickok
Brigadier General Jay D. Jensen
Brigadier General Linda M. Marsh
Brigadier General Todd J. McCubbin
Brigadier General Tyler D. Otten
Brigadier General Boyd C. L. Parker, IV

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Elizabeth E. Arledge
Colonel Matthew J. Burger
Colonel Kenneth R. Council, Jr.
Colonel Derin S. Durham
Colonel Paul R. Fast
Colonel Christopher A. Freeman
Colonel Constance L. Jenkins
Colonel Paul E. Knapp
Colonel Douglas S. Martin
Colonel Jody A. Merritt
Colonel John M. Olson
Colonel Stacey L. Scarisbrick
Colonel David W. Smith
Colonel Roger P. Suro

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Sami D. Said

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601 and for appointment as a Senior Member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations under title 10, U.S.C., section 711:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. David W. Allvin

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated while serving as Chief of Chaplains of the Navy under title 10, U.S.C., section 5142:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Brent W. Scott

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. John J. Bartrum
Col. Anita L. Fligge

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN2155 AIR FORCE nominations (19) beginning LISA M. BADER, and ending ILAINA M. WINGLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2018.

PN2565 AIR FORCE nomination of Sung-Yul Lee, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 5, 2018.

PN2610 AIR FORCE nominations (38) beginning FRANCISCA A. ALAKA LAMPTON,

and ending MICHAEL D. ZIMMER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 13, 2018.

PN2611 AIR FORCE nominations (1268) beginning CHRISTOPHER GENE ADAMS, and ending BENJAMIN PAUL ZUNIGA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 13, 2018.

PN2627 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning STEVEN D. SIKORA, and ending Anita Sargent, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 14, 2018.

PN2654 AIR FORCE nomination of Luke M. Sauter, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2655 AIR FORCE nomination of Tasha L. Pravecsek, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2656 AIR FORCE nomination of Brian J. Neff, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2657 AIR FORCE nomination of Cory A. Cooper, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2658 AIR FORCE nomination of Joel A. Sloan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2659 AIR FORCE nominations (3) beginning JAMIE J. JOHNSON, and ending RENEE M. SUMMERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2660 AIR FORCE nomination of Timothy B. Murphy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2661 AIR FORCE nomination of Andrew M. Deramus, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2662 AIR FORCE nomination of Brianne D. Newman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2683 AIR FORCE nominations (76) beginning MOHAN S. AKELLA, and ending WILLIAM E. ZUTELL, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 29, 2018.

PN2684 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning Jennifer L. Gurganus, and ending April H. Clemmensen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 29, 2018.

IN THE ARMY

PN2566 ARMY nomination of Harold E. Turks, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 5, 2018.

PN2567 ARMY nominations (4) beginning BENJAMIN M. LIPARI, and ending GREGORY S. SOULE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 5, 2018.

PN2568 ARMY nomination of Jennifer L. Wright, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 5, 2018.

PN2569 ARMY nomination of Christiaan D. Taylor, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 5, 2018.

PN2613 ARMY nomination of Shayne R. Estes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 13, 2018.

PN2614 ARMY nomination of Michael W. Keebaugh, which was received by the Senate

and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 13, 2018.

PN2615 ARMY nomination of Heins V. Recheungel, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 13, 2018.

PN2616 ARMY nomination of John R. Schwab, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 13, 2018.

PN2617 ARMY nomination of Amanda L. Silvers, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 13, 2018.

PN2618 ARMY nomination of Ricky L. Warren, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 13, 2018.

PN2619 ARMY nomination of Eric R. Swenson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 13, 2018.

PN2620 ARMY nominations (17) beginning ANTHONY C. ADOLPH, and ending KAY K. WAKATAKE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 13, 2018.

PN2628 ARMY nominations (10) beginning SCOTT S. BRENNEMAN, and ending KEVIN V. THOMPSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 14, 2018.

PN2629 ARMY nomination of Richard S. Taylor, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 14, 2018.

PN2630 ARMY nominations (10) beginning JASON A. FERGUSON, and ending SAMUEL M. SIEGAL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 14, 2018.

PN2631 ARMY nomination of Daniel S. Marshall, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 14, 2018.

PN2632 ARMY nomination of Christopher G. Neeley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 14, 2018.

PN2633 ARMY nominations (2) beginning SAMUEL J. HIBRONPADILLA, and ending SCOTT D. INGALSBE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 14, 2018.

PN2634 ARMY nomination of Kindra C. New, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 14, 2018.

PN2635 ARMY nominations (100) beginning SANDRA L. AHINGA, and ending D014887, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 14, 2018.

PN2636 ARMY nomination of Rhonda C. Pugh, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 14, 2018.

PN2663 ARMY nomination of Jeremy W. Lewis, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2664 ARMY nomination of David R. Dinklocker, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2665 ARMY nomination of Loren C. Duwel, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2666 ARMY nomination of Renrose V. Hinkle, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2667 ARMY nomination of Sarah L. Fortier, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2668 ARMY nomination of David A. Neveau, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2669 ARMY nomination of Kyle B. Hurst, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 26, 2018.

PN2685 ARMY nominations (44) beginning RAYMOND R. ADAMS, III, and ending MATTHEW E. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 29, 2018.

PN2686 ARMY nomination of Paul M. Fugere, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 29, 2018.

PN2687 ARMY nomination of Clarence K. Graham, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 29, 2018.

PN2688 ARMY nomination of Jackson A. Kurtzman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 29, 2018.

PN2689 ARMY nomination of Jeremy T. Tennent, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 29, 2018.

PN2690 ARMY nomination of Jonathan D. Thompson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 29, 2018.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN2637 MARINE CORPS nomination of James D. Foley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 14, 2018.

PN2693 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning ROBERT A. GREEN, JR., and ending JESUS S. MENDEZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 29, 2018.

IN THE NAVY

PN2621 NAVY nominations (45) beginning JOSHUA C. ANDRES, and ending TRAVIS R. VOSLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 13, 2018.

PN2691 NAVY nomination of Thomas J. Zerr, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 29, 2018.

PN2692 NAVY nomination of Shelton L. Lyons, II, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 29, 2018.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESSS

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak to up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, when we set out to update and reform our criminal justice system, we sought the expertise from a broad range of stakeholders and advocates. Our focus has always been to reduce crime and recidivism and improve fairness in a way that promotes safety and respect for

the law. We could not have done this without the essential input from a number of key law enforcement organizations that partnered with us in this endeavor.

The Fraternal Order of Police, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives played a formative role in the updated text we released earlier today. Their continued leadership and good faith engagement have cut a path forward on a once-in-a-generation chance to improve American justice. I would also like to thank the National District Attorneys Association, the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, and Law Enforcement Leaders to Reduce Crime and Incarceration, who gave valuable input on this bill. Their engagement offered important law enforcement perspective in the initial stages of our work.

While some groups have chosen to stay on the sidelines or even undermine our work, these organizations have provided us with critical feedback needed to refine and strengthen the First Step Act. They have helped to advance law enforcement priorities and the goals of reform.

With President Trump's continued leadership, the wealth of input from voices across the political spectrum, and Senator MCCONNELL's work in bringing this up for a vote, I look forward to getting this bill signed into law.

TRIBUTE TO BOB CORKER

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, In his two terms in the Senate, BOB CORKER established a strong reputation as a visionary leader who offered innovative, commonsense solutions and developed an extraordinary expertise in foreign policy. He has served the people of Tennessee and of America with distinction and will always be a good friend.

He certainly was well-prepared when he came to the Senate in 2007. His early work on a charitable mission to Haiti inspired him to serve his home community of Chattanooga as an advocate for the disadvantaged. He built a successful business, providing jobs and opportunity to others. As mayor of Chattanooga, he led initiatives to improve education, reduce crime, grow the economy, and increase accountability in government. Those experiences and accomplishments guided his work in the Senate.

As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CORKER has been a powerful voice for U.S. global leadership and diplomacy, a complement to his visits to more than 70 nations since he took office in 2007. Although he has many accomplishments worth mentioning, I believe his leadership this year in enacting the BUILD Act, which modernizes American development finance to drive long-term economic growth in the developing world, may be among his most lasting contributions

to American diplomacy and global security.

Senator CORKER does not seek partisan advantage, but common ground. He has been an extraordinary Senator who always did what he believed was right. He has contributed greatly to our country and served his State well. I commend my colleague, Senator BOB CORKER, for his outstanding service, and I thank him for his commitment, integrity, and friendship.

THE STOPPING IMPROPER PAYMENTS TO DECEASED PEOPLE ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Social Security Administration needs to get out of the death data business. Unfortunately, S. 2374, the Stopping Improper Payments to Deceased People Act, moves the issue in the wrong direction. Under current law, the Social Security Administration receives death data from the States. SSA shares the State data with other Federal benefit paying agencies. This bill would expand the distribution of the State data and burden the Social Security Administration with responsibilities unrelated to running the Social Security program. Similar to a musician receiving compensation each time their song plays on Spotify or Apple Music, the States own the data, want to control the distribution of the data, and deserve adequate compensation. Proceeds from the use of State death data helps maintain State vital records offices. Because the bill would increase sharing of personal data by the Federal Government at the expense of States, I will object to any unanimous consent request to proceed to or pass this bill. I hope the sponsors of this bill will work with the Finance Committee on this important issue in the future.

THANKING STAFF

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, before I depart the Senate, I want to again recognize my staff in my Washington, DC, and State offices for their hard work and service to North Dakota, the Senate, and the Nation.

As I said in my farewell remarks, I have the best staff in the Senate, and I ask that their names be included in the RECORD: Tessa Gould, Abbie McDonough, Connor Joseph, Ian Jannetta, Jesse Overton, Jared Pfliger, Robert Chester, Beth Nielson, Tracee Sutton, Megan DesCamps, Craig Radcliffe, Matt Squeri, Libby Marking, Jared Henderson, Ryan Tvedt, Jon Cheatwood, Libby Schneider, Anna Diederich, Jacob Westlin, James Feinstein, Kevin George, Alec Buckley, Guneev Sharma, Santiago Gonzalez, Jeessue Lee, Virginia Hagerott, Prescott Robinson, Stacy Austad, Olivia Cox, Patrick Brende, Bryce Hample, Eric Bursch, Ashley Poling, Anthony Papian, Jared Lennon, Allison Tinsey, Dean Williams, Ross Keys, Jane Opdahl, Joanne Beckman, Megan

Carranza, Shirley Meyer, Aimee Kittilson, Aaron Krauter, Chris Vandeventer, Gail Hand, Matthew Leiphon, Renae Aarfor, Justin Hanson, Amy Long, Megan Edwardson, Raechel Heuer, Laura Dronen, Norman McCloud, and Maggie Laducer.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO LORI SUTLIFF "GILBERT"

• Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I come forward today to recognize the service of Lori Sutliff who, after 10 years as a member of the board of directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, will be ending her service at the end of this year.

Ms. Sutliff began her career in broadcasting in 1983. Working under the broadcast name "Lori Gilbert," she has specialized in providing broadcast news to rural areas, serving most recently as the news director for Elko Broadcasting Company's KELK-AM and KLKO-FM in the rural community of Elko, NV. She also hosts a community news program, Elko Live, which provides listeners throughout north-eastern Nevada with news about local, regional, and national issues.

In 2008, Ms. Gilbert was appointed to the CPB board of directors by President George W. Bush. President Barack Obama reappointed her, and she was confirmed by the Senate in 2013. She served as board chair from September 2016 to October 2018 and vice chair from September 2014 to September 2016.

She helped lead the Corporation through multiple challenges, such as the FCC's Broadcast Spectrum Auction and repack process. Lori has also been instrumental in helping develop new ways for public media stations to collaborate, and, over the last 5 years, CPB has launched 13 new regional journalism collaborations, creating 90 newsroom positions.

In addition to this work, Gilbert is member of the board of directors of the Associated Press Television and Radio Association of California and Nevada. She serves the rural Nevada community as a founding member of the Elko Cancer Network and the Great Basin College Health Sciences Advisory Board. She has also served on the boards of the Elko County Family Resource Center, the Boys and Girls Club of Elko, and the Elko County Juvenile Advisory Board.

Through all of this incredible work and service, she has gained an intimate understanding of the issues of rural America and how vital it is for rural residents to have a trusted source of information about their community. Ms. Gilbert speaks in journalism schools across the Nation and has consistently demonstrated her commitment to providing meaningful public media offerings to all Americans, regardless of where they live or their economic means.

Today I celebrate the many contributions of Lori Gilbert in all of her service. We are fortunate to have had her leadership, knowledge, and voice during her service to both Nevada and the Nation as a whole.●

TRIBUTE TO VICTORIA BROOKE

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the hard work of my Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee intern Victoria Brooke. Victoria hails from Waldorf, MD, and is a recent graduate of Marshall University.

While interning on the Commerce Committee, Victoria worked in the committee's front office and assisted the Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security Subcommittee with various projects. She is a dedicated worker who was committed to getting the most out of her internship. I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Victoria for all of the fine work she did for the Commerce Committee and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:20 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 245. An act to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 12:43 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 825. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 2465. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a sickle cell disease prevention and treatment demonstration program and to provide for sickle cell disease research, surveillance, prevention, and treatment.

S. 3029. An act to revise and extend the Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Act (PREEMIE Act).

S. 3119. An act to allow for the taking of sea lions on the Columbia River and its tributaries to protect endangered and threatened species of salmon and other nonlisted fish species.

S. 3209. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 413 Washington Avenue in Belleville, New Jersey, as the "Private Henry Svehla Post Office Building".

S. 3237. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 12th Street Lobby in Columbus, Georgia, as the "Richard W. Williams, Jr., Chapter of the Triple Nickles (555th P.I.A.) Post Office".

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in

which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1318. An act to support States in their work to save and sustain the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period, to eliminate disparities in maternal health outcomes for pregnancy-related and pregnancy-associated deaths, to identify solutions to improve health care quality and health outcomes for mothers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1850. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 907 Fourth Avenue in Lake Odessa, Michigan, as the "Donna Sauers Besko Post Office".

H.R. 5205. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 701 6th Street in Hawthorne, Nevada, as the "Sergeant Kenneth Eric Bostic Post Office".

H.R. 5475. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 108 North Macon Street in Bevier, Missouri, as the "SO2 Navy SEAL Adam Olin Smith Post Office".

H.R. 6059. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 51 Willow Street in Lynn, Massachusetts, as the "Thomas P. Costin, Jr. Post Office Building".

H.R. 6140. An act to require the Secretary of Energy to establish and carry out a program to support the availability of HA-LEU for domestic commercial use, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6167. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5707 South Cass Avenue in Westmont, Illinois, as the "James William Robinson Jr. Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 6335. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 322 Main Street in Oakville, Connecticut, as the "Oakville Veterans Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 6615. An act to reauthorize the Traumatic Brain Injury program.

H.R. 6930. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10 Miller Street in Plattsburgh, New York, as the "Ross Bouyea Post Office Building".

H.R. 7217. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing coordinated care for children with complex medical conditions through a health home, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7230. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 226 West Main Street in Lake City, South Carolina, as the "Postmaster Frazier B. Baker Post Office".

H.R. 7243. An act to amend Public Law 115-217 to change the address of the postal facility designated by such Public Law in honor of Sergeant First Class Alwyn Crendall Cashe, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 943. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an accurate comprehensive student count for the purposes of calculating formula allocations for programs under the Johnson-O'Malley Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1918) to oppose loans at international financial institutions for the Government of Nicaragua unless the Government of

Nicaragua is taking effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill (H.R. 3342) to impose sanctions on foreign persons that are responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights by reason of the use by Hizballah of civilians as human shields, and for other purposes, and that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the aforementioned bill.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the numbered amendments 1, 2, and 3 of the Senate to the text of the bill (H.R. 4407) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3s101 Rockwell Street in Warrenville, Illinois, as the "Corporal Jeffery Allen Williams Post Office Building", and that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the aforementioned bill.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 201(b) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6431), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission on International Religious Freedom for a term ending on May 14, 2020: Ms. Anurima Bhargava of Chicago, Illinois, to succeed Mr. Daniel I. Mark.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 2:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 3342. An act to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons that are responsible for using civilians as human shields, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4111. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the number of small business investment companies in underlicensed States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4407. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3s101 Rockwell Street in Warrenville, Illinois, as the "Corporal Jeffrey Allen Williams Post Office Building".

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 6:16 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2454) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security

to establish a data framework to provide access for appropriate personnel to law enforcement and other information of the Department, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 3(b) of the Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Act of 2001 (42 U.S.C. 15202), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Minority Leader reappoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Medal of Valor Review Board: Mr. Brian Fengel of Bartonville, Illinois.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 6140. An act to require the Secretary of Energy to establish and carry out a program to support the availability of HA-LEU for domestic commercial use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 6615. An act to reauthorize the Traumatic Brain Injury program.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 3747. A bill to provide for programs to help reduce the risk that prisoners will recidivate upon release from prison, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 12, 2018, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 245. An act to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self Determination Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-7415. A communication from the Regulations Team Lead, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rural Development Environmental Regulation for Rural Infrastructure Projects" (RIN0572-AC44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 5, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-7416. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations/Low-Intensity Conflict), transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2018 annual report on the Regional Defense Combating

Terrorism Fellowship Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-7417. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of an item not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7418. A communication from the Program Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans Exemption Threshold Adjustment" (RIN1557-AE53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 11, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-7419. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semi-annual Implementation Report on Energy Conservation Standards Activities of the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-7420. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department's proposal to sell 3,380.69 acres of public land in Maricopa and Pinal Counties, Arizona, to the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC), a federally recognized Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-7421. A communication from the Deputy Inspector General for Audit Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Review of Medicare Administrative Contractor Information Security Program Evaluations for Fiscal Year 2017"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7422. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modernized Drawback" ((RIN1515-AE23) (CBP Dec. 18-15)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 7, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-7423. A communication from the Correspondence Specialist, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Adoption of the Methodology for the HHS-operated Permanent Risk Adjustment Program for the 2018 Benefit Year Final Rule" ((RIN0938-AT66) (CMS-9919-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 10, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-7424. A communication from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corps' Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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-313. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska urging the

United States Congress to adopt spill prevention measures into international agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 19

Whereas the Arctic Waterways Safety Committee has been formed by marine mammal hunting groups, Arctic municipalities, and Arctic marine ship operators to identify and promote safe and environmentally responsible shipping operations in the Arctic; and

Whereas, because of the lack of spill response capacity in the Arctic, the United States Coast Guard has authorized vessels to adopt spill prevention measures in lieu of meeting the response standard; and

Whereas, even under the best circumstances, only 20 percent of spilled oil is recovered, indicating the importance of spill prevention measures; and

Whereas prevention measures include active vessel tracking and monitoring, prescribed routing measures, immediate notification of a loss of vessel power or steering, identification of vessels nearby with an opportunity to respond, identification of ports of refuge, prepositioning towing packages and ship arrestors, and dynamic protection of local marine mammal resources; and

Whereas prevention measures apply only to vessels calling on a port in the United States; and

Whereas vessels not calling on a port in the United States are considered in innocent passage and not subject to prevention measures; and

Whereas the United States has not ratified the Law of the Sea treaty and accordingly may not use Article 234, which authorizes coastal states with "ice-covered areas" to require special protection measures; and

Whereas universal adherence to marine protection measures in the Arctic may also occur through international bilateral agreements or by the adoption of measures in the Polar Code of the International Maritime Organization; be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature commends the formation of the Arctic Waterways Safety Committee and appreciates its leadership in establishing safe shipping practices in state water; and be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature supports the adoption of prevention measures into international agreements to ensure clear, universal, and enforceable marine safety measures in the Arctic; and be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature urges the governor and the state's Congressional delegation to promote the adoption of spill prevention measures into international agreements with member organizations, including the Northern Forum; and be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature urges the President of the United States and the United States Department of State to initiate negotiations with Alaska's coastal neighbors to enter into international agreements to ensure safe and environmentally responsible marine operations in the Arctic.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Donald J. Trump, President of the United States; the Honorable Michael R. Pence, Vice President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Paul D. Ryan, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Nancy Pelosi, Minority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Mitch McConnell, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Charles E. Schumer, Minority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Lisa Murkowski, Chair of the U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural

Resources; the Honorable Dan Sullivan, U.S. Senator; and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress; and all other members of the 115th United States Congress.

POM-314. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska urging the United States Congress to adopt spill prevention measures into international agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 19

Whereas the Arctic Waterways Safety Committee has been formed by marine mammal hunting groups, Arctic municipalities, and Arctic marine ship operators to identify and promote safe and environmentally responsible shipping operations in the Arctic; and

Whereas, because of the lack of spill response capacity in the Arctic, the United States Coast Guard has authorized vessels to adopt spill prevention measures in lieu of meeting the response standard; and

Whereas, even under the best circumstances, only 20 percent of spilled oil is recovered, indicating the importance of spill prevention measures; and

Whereas prevention measures include active vessel tracking and monitoring, prescribed routing measures, immediate notification of a loss of vessel power or steering, identification of vessels nearby with an opportunity to respond, identification of ports of refuge, prepositioning towing packages and ship arrestors, and dynamic protection of local marine mammal resources; and

Whereas prevention measures apply only to vessels calling on a port in the United States; and

Whereas vessels not calling on a port in the United States are considered in innocent passage and not subject to prevention measures; and

Whereas the United States has not ratified the Law of the Sea treaty and accordingly may not use Article 234, which authorizes coastal states with "ice-covered areas" to require special protection measures; and

Whereas universal adherence to marine protection measures in the Arctic may also occur through international bilateral agreements or by the adoption of measures in the Polar Code of the International Maritime Organization; be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature commends the formation of the Arctic Waterways Safety Committee and appreciates its leadership in establishing safe shipping practices in state water; and be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature supports the adoption of prevention measures into international agreements to ensure clear, universal, and enforceable marine safety measures in the Arctic; and be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature urges the governor and the state's Congressional delegation to promote the adoption of spill prevention measures into international agreements with member organizations, including the Northern Forum; and be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature urges the President of the United States and the United States Department of State to initiate negotiations with Alaska's coastal neighbors to enter into international agreements to ensure safe and environmentally responsible marine operations in the Arctic.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Donald J. Trump, President of the United States; the Honorable Michael R. Pence, Vice President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Paul D. Ryan, Speaker of the U.S.

House of Representatives; the Honorable Nancy Pelosi, Minority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Mitch McConnell, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Charles E. Schumer, Minority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Lisa Murkowski, Chair of the U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; the Honorable Dan Sullivan, U.S. Senator; and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress; and all other members of the 115th United States Congress.

POM-315. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska urging the United States Congress to enact legislation that requires prominently labeling genetically engineered salmon and salmon products with the words "Genetically Modified" on the product's packaging; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 12

Whereas, on November 19, 2015, the United States Food and Drug Administration approved AquaBounty AquAdvantage genetically engineered salmon as safe for human consumption; and

Whereas the approval is the first time in history that the United States Food and Drug Administration has approved a genetically engineered animal for human consumption; and

Whereas a large majority of state residents oppose the approval of genetically engineered salmon by the United States Food and Drug Administration; and

Whereas more than 2,000,000 Americans opposed the United States Food and Drug Administration's approval of genetically engineered salmon in the largest number of comments the United States Food and Drug Administration has ever received on an action; and

Whereas more than 65 retailers, including Costco, Safeway, and Target, have announced that they have no plans to sell genetically modified salmon; and

Whereas more than 40 members of the United States Congress have expressed opposition to the approval of AquaBounty AquAdvantage genetically engineered salmon; and

Whereas the state has bountiful fisheries that provide wild, natural, and sustainable seafood; and

Whereas the accidental release of transgenic fish into the wild could devastate native fish populations and ecosystems; and

Whereas a May 2013 McGill University research report detailed findings demonstrating interbreeding between genetically modified salmon and brown trout could occur, suggesting that the potential for similar hybridization between other closely related species could pose risks for wild populations, including wild salmon; and

Whereas the research demonstrated that transgenic hybrid salmon can outcompete with both wild salmon and genetically modified salmon, making hybridization relevant to risk assessments; and

Whereas, each year, thousands of salmon escape from open water net pens into the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, demonstrating that escapement is a serious threat to wild fish populations; and

Whereas the AquaBounty facility on Prince Edward Island is producing genetically engineered fish eggs and sits adjacent to a water body that is directly connected to the Saint Lawrence Seaway and the Atlantic Ocean; and

Whereas the proximity of the AquaBounty facility to the Saint Lawrence Seaway and the Atlantic Ocean puts wild Atlantic salmon, which are listed under the Endangered Species Act, at risk; and

Whereas the long-term human health effects of consuming genetically engineered salmon are unknown; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature opposes the United States Food and Drug Administration's approval of AquaBounty AquAdvantage genetically engineered salmon; and be it further

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature urges the United States Congress to enact legislation that requires prominently labeling genetically engineered salmon or salmon products, including AquaBounty AquAdvantage genetically engineered salmon, with the words "Genetically Modified" on the product's packaging, as required by state law.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Donald J. Trump, President of the United States; the Honorable Michael R. Pence, Vice President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Sonny Perdue, United States Secretary of Agriculture; the Honorable Scott Gottlieb, M.D., United States Commissioner of Food and Drugs; and the Honorable Lisa Murkowski and the Honorable Dan Sullivan, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

POM-316. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska urging the United States Congress to pass legislation providing for the exemption of legally acquired walrus, mammoth, and mastodon ivory from laws that ban the sale, use, and possession of ivory; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1361-1423h) explicitly protects the right of coastal Alaska Natives to harvest walrus and use the walrus byproducts in handicrafts for sale in the United States; and

Whereas the use by Alaska Natives of legally acquired walrus, mammoth, and mastodon ivory to create tools, handicrafts, jewelry, and artwork is a longstanding tradition that is a vital component of current Alaska Native culture; and

Whereas non-Native individuals in the state use legally acquired fossilized ivory to make handicrafts, jewelry, and artwork; and

Whereas the sale of walrus, mammoth, and mastodon ivory tools, handicrafts, jewelry, and artwork by Alaska artists is an important source of income in the cash-limited economy of rural Alaska; and

Whereas, in the effort to stop the poaching of African elephants, certain states in the United States have passed laws banning the sale, use, and possession of all ivory, and other states are considering enacting those laws; and

Whereas the laws banning the sale, use, and possession of ivory in certain states of the United States do not distinguish between African elephant ivory and the legally acquired walrus, mammoth, and mastodon ivory used by Alaska artists; and

Whereas the laws banning the sale, use, and possession of ivory may subject residents of certain states to criminal charges for buying, owning, or bringing home legally acquired walrus, mammoth, and mastodon ivory items from Alaska; and

Whereas the laws banning the sale, use, and possession of ivory in certain states adversely affect those Alaska artists who depend on the sale of ivory handicrafts to obtain the cash necessary to live in cash-limited local economies; Be it

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature opposes the inclusion of legally acquired walrus, mammoth, and mastodon ivory in current and future laws that ban the

sale, use, and possession of ivory; and be it further

Resolved, That the Alaska State Legislature requests that the United States Congress pass legislation providing for the exemption of legally acquired walrus, mammoth, and mastodon ivory from current and future laws that ban the sale, use, and possession of ivory.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Donald J. Trump, President of the United States; the Honorable Michael R. Pence, Vice President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Paul D. Ryan, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Nancy Pelosi, Minority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Mitch McConnell, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate; the Honorable Charles E. Schumer, Minority Leader of the U.S. Senate; and the Honorable Lisa Murkowski and the Honorable Dan Sullivan, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 2961, A bill to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (Rept. No. 115-432).

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. CASEY:

S. 3741. A bill to prohibit the Social Security Administration from reinstating the reconsideration level of appeal for disability determinations in the 10 prototype States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 3742. 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 Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HARRIS:

S. 3743. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make certain changes with respect to bringing a civil action for the misappropriation of a trade secret, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3744. A bill to establish duties for online service providers with respect to end user data that such providers collect and use; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 3745. A bill to improve the financial literacy of secondary school students; to the

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 3746. A bill to curtail the use of changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund to inflate spending; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3747. A bill to provide for programs to help reduce the risk that prisoners will recidivate upon release from prison, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 3748. A bill to amend the removal and transfer procedures for the Inspectors General of the Library of Congress, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and the Government Publishing Office; considered and passed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 352

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 352, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick "Roddie" Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II.

S. 821

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 821, a bill to promote access for United States officials, journalists, and other citizens to Tibetan areas of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes.

S. 1101

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1101, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1303

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1303, a bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved.

S. 1730

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1730, a bill to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally.

S. 2018

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2018, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the child tax credit fully refundable, establish an increased child tax credit for young children, and for other purposes.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2122

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2122, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 regarding reasonable break time for nursing mothers.

S. 2274

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2274, a bill to provide for the compensation of Federal employees affected by lapses in appropriations.

S. 2418

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2418, a bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations that establish a national standard for determining whether mobile and broadband services available in rural areas are reasonably comparable to those services provided in urban areas.

S. 3622

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3622, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3622, supra.

S. 3649

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 3649, a bill to provide for programs to help reduce the risk that

prisoners will recidivate upon release from prison, and for other purposes.

S. 3688

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3688, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it a criminal offense for individuals to engage in sexual acts while acting under color of law or with individuals in their custody, to encourage States to adopt similar laws, and for other purposes.

S. 3702

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3702, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prevent the misclassification of drugs for purposes of the Medicaid drug rebate program.

S. 3713

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3713, a bill to appropriate \$25,000,000,000 for the construction of a border wall between the United States and Mexico, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 3748. A bill to amend the removal and transfer procedures for the Inspectors General of the Library of Congress, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and the Government Publishing Office; considered and passed.

S. 3748

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 "Improving the Inspector General Process for Legislative Branch Instrumentalities Act".

SEC. 2. REMOVAL AND TRANSFER PROCEDURES FOR THE INSPECTORS GENERAL OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL, AND GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE.

(a) LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.—Paragraph (2) of section 1307(c) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2006 (2 U.S.C. 185(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) REMOVAL OR TRANSFER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General may be removed from office, or transferred to another position within, or another location of, the Library of Congress, by the Librarian of Congress.

“(B) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days before the Librarian of Congress removes or transfers the Inspector General under subparagraph (A), the Librarian of Congress shall communicate in writing the reason for the removal or transfer to—

“(i) the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(ii) the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

“(C) APPLICABILITY.—Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit a personnel action (ex-

cept for removal or transfer) that is otherwise authorized by law.”.

(b) OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL.—Paragraph (2) of section 1301(c) of the Architect of the Capitol Inspector General Act of 2007 (2 U.S.C. 1808(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) REMOVAL OR TRANSFER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General may be removed from office, or transferred to another position within, or another location of, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, by the Architect of the Capitol.

“(B) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days before the Architect of the Capitol removes or transfers the Inspector General under subparagraph (A), the Architect of the Capitol shall communicate in writing the reason for the removal or transfer to—

“(i) the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(ii) the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

“(C) APPLICABILITY.—Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit a personnel action (except for removal or transfer) that is otherwise authorized by law.”.

(c) GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE.—Section 3902(b) of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b)(1) The Inspector General may be removed from office, or transferred to another position within, or another location of, the Government Publishing Office, by the Director of the Government Publishing Office.

“(2) Not later than 30 days before the Director removes or transfers the Inspector General under paragraph (1), the Director shall communicate in writing the reason for the removal or transfer to—

“(A) the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

“(3) Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit a personnel action (except for removal or transfer) that is otherwise authorized by law.”.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4077. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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.

SA 4078. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4079. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4080. Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra.

SA 4081. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4082. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4083. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4084. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4085. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4086. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4087. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4088. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4089. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4090. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4091. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4092. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4093. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4094. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 90, to survey the gradient boundary along the Red River in the States of Oklahoma and Texas, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4095. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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.

SA 4096. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4097. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4098. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4099. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4100. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4101. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4102. Mr. GARDNER (for Mr. CARDIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1158, to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.

SA 4103. Mr. GARDNER (for Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG)) proposed an

amendment to the bill H.R. 1222, to amend the Public Health Service Act to coordinate Federal congenital heart disease research efforts and to improve public education and awareness of congenital heart disease, and for other purposes.

SA 4104. Mr. GARDNER (for Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2076, to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

SA 4105. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4077. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. 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 Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report assessing the risks posed to United States citizens and the civilian population of the Kingdom 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.

SA 4078. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. REPORT ON INCREASED RISK OF TERRORIST ATTACKS TO UNITED STATES FORCES ABROAD, ALLIES, AND THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES IF SAUDI ARABIA CEASES INTELLIGENCE SHARING OPERATIONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the Secretary of Defense 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 intelligence sharing operations with the United States and regional partners.

SA 4079. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING CONTINUED MILITARY OPERATIONS AND COOPERATION WITH ISRAEL AND REGIONAL ALLIES.

Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to influence or disrupt any military operations and cooperation with Israel or regional allies.

SA 4080. Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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 4, line 21, add after the period at the end the following: "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."

SA 4081. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. ADDRESSING THE ROHINGYA REFUGEE CRISIS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On August 25, 2017, attacks on security posts in Burma by the military group Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army resulted in a brutal, systematic, and disproportionate reprisal by the Burmese military and security forces on Rohingya villages in Rakhine State.

(2) More than 680,000 Rohingya refugees have fled to Bangladesh since the Burmese military commenced its scorched-earth campaign, with the burning of villages and local monuments, and reports of widespread gang rape, starvation, killing, and forcible deportation.

(3) The Government of Burma has consistently denied access to the United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar established to investigate human rights violations around the country.

(4) Bangladesh Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina proposed that "safe zones" be created inside Burma to protect all civilians irrespective of religion and ethnicity under United Nations (UN) supervision.

(5) The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)'s mandate is to provide, in collaboration with other actors, international protection to refugees and to assist them in finding durable solutions through voluntary repatriation, local integration, or resettlement.

(6) The UN General Assembly has repeatedly affirmed UNHCR's function of facilitating the voluntary repatriation of refugees and, in recognition of the importance of sustainable return, has widened its mandate to include providing assistance for their rehabilitation and dealing with the consequences of their return.

(7) The fundamental operational principles of voluntary repatriation are safety, to include legal and physical safety, and dignity, to include treatment with respect and full acceptance by their national authorities, including the full restoration of refugees' rights.

(8) On November 23, 2017, the Government of Burma and the Government of Bangladesh

signed an agreement, known as the “Arrangement”, on the return of displaced persons from Rakhine State, which is modeled after the 1992 repatriation agreement between Burma and Bangladesh.

(9) The Arrangement includes references to restoring normalcy and human rights in Rakhine State, for refugee returns to comply with international standards of safety, dignity, and voluntariness, and to commencing a process to address root causes in line with the Rakhine Advisory Commission recommendations.

(10) Approximately 236,000 Rohingya refugees returned to Burma under the terms of the 1992 agreement, only to continue to be denied citizenship, face prejudice, violence, and persecution, and in many instances be forced to live in internally displaced persons (IDP) camps with their freedom of movement restricted.

(11) Burma’s 1982 citizenship law stripped Rohingya of their Burmese citizenship, rendering them stateless.

(12) The Government of Burma continues to systematically discriminate against the Rohingya people, including by continuing to restrict registration of Rohingya births and to deny them freedom of movement, access to healthcare, land, education, marriage, voting rights, and political participation.

(13) The Government of Burma has repeatedly abused land use laws to unjustly seize land from Rohingya refugees.

(14) UNHCR is working closely with the Government of Bangladesh and partners to provide protection and assistance to the Rohingya refugees and to support the host populations affected by the influx.

(15) The Government of Burma has not reached an agreement with UNHCR on its role in the safe, dignified, and voluntary return of Rakhine State refugees.

(16) Myanmar Minister of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement Dr. Win Myat Aye, on December 28, 2017, announced that the repatriation process will begin on January 22, 2018, but this process has not yet begun.

(17) There is concern that up to 100,000 Rohingya could be at risk of forced return into two “model villages” or into 1,200 tents provided by the Government of Burma, without assurances of their safety or details regarding long term solutions to address root causes of Rohingya disenfranchisement.

(18) “Model villages” and similar tactics in Burma dating back to colonial rule have been used to strategically shift population groups and deepen religious and cultural divides.

(19) On December 12, 2017, Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo, two journalists reporting and documenting atrocities against the Rohingya, were arrested and on January 10, 2018, formally prosecuted with violating the “Official Secrets Act,” further risking Burma’s democratic transition.

(20) UNHCR, as of December 17, 2017, reports that conditions in Burma’s Rakhine State are not yet conducive to enable safe and sustainable return, as refugees continue to flee Rakhine State into neighboring Bangladesh.

(21) UNHCR reports that those who arrive have suffered immense violence and trauma in Burma, with some having witnessed the deaths of family members and friends and most having little or nothing to return to, with their homes and villages destroyed.

(22) There is concern that deep divisions between communities remain unaddressed and humanitarian access is inadequate.

(b) IN GENERAL.—Congress—

(1) condemns the violence and displacement inflicted on Burma’s Rohingya and other ethnic minorities;

(2) calls for an immediate halt to all hostilities by Burmese authorities;

(3) condemns the attacks by the Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army militant group;

(4) calls on the Government of Burma to allow full access to Rakhine State and ensure the full participation of UNHCR, the internationally endorsed organization tasked with ensuring that refugee returns are voluntary, safe, dignified, and respect fundamental human rights, and that the voices of refugees are represented in order to ensure the sustainability of such returns and to prevent further waves of displacement;

(5) calls on the Government of Burma to allow the United Nations-backed Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar immediate and unfettered access to Burma, including northern Rakhine State, to establish the facts and circumstances of the alleged recent human rights violations by Burmese military and security forces against the Rohingya and other ethnic minorities;

(6) commends the positive role of the Government of Bangladesh in receiving Rohingya refugees to date and urges the Government of Bangladesh to continue allowing the full participation of UNHCR and human rights organizations in accessing refugee camps;

(7) calls on UNHCR and international non-governmental organizations to play a role in monitoring repatriation efforts by the Governments of Bangladesh and Burma to ensure a process that meets international norms for voluntary, safe, and dignified repatriation;

(8) agrees that any return of Rohingya should include guarantees that any returns of refugees will be voluntary and dignified, that there will be no threats to protection or security upon return, that refugees will be able to return to their places of origin or other locations as desired, and be able to enjoy equal rights with others in Burma, including the restoration or granting of full citizenship, freedom of movement, and access to basic services;

(9) recognizes that any forced relocation of Rohingya refugees into temporary settlements, IDP camps, “model villages,” or other areas not of refugees’ choosing is unacceptable;

(10) calls on the Government of Burma to allow for a flexible and practical approach to dealing with evidence of Rohingya residence in Burma, recognizing that the Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh possess a wide range of documents and that some refugees have no documents and will need to establish their residence by other means;

(11) calls on the Government of Burma to address root causes consistent with the Rakhine Advisory Commission recommendations and fully implement all of the recommendations of the Commission, including providing equal access to full restoration or granting of full citizenship for the Rohingya population;

(12) calls on the Government of Burma to acknowledge and address the issue of statelessness for the Rohingya, the deprivation of rights, and institutionalized and pervasive discrimination of the Rohingya population in order to bring about any sustainable solutions;

(13) commends the Government and the people of Bangladesh for their extraordinary generosity and efforts to provide shelter and relief for nearly 1,000,000 Rohingya refugees forced to flee their homes in Burma;

(14) calls on the Government of Bangladesh to ensure all refugees have freedom of movement and under no circumstances are subject to unsafe, involuntary, precipitous, or uninformed returns to Burma; and

(15) calls on the Government of Burma to immediately release journalists Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo.

SA 4082. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. REQUEST FOR A REPORT ON THE OBSERVANCE OF AND RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOM IN SAUDI ARABIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In July 2018, the Government of Saudi Arabia detained prominent women rights activists Samar Badawi and Nassima al-Sada.

(2) The United States Department of State presented Ms. Badawi with the 2012 International Women of Courage Award in recognition of her efforts with regard to the discriminatory male guardianship system in Saudi Arabia.

(3) The Department of State has declined to express solidarity with the Government of Canada, which reacted appropriately to news of the detention of Ms. Badawi and Ms. al-Sada in expressing that it was “gravely concerned about additional arrests of civil society and women’s rights activists” and calling upon “Saudi authorities to immediately release them and all other peaceful human-rights activists”.

(4) The Government of Saudi Arabia reacted disproportionately to criticism by the Government of Canada by taking extreme retaliatory measures, including—

(A) expelling the Ambassador of Canada to Saudi Arabia and recalling the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia to Canada;

(B) ordering the return of citizens of Saudi Arabia living in Canada, including more than 1,000 medical students;

(C) shutting off new bilateral trade and investment with Canada; and

(D) terminating direct commercial flights on Saudi Arabian air carriers between Saudi Arabia and Canada.

(5) Canada is an indispensable ally in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization that shares the commitment of the United States to equal rights and the rule of law and, in defense of shared interests and values, Canada has fought and sacrificed alongside the United States in each of the World Wars and has contributed to Missions of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Afghanistan, the Balkans, Libya, and Central and Eastern Europe.

(6) The arrest of Ms. Badawi and Ms. al-Sada, as well as the ongoing detention of countless others such as blogger Raif Badawi and human rights lawyer Waleed Abu al-Khair, is part of a disturbing pattern of human rights violations committed by the Government of Saudi Arabia, which are documented in more than 50 pages of the 2017 Human Rights Report of the Department of State.

(7) Among the human rights violations by the Government of Saudi Arabia documented in that report, are unlawful killings, torture, arbitrary arrest and detention, restrictions on freedom of expression, violence and official gender discrimination against women, and criminalization of same-sex sexual activity.

(8) The office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees assesses that airstrikes carried out by Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates in Yemen accounted for 80 percent of all civilian casualties from December 2017 to May 2018 in the 5 governorates of Yemen most affected by fighting.

(9) Section 502B(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(a)(2)) states that “no security assistance may be provided to any country the government of which engages in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President should offer public support to Canada by calling upon the Government of Saudi Arabia to release Samar Badawi, Nassima al-Sada, Raif Badawi, Waleed Abu al-Khair, and all other peaceful human rights activists, journalists, and religious minorities held in detention by that Government on dubious charges; and

(2) the arrest of women’s rights activists and their supporters since May 2018 is contrary to the stated goals of the Government of Saudi Arabia.

(c) REQUEST FOR REPORT.—Congress requests, pursuant to section 502B(c)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(c)(1)), that the Secretary of State submit to Congress a statement, as required by that section, setting forth all the available information about observance of and respect for human rights and fundamental freedom in Saudi Arabia.

SA 4083. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) It is appropriate for Congress to assert its power under Article I of the Constitution of the United States to declare war, raise and support armies, and maintain an army.

(2) Nothing in this joint resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

(3) The Framers of the Constitution, as outlined in Federalist No. 69, explained the difference between the authorities of the President under the Constitution as Commander-in-Chief and the power of Congress under the Constitution to declare war.

(4) The Framers of the Constitution were concerned that vesting too much war-making power in the President would cause the Nation to become involved hastily or unwisely in war.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force in Iraq and Afghanistan against the Taliban, al Qaeda, and the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) in order to protect the United States and its compelling interests (as defined in section 11) from attack by the Taliban, al Qaeda, and the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant.

SEC. 3. LIMITATIONS.

(a) STATE ACTORS.—This joint resolution does not authorize use of force against any foreign state (as defined in section 11).

(b) NONAPPLICABILITY TO UNSPECIFIED ENTITIES.—The authorization provided by section 2 extends only to the entities specified in that section, and does not extend to organizations or forces that the President determines to be associated forces, successor forces, or forces otherwise related to the entities specified in that section.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW.—The authority in this joint resolution may be used only in a manner consistent with the

obligations of the United States under international law.

(d) WAR POWERS RESOLUTION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) SPECIFIC STATUTORY AUTHORIZATION.—Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(a)(1)), Congress declares that section 2 is intended to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(b)).

(2) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this joint resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

SEC. 4. NEW GROUPS AND COUNTRIES AND USE OF GROUND FORCES IN A COMBAT ROLE.

(a) USE OF FORCE AGAINST OTHER NON-STATE PARTIES TO THE CONFLICT.—

(1) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE.—A joint resolution to authorize use of force against any organization or force not specified in section 2 (in this joint resolution referred to as a “new group”) shall be eligible for expedited consideration in accordance with the procedures in section 8 (in this section referred to as “expedited consideration”).

(2) LIMITATION.—A joint resolution under this subsection shall not be eligible for expedited consideration unless the new group covered by the joint resolution—

(A) is not a foreign state;

(B) is an organized armed group that has engaged, and continues to be engaged, in active hostilities against the United States as a party to an ongoing armed conflict involving the groups specified in section 2; and

(C) demonstrates a credible ability to conduct a substantial attack against compelling United States interests.

(b) USE OF FORCE IN ADDITIONAL COUNTRIES.—

(1) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE.—A joint resolution to authorize use of force against the groups specified in section 2, or any new group covered by a joint resolution enacted pursuant to subsection (a), in a country other than those specified in the joint resolution authorizing such use of force (in this section referred to as a “new country”) shall be eligible for expedited consideration.

(2) LIMITATION.—A joint resolution described by paragraph (1) that also authorizes use of ground forces in a combat role shall not be eligible for expedited consideration.

(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE USE OF GROUND FORCES IN COMBAT ROLE IN ADDITIONAL COUNTRIES.—A joint resolution to authorize use of ground forces in a combat role in a new country for which authorization of use force has been provided under subsection (b) shall be eligible for expedited consideration.

(d) GROUND FORCES IN A COMBAT ROLE.—For purposes of this section, ground forces in a combat role do not include the following:

(1) Small detachments of special operations forces.

(2) Any other forces deployed under any authority other than the authority in this joint resolution.

(e) PRESIDENTIAL REQUEST.—To be eligible for expedited consideration, a joint resolution described in subsection (a), (b), or (c) must be requested in writing by the President to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership, together with a written justification of the manner which such joint resolution meets the applicable criteria in such subsection.

(f) SEPARATE JOINT RESOLUTION REQUIRED FOR EACH AUTHORIZATION.—To be eligible for expedited consideration, a separate joint resolution is required for each new group, each new country, and each use of ground forces in a combat role in a new country.

SEC. 5. SUNSET UPON CESSATION OF THREAT.

(a) REPORTS ON CONTINUING THREATS.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, and every six months thereafter, the President shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report certifying whether or not each group specified in section 2, and each new group against which use of force is currently authorized by this joint resolution pursuant to section 4(a), continues to meet the criteria set forth in section 4(a)(2).

(b) SUNSET.—If the President does not certify under subsection (a) that a group described in that subsection continues to meet the criteria set forth in section 4(a)(2), the authorization in this joint resolution to use force against such group shall cease, effective as of the date that is 60 days after the date the certification is due.

(c) CONSTRUCTION.—The cessation of authority to use force against a group under subsection (b) shall not be construed as the cessation of authority to use force pursuant to this joint resolution against any other group specified in section 2, or against any new group covered by section 4(a) against which force is being used pursuant to this joint resolution at the time of such cessation of authority.

SEC. 6. DURATION OF AUTHORIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The authorization for use of force in this joint resolution shall expire on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days before the expiration date provided for in subsection (a), the President shall submit to Congress a report on use of force pursuant to this joint resolution. The report may include recommendations of the President for extension, whether with or without modification, of this joint resolution.

(c) PROCEDURES FOR ENACTMENT.—Any joint resolution to extend this joint resolution, whether with or without modification, shall be eligible for expedited consideration in accordance with the procedures in section 8.

SEC. 7. REPORTING AND PUBLIC NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, and every six months thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership, and shall publish in the Federal Register, a report setting forth the following:

(1) A list of the groups, organizations, and forces against which the United States is using force pursuant to this joint resolution as of the date of submittal and publication.

(2) For each group, organization, and force listed under paragraph (1)—

(A) the extent to which such group, organization, or force directly targeted any compelling United States interest during the six-month period ending on the date of submittal and publication (in this section referred to as the “reporting period”); and

(B) the extent to which such group, organization, or force continues to pose a threat to any compelling United States interest as of the date of submittal and publication.

(3) A list of the countries in which the United States used force pursuant to this joint resolution during the reporting period, including the geographic location in each country in which the United States so used force.

(4) The number of combatant casualties in connection with the use of force pursuant to this joint resolution during the reporting period.

(5) The number of civilian casualties in connection with the use of force pursuant to this joint resolution during the reporting period, as determined by the following:

(A) The United States Government.

(B) Credible and reliable nongovernmental entities.

(6) An explanation for the differences, if any, between the number of civilian casualties reported pursuant to paragraph (5)(A) during the reporting period and the number of civilian casualties reported pursuant to paragraph (5)(B) during the reporting period.

(7) A description of the mechanisms used to prevent and limit civilian casualties in connection with the use of force pursuant to this joint resolution during the reporting period.

(8) A current description of the process by which the United States investigates allegations of civilian casualties resulting from United States military operations.

(9) A description of the current national security, diplomatic, development, and humanitarian goals of the United States for each country listed under paragraph (3) in order to create the conditions for the end of use of United States military force in such country, and the strategy and expected timeline to execute such goals.

(10) An assessment, as of the date of submittal and publication, of the bilateral and multilateral impact of United States use of force pursuant to this joint resolution in each country listed under paragraph (3), and an assessment of the engagement of the government of such country with United States use of force in such country.

(11) A comprehensive and current description, both for the reporting period and in aggregate as of the date of submittal and publication, of the amounts expended by the United States for and in support of military operations and activities in connection with use of force pursuant to this joint resolution.

(b) FORM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each report under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form.

(2) CLASSIFIED FORM.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), portion of a report under subsection (a) may be submitted in classified form if strictly required to protect the national security interests of the United States.

(3) CERTAIN INFORMATION ONLY IN UNCLASSIFIED FORM.—The information required by subsection (a)(1), and the countries listed pursuant to subsection (a)(3), shall be submitted in unclassified form.

(c) BRIEFINGS.—The Department of Defense shall provide a briefing to any appropriate congressional committee or leadership upon request of such committee or leadership not less often than every six months on activities undertaken pursuant to this joint resolution.

SEC. 8. EXPEDITED PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A resolution specified in subsection (b) shall be eligible for consideration using expedited procedures specified in this section.

(b) RESOLUTIONS.—A resolution specified in this subsection is any joint resolution as follows:

(1) A joint resolution covered by section 4.

(2) A joint resolution to extend, whether with or without modifications, this joint resolution, as provided for in section 6.

(c) REFERRAL.—A resolution described in subsection (b) introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. A resolution described in subsection (b) that is introduced in the House of Representatives shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(d) DISCHARGE.—If the committee to which a resolution described in subsection (b) is referred has not reported such resolution (or an identical resolution) by the end of the 20-day period beginning on the date of introduction, such committee shall be, at the end of such period, discharged from further consideration of such resolution, and such resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar of the House involved.

(e) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On or after the third day after the date on which the committee to which such a resolution is referred has reported, or has been discharged (under subsection (d)) from further consideration of, such a resolution, it is in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for any Member of the respective House to move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. A Member may make the motion only on the day after the calendar day on which the Member announces to the House concerned the Member's intention to make the motion, except that, in the case of the House of Representatives, the motion may be made without such prior announcement if the motion is made by direction of the committee to which the resolution was referred. All points of order against the resolution (and against consideration of the resolution) are waived. The motion is highly privileged in the House of Representatives and is privileged in the Senate and is not debatable. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is agreed to, the respective House shall immediately proceed to consideration of the joint resolution without intervening motion, order, or other business, and the resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the respective House until disposed of.

(2) DEBATE.—Debate on the resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 30 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. An amendment to the resolution is not in order. A motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable. A motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the resolution is not in order. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to is not in order.

(3) VOTE ON FINAL PASSAGE.—Immediately following the conclusion of the debate on the resolution and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the appropriate House, the vote on final passage of the resolution shall occur.

(4) APPEALS FROM DECISIONS OF CHAIR.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution shall be decided without debate.

(f) CONSIDERATION BY OTHER HOUSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, before the passage by one House of a resolution of that House described in subsection (b), that House receives from the other House a resolution described in subsection (b), then the following procedures shall apply:

(A) The resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee and may not be considered in the House receiving it except in the case of final passage as provided in subparagraph (B)(ii).

(B) With respect to a resolution described in subsection (b) of the House receiving the resolution—

(i) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no resolution had been received from the other House; but

(ii) the vote on final passage shall be on the resolution of the other House.

(2) FOLLOWING DISPOSITION.—Upon disposition of the resolution received from the other House, it shall no longer be in order to consider the resolution that originated in the receiving House.

(g) RULES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—This section is enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a resolution described in subsection (b), and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 9. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107-40; 115 Stat. 224; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed, effective six months after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 10. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 116 Stat. 1498; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 11. DEFINITIONS.

In this joint resolution:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP.—The term “appropriate congressional committees and leadership” means—

(A) the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(C) the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) COMPELLING UNITED STATES INTERESTS.—The term “compelling United States interests” means the following:

(A) United States territory.

(B) The United States Armed Forces.

(C) United States citizens.

(3) FOREIGN STATE.—The term “foreign state” has the meaning given that term in section 1603(a) of title 28, United States Code, namely a foreign state, a political subdivision of a foreign state, or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state (as that term is defined in section 1603(b) of such title).

SA 4084. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON UNITED STATES-SAUDI ARABIA CIVILIAN NUCLEAR COOPERATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress make the following findings:

(1) On May 21, 2009, the United States and the United Arab Emirates signed a bilateral agreement pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153), establishing cooperation on civilian nuclear programs in which the United Arab Emirates agreed that it “shall not possess sensitive nuclear facilities within its territory or otherwise engage in activities within its territory for, or relating to, the enrichment or reprocessing of material, or for the alternation in form or content (except by irradiation or further irradiation or, if agreed by the Parties, post-irradiation examination) of plutonium, uranium 233, high enriched uranium, or irradiated source or special fissionable material”.

(2) The civil nuclear cooperation agreement between the United States and the United Arab Emirates further obligates the United Arab Emirates to bring into force its Additional Protocol to its IAEA Safeguards Agreement before the United States licenses “exports of nuclear material, equipment, components, or technology” pursuant to the agreement.

(3) This agreement became known as the first “gold standard” civil nuclear agreement and was lauded as a step toward establishing a precedent for strong nonproliferation standards on the Arabian Peninsula.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that any United States-Saudi Arabia civilian nuclear cooperation agreement under section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153), commonly known as a “123 Agreement”, concluded in the future should prohibit the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia from enriching uranium or separating plutonium on Saudi Arabian territory in keeping with the strongest possible nonproliferation “gold standard” as well as require the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to bring into force the Additional Protocol with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

SA 4085. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE VALUE OF TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) opened for signature 50 years ago on July 1, 1968.

(2) The United States and the former Soviet Union averted a catastrophic nuclear exchange during the October 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, which led to a series of bilateral and multilateral agreements to lessen the chance of nuclear war, including the NPT.

(3) President John F. Kennedy predicted in 1963 that as many as 25 countries would acquire nuclear weapons by 1970 absent a treaty to control nuclear weapons.

(4) The United States Senate provided its advice and consent to the NPT on March 13, 1969, with a vote on ratification of 83 to 15.

(5) The NPT entered into force on March 5, 1970.

(6) The NPT has grown to include 191 States Party to the Treaty, making an irreplaceable contribution to international security by helping to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

(7) Article III of the NPT obligates all non-nuclear weapon States Party to the NPT to conclude a Safeguards Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to verify treaty compliance, 174 of which are Comprehensive Safeguards Agreements crafted to detect the diversion of nuclear materials from peaceful to non-peaceful uses.

(8) Nuclear weapon States Party to the NPT have also concluded voluntary offer Safeguards Agreements and Additional Protocols with the IAEA;

(9) The 2018 Department of Defense Nuclear Posture Review affirms, “The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is a cornerstone of the nuclear nonproliferation regime. It plays a positive role in building consensus for non-proliferation and enhances international efforts to impose costs on those that would pursue nuclear weapons outside the Treaty.”

(10) The success of the NPT has and will continue to depend upon the full implementation by all States Party to the Treaty of the NPT’s obligations and responsibilities, which are derived from three mutually reinforcing pillars: nonproliferation, access to peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and disarmament.

(11) Over the past half century, the United States has exhibited leadership in strengthening each of the NPT’s three pillars for the global good, including—

(A) reducing its nuclear weapons stockpile by more than 85 percent from its Cold War heights of 31,225 in parallel with equally massive reductions of Russia’s stockpile through bilateral coordination;

(B) cooperating with Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belarus—to facilitate the surrender of nuclear weapons on their soil after the fall of the Soviet Union—leading to each country’s accession to the NPT as a non-nuclear weapons state;

(C) providing voluntary contributions to the IAEA to promote peaceful nuclear activities exceeding \$374,000,000 since 2010, including activities that help in the treatment of cancer and other life-saving applications; and

(D) extending deterrence to United States allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Japan, and the Republic of Korea—which is an unmistakable demonstration of the United States commitment to collective security; heightened geopolitical tensions in recent years have made cooperation on nonproliferation and arms control issues with the Russian Federation more challenging.

(12) A range of actions by the Government of the Russian Federation has led to a deterioration in bilateral relations with the United States, including Russia’s brazen interference in the 2016 United States presidential elections, its violation of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (commonly known as the “INF Treaty”), signed at Washington, D.C., December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988, its use of a chemical nerve agent in an assassination attempt against Sergei Skripal and his daughter Yulia in the United Kingdom in March 2018, its illegal annexation of Crimea, its invasion of Eastern Ukraine, its destabilizing actions in Syria, and its use of polonium to assassinate Alexander Litvinenko in the United Kingdom in November 2006.

(13) The actions undertaken by the Russian Federation in violation of the INF Treaty, including the flight-test, production, and possession of prohibited systems diminishes the contributions that the Treaty has made to security on the European continent.

(14) Russian President Vladimir Putin, in a March 2018 speech, unveiled details of new kinds of strategic nuclear weapons under development, including hypersonic nuclear cruise missiles, nuclear-powered ballistic missiles, and a multi-megaton nuclear torpedoes shot from drone submarines that may be accountable under the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed April 8, 2010, and entered into force February 5, 2011 (commonly known as the “New START Treaty”).

(15) The Russian Federation erroneously claimed that the United States may have not reached New START Treaty Central Limits by February 5, 2018, as is mandated by the Treaty.

(16) The Bilateral Consultative Commission (BCC) is the appropriate forum for the Parties to engage constructively on any New START Treaty implementation issues that arise.

(17) Within a difficult environment, preserving full compliance with agreements that may continue to contribute to the national security of the United States and to global security, particularly the New START Treaty, is all the more essential, and to that end, the Department of State confirmed in February 2018 that Russia had met New START’s Central Treaty Limits and stated that “implementation of the New START Treaty enhances the safety and security of the United States”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should continue to encourage all States Party to the NPT to comply fully with the Treaty;

(2) any United States negotiated agreement with the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) on denuclearization should require the DPRK to return to as a State Party to the NPT in good standing and full compliance with the Treaty;

(3) the United States should maintain support for the IAEA through its assessed and voluntary contributions and promote the universal adoption of the IAEA Additional Protocol;

(4) the United States and its allies should pursue diplomatic efforts to ensure that the Islamic Republic of Iran complies with the NPT and fully implements the IAEA Additional Protocol;

(5) the United States should—

(A) consider whether to extend the New START Treaty, within the context of meaningful arms control that decreases the chances of misperception and miscalculation, avoids destabilizing arms competition, and is verifiable and consistent with the security objectives of the United States and its allies and partners;

(B) assess whether Russia’s recently announced nuclear weapons should be accountable under the New START Treaty and raise the issue directly with the Russian Federation;

(C) press the Russian Federation to engage constructively on compliance matters related to the New START Treaty, and also to take steps that provide greater transparency into Russia’s non-strategic nuclear weapons, which are not captured under any treaty and which are numerically superior to those held by the United States and its allies;

(D) begin negotiations with the Russian Federation on an agreement to address the massive disparity between the non-strategic

nuclear weapons stockpiles of the Russian Federation and of the United States and to secure and reduce non-strategic nuclear weapons in a verifiable manner;

(E) begin an interagency process to discuss whether to extend the New START Treaty and the possibility of further engagement with the Russian Federation on strategic stability and other arms control and non-proliferation issues; and

(F) consider the consequences of the New START Treaty's expiration in 2021 also in relation to the insights the Treaty provides into the location, movement, and disposition of current and future Russian strategic systems;

(6) the United States strongly condemns the Russian Federation's violations of the INF Treaty and its non-compliance with its other arms control commitments and treaty obligations, and urges Russia to come back into full compliance;

(7) the executive branch of the United States Government should consult with the Senate, and in particular with the Committee on Foreign Relations, prior to any decision to withdraw from an arms control treaty ratified by the Senate, particularly any that may impact collective defense arrangements the United States has entered into with other countries; and

(8) the United States Government should continue to encourage opportunities for cooperation with other states possessing nuclear arms to reduce the salience, number, and role of nuclear weapons in their national military strategies.

SA 4086. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO OFFICIALS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SAUDI ARABIA RESPONSIBLE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES.

(a) LIST REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of all senior officials of the Government of Saudi Arabia, including senior officials of the military and security forces of Saudi Arabia, that the President determines have played a direct and substantial role in the commission of human rights abuses, including torture of political prisoners.

(2) UPDATES.—Not less frequently than every 180 days, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an updated version of the list required by paragraph (1).

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President shall impose the following sanctions with respect to each individual on the list required by subsection (a):

(1) ASSET BLOCKING.—The exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of the individual 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.

(2) EXCLUSION FROM THE UNITED STATES AND REVOCATION OF VISA OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.—Denial of a visa to, and exclusion from

the United States of, the individual, and revocation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), of any visa or other documentation of the individual.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—The requirement to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property under subsection (b)(1) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(2) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under subsection (b)(2) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

(d) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—The President may waive the imposition of sanctions under subsection (b) if the President determines, and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

(e) IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.—

(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out subsection (b)(1).

(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.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) 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.

SA 4087. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. REPORT ON DETENTION OF WOMEN BASED ON PEACEFUL ADVOCACY FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN SAUDI ARABIA.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Government of Saudi Arabia should immediately release all women who have been detained in that country, without being charged of any crime or on po-

litically motivated charges, based on their peaceful advocacy for human rights in Saudi Arabia.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report assessing the status of all women who have been detained in Saudi Arabia, without being charged of any crime or on politically motivated charges, based on their peaceful advocacy for human rights in that country.

(2) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include a classified annex that explains in detail what the Department of State is doing to secure the release of the women described in the report.

SA 4088. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia have maintained a close and productive relationship for most of the years since establishing relations in 1933;

(2) the United States seeks to continue a constructive and strategic relationship with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, based on both our mutual interests as well as a growing agreement on the values of human rights, democracy, and the rule of law, which are the cornerstone of any strong and lasting relationship with the United States; and

(3) there have been numerous Saudi actions since January 2015 that have threatened the comity between our two nations, including—

(A) the continued jailing of prisoner of conscience Raif Badawi in Saudi Arabia, who received 50 lashes in 2015 that nearly killed him;

(B) the imprisonment of women's rights activists in May of this year by Saudi government authorities, and, according to media reports, their torture while in custody, including Raif Badawi's sister, Samar;

(C) the premeditated murder of Washington Post writer and Saudi citizen Jamal Khashoggi by Saudi government authorities in the Saudi Consulate in Istanbul after being called there by his government;

(D) the Government of Saudi Arabia's disastrous war in Yemen, which, while trying to rid Yemen of Iranian influence, has created a humanitarian nightmare that has killed tens of thousands, displaced hundreds of thousands, impoverished millions, and pushed the country to the brink of massive famine; and

(E) a reckless diplomatic and economic confrontation with the State of Qatar, a Gulf Cooperation Council Member and regional partner of the United States on counterterrorism and regional security.

SA 4089. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. ANNUAL REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS IN SAUDI ARABIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, and annually thereafter for 10 years (except as provided under subsection (d)) not later than 90 days after the start of the new school year in Saudi Arabia, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report reviewing educational materials published by Saudi Arabia's Ministry of Education that are used in schools both inside the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and at schools throughout the world.

(b) CONSULTATION.—Not later than 30 days after the submission of a report under subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall consult with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on the contents of the report.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A detailed determination regarding whether all intolerant content has been removed from educational materials published by Saudi Arabia's Ministry of Education that are used in schools both inside the Saudi Arabia and at schools throughout the world, including full quotations of all passages that could be seen as encouraging violence or intolerance towards adherents of religions other than Islam or towards Muslims who hold dissenting views.

(2) A detailed assessment of the global exportation of such materials, including the extent to which such materials are used in privately funded educational institutions overseas.

(3) A detailed summary of actions the Government of Saudi Arabia has taken to retrieve and destroy materials with intolerant material.

(4) A detailed assessment of the efforts of the Government of Saudi Arabia to revise teacher manuals and retrain teachers to reflect changes in educational materials and promote tolerance.

(5) A detailed determination regarding whether issuing a waiver regarding Saudi Arabia as a country of particular concern under the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-292) furthers the purposes of such Act or is otherwise in the important national security interests of the United States.

(d) DURATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) TERMINATION BEFORE 10 YEARS.—If, at any time after submission of a report required under subsection (a) but before the expiration of the 10-year period referred to in such subsection, the Secretary of State determines that intolerant religious content has been removed completely from Saudi Arabia's education materials, the requirement to submit any remaining reports under such subsection shall not apply.

(2) CONTINUATION AFTER 10 YEARS.—If at the end of the 10-year period referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of State determines that intolerant religious content remains in Saudi Arabia's education materials, the termination of the requirement to submit reports under such subsection shall not apply and the reports shall be submitted for an additional five years.

(e) FORM.—Reports under this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(f) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 60 days after submission of a report required under subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall make copies of reviewed Saudi educational materials publicly available on a website of the Department of State.

SA 4090. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. 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 the Kingdom 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.

SA 4091. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. REPORT ON INCREASED RISK OF TERRORIST ATTACKS TO UNITED STATES FORCES ABROAD, ALLIES, AND THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES IF SAUDI ARABIA CEASES RELATED INTELLIGENCE SHARING 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 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 related intelligence sharing operations with the United States.

SA 4092. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TRANSITION OF MILITARY AND SECURITY OPERATIONS IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) After al Qaeda attacked the United States on September 11, 2001, the United States Government rightly sought to bring to justice those who attacked us, to eliminate al Qaeda's safe havens and training camps in Afghanistan.

(2) Members of the Armed Forces, intelligence personnel, and diplomatic corps have skillfully achieved these objectives, culminating in the death of Osama bin Laden.

(3) Operation Enduring Freedom is now the longest military operation in United States history, and United States involvement in Afghanistan has exceeded \$1,000,000,000,000 in costs to the United States taxpayer and continues to cost taxpayers over \$45,000,000,000 a year.

(4) Members of the United States Armed Forces have served in Afghanistan valiantly and with honor, and many have sacrificed their lives and health in service to their country;

(5) The United States has suffered more than 2,000 casualties in Afghanistan (including 13 in 2018 thus far), and the United States has dropped more than 5,200 bombs this year (through September 30), a record high.

(6) Secretary of Defense Mattis, reflecting consensus within United States and international security experts, has concluded that there is no military solution to the conflict in Afghanistan, stating, "It's all working to achieve a political reconciliation, not a military victory. The victory will be a political reconciliation."

(7) Over the past 17 years, the mission of the United States has evolved to include a prolonged nation-building effort in Afghanistan.

(8) Such nation-building efforts in Afghanistan are undermined by endemic corruption, high illiteracy, tribal fractions, and a historic aversion to a strong central government in that country.

(9) The United States Government will continue to support the development of Afghanistan with a strong diplomatic and counterterrorism presence in the region.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President should complete the transition of the responsibility for military and security operations in Afghanistan to the Government of Afghanistan by September 18, 2021, the 20th anniversary of the enactment of Public Law 107-40, the Authorization for Use of Military Force against those responsible for the attacks on September 11, 2001, in conjunction with efforts by Special Representative for Afghanistan Reconciliation Zalmay Khalilzad to seek a durable peace between the Government of Afghanistan and the Taliban;

(2) reflecting press reports that the President seeks to end the United States military engagement in Afghanistan by 2020, the President should devise a plan based on inputs from Special Representative Khalilzad, military commanders, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member countries, and other allies in Afghanistan, and appropriate members of the Cabinet, along with the consultation of Congress, for completing the drawdown of United States combat troops in Afghanistan and accelerating the transfer of security authority to Afghan authorities; and

(3) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President should submit to Congress a report—

(A) assessing progress made on the battlefield in Afghanistan since the announcement of the President's New South Asia Strategy and the increase in United States troops;

(B) assessing efforts by Special Representative Khalilzad to foster a durable peace agreement between the Government of Afghanistan and the Taliban; and

(C) including a plan for the complete transition of all military and security operations in Afghanistan to the Government of Afghanistan.

SA 4093. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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 4, line 13, insert " , which includes 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)).",

SA 4094. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 90, to survey the gradient boundary along the Red River in the States of Oklahoma and Texas, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Red River Gradient Boundary Survey Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **AFFECTED AREA.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “affected area” means land along the approximately 116-mile stretch of the Red River, from its confluence with the north fork of the Red River on the West to the 98th meridian on the east.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term “affected area” does not include the portion of the Red River within the boundary depicted on the survey prepared by the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Township 5 South, Range 14 West, of the Indian Meridian, Oklahoma, Dependent Resurvey and Survey” and dated February 28, 2006.

(2) **GRADIENT BOUNDARY SURVEY METHOD.**—The term “gradient boundary survey method” means the measurement technique used to locate the South Bank boundary line in accordance with the methodology established in *Oklahoma v. Texas*, 261 U.S. 340 (1923) (recognizing that the boundary line along the Red River is subject to change due to erosion and accretion).

(3) **LANDOWNER.**—The term “landowner” means any individual, group, association, corporation, federally recognized Indian tribe or member of such an Indian tribe, or other private or governmental legal entity that owns an interest in land in the affected area.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(5) **SOUTH BANK.**—The term “South Bank” means the water-washed and relatively permanent elevation or acclivity (commonly known as a “cut bank”) along the southerly or right side of the Red River that—

(A) separates the bed of that river from the adjacent upland, whether valley or hill; and

(B) usually serves, as specified in the fifth paragraph of *Oklahoma v. Texas*, 261 U.S. 340 (1923)—

(i) to confine the waters within the bed; and

(ii) to preserve the course of the river.

(6) **SOUTH BANK BOUNDARY LINE.**—The term “South Bank boundary line” means the boundary, with respect to title and ownership, between the States of Oklahoma and Texas identified through the gradient boundary survey method that does not impact or alter the permanent political boundary line between the States along the Red River, as outlined under article II, section B of the Red River Boundary Compact enacted by the States and consented to by Congress pursuant to Public Law 106-288 (114 Stat. 919).

SEC. 3. SURVEY OF SOUTH BANK BOUNDARY LINE.

(a) **SURVEY REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall commission a survey to identify the South Bank boundary line in the affected area.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The survey shall—

(A) adhere to the gradient boundary survey method;

(B) span the length of the affected area;

(C) be conducted by 1 or more independent third-party surveyors that are—

(i) licensed and qualified to conduct official gradient boundary surveys; and

(ii) selected by the Secretary, in consultation with—

(I) the Texas General Land Office;

(II) the Oklahoma Commissioners of the Land Office, in consultation with the attorney general of the State of Oklahoma; and

(III) each affected federally recognized Indian Tribe; and

(D) subject to the availability of appropriations, be completed not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **APPROVAL OF THE BOUNDARY SURVEY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the survey or a portion of the survey under subsection (a)(1) is completed, the Secretary shall submit the survey for approval to—

(A) the Texas General Land Office;

(B) the Oklahoma Commissioners of the Land Office, in consultation with the attorney general of the State of Oklahoma; and

(C) each affected federally recognized Indian Tribe.

(2) **TIMING OF APPROVAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date on which each of the Texas General Land Office, the Oklahoma Commissioners of the Land Office, in consultation with the attorney general of the State of Oklahoma, and each affected federally recognized Indian Tribe notify the Secretary of the approval of the boundary survey or a portion of the survey by the applicable office or federally recognized Indian Tribe, the Secretary shall determine whether to approve the survey or portion of the survey, subject to paragraph (4).

(3) **SUBMISSION OF PORTIONS OF SURVEY FOR APPROVAL.**—As portions of the survey are completed, the Secretary may submit the completed portions of the survey for approval under paragraph (1).

(4) **WRITTEN APPROVAL.**—The Secretary shall only approve the survey, or a portion of the survey, that has the written approval of each of—

(A) the Texas General Land Office;

(B) the Oklahoma Commissioners of the Land Office, in consultation with the attorney general of the State of Oklahoma; and

(C) each affected federally recognized Indian Tribe.

SEC. 4. SURVEY OF INDIVIDUAL PARCELS.

Surveys of individual parcels in the affected area shall be conducted in accordance with the boundary survey approved under section 3(b).

SEC. 5. NOTICE AND AVAILABILITY OF SURVEY.

Not later than 60 days after the date on which the boundary survey is approved under section 3(b), the Secretary shall—

(1) publish notice of the approval of the survey in—

(A) the Federal Register; and

(B) 1 or more local newspapers; and

(2) on request, furnish to any landowner a copy of—

(A) the survey; and

(B) any field notes relating to—

(i) the individual parcel of the landowner; or

(ii) any individual parcel adjacent to the individual parcel of the landowner.

SEC. 6. EFFECT OF ACT.

Nothing in this Act—

(1) modifies any interest of the State of Oklahoma or Texas, or the sovereignty, property, or trust rights of any federally recognized Indian Tribe, relating to land located north of the South Bank boundary line, as established by the survey;

(2) modifies any land patented under the Act of December 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 1069, chapter 47; 43 U.S.C. 1068) (commonly known as the “Color of Title Act”), before the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) modifies or supersedes the Red River Boundary Compact enacted by the States of

Oklahoma and Texas and consented to by Congress pursuant to Public Law 106-288 (114 Stat. 919);

(4) creates or reinstates any Indian reservation or any portion of such a reservation;

(5) modifies any interest or any property or trust rights of any individual Indian allottee; or

(6) alters any valid right of the State of Oklahoma or the Kiowa, Comanche, or Apache Indian tribes to the mineral interest trust fund established under the Act of June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 740, chapter 572).

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this Act \$1,000,000.

SA 4095. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. REPORT ON INCREASED RISK OF TERRORIST ATTACKS TO UNITED STATES 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.

SA 4096. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING CONTINUED MILITARY OPERATIONS AND COOPERATION WITH ISRAEL AND REGIONAL ALLIES.

Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to influence or disrupt any military operations and cooperation with Israel.

SA 4097. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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 4, line 16, insert after “associated forces” the following: “or involved in the provision of materials and advice intended to reduce civilian casualties or further enable adherence to the Law of Armed Conflict”.

SA 4098. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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 4, line 16, insert after “associated forces,” the following: “or to support efforts

to disrupt Houthi attacks against locations outside of Yemen, such as ballistic missile attacks, unmanned aerial vehicle attacks, maritime attacks against United States or international vessels, or terrorist attacks against civilian targets.”.

SA 4099. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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 4, line 14, insert “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)),” after “Yemen.”.

SA 4100. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. REQUIREMENTS FOR CIVIL NUCLEAR CO-OPERATION AGREEMENTS WITH THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA.

Any United States-Saudi Arabia civilian nuclear cooperation agreement under section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153) concluded after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution shall—

(1) prohibit the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia from enriching uranium or separating plutonium on Saudi Arabian territory; and

(2) require the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to bring into force the Additional Protocol with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

SA 4101. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. 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.

SA 4102. Mr. GARDNER (for Mr. CARDIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1158, to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crimes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States Government’s efforts at atrocity prevention and response through interagency coordination, such as the Atrocities Prevention Board (referred to in this Act as the “Board”) or successor entity are critically important, and that appropriate officials of the United States Government should—

(1) meet regularly to monitor developments throughout the world that heighten the risk of atrocities;

(2) identify any gaps in United States foreign policy concerning regions or particular countries related to atrocity prevention and response;

(3) facilitate the development and implementation of policies to enhance the capacity of the United States to prevent and respond to atrocities worldwide;

(4) provide the President and Congress with recommendations to improve policies, programs, resources, and tools related to atrocity prevention and response;

(5) conduct outreach, including consultations, not less frequently than biannually, with representatives of nongovernmental organizations and civil society dedicated to atrocity prevention and response;

(6) operate with regular consultation and participation of designated interagency representatives of relevant Federal agencies, executive departments, or offices; and

(7) ensure resources are made available for the policies, programs, and tools related to atrocity prevention and response.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States to—

(1) regard the prevention of atrocities as in its national interest;

(2) work with partners and allies, including to build their capacity, and enhance the capacity of the United States, to identify, prevent, and respond to the causes of atrocities, including insecurity, mass displacement, violent conflict, and other conditions that may lead to such atrocities; and

(3) pursue a United States Government-wide strategy to identify, prevent, and respond to the risk of atrocities by—

(A) strengthening the diplomatic, risk analysis and monitoring, strategic planning, early warning, and response capacities of the Government;

(B) improving the use of foreign assistance to respond early, effectively, and urgently in order to address the causes of atrocities;

(C) strengthening diplomatic response and the effective use of foreign assistance to support appropriate transitional justice measures, including criminal accountability, for past atrocities;

(D) supporting and strengthening local civil society, including human rights defenders and others working to help prevent and respond to atrocities;

(E) promoting financial transparency and enhancing anti-corruption initiatives as part of addressing causes of conditions that may lead to atrocities; and

(F) employing a variety of unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral means to prevent and respond to atrocities by—

(i) placing a high priority on timely, preventive diplomatic efforts; and

(ii) exercising leadership in promoting international efforts to prevent atrocities.

SEC. 4. TRAINING OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS IN CONFLICT AND ATROCITIES PREVENTION.

Section 708 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4028) is amended in subsection (a)(1)—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) for Foreign Service Officers who will be assigned to a country experiencing or at risk of mass atrocities, as determined by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and relevant civil society organizations, instruction on recognizing patterns of escalation and early warning signs of potential atrocities, and methods of preventing and responding to atrocities, including conflict assessment methods, peacebuilding, mediation for prevention, early action and response, and appropriate transitional justice measures to address atrocities.”.

SEC. 5. REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter for the following six years, the President shall transmit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report, with a classified annex if necessary, that includes—

(1) a review, in consultation with appropriate interagency representatives, including the Board, consisting of a detailed description of—

(A) current efforts to prevent and respond to atrocities, based on United States and locally identified indicators, including an analysis of capacities and constraints for interagency detection, early warning and response, information-sharing, contingency planning, and coordination;

(B) recommendations to further strengthen United States capabilities described in subparagraph (A);

(C) funding expended by relevant Federal departments and agencies on atrocities prevention activities, including appropriate transitional justice measures and the legal, procedural, and resource constraints faced by the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development throughout respective budgeting, strategic planning, and management cycles regarding support for atrocity prevention activities;

(D) a global assessment of ongoing atrocities, including the findings of such assessment and, where relevant, the efficacy of any steps taken by the Board or relevant Federal agency to respond to such atrocities;

(E) countries and regions at risk of atrocities, including a description of specific risk factors, at-risk groups, and likely scenarios in which atrocities would occur; and

(F) the atrocities prevention training for Foreign Service officers authorized under subparagraph (D) of section 708(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, as added by section 4;

(2) recommendations to ensure shared responsibility by—

(A) enhancing multilateral mechanisms for preventing atrocities, including strengthening the role of international organizations and international financial institutions in conflict prevention, mitigation, and response; and

(B) strengthening relevant regional organizations;

(3) the implementation status of the recommendations contained in the previous review required by this section; and

(4) identification of the Federal agencies and civil society, academic, and nongovernmental organizations and institutions consulted for preparation of such report.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—The preparation of the report required by subsection (a) shall include a consideration of analysis, reporting, and policy rec-

ommendations to prevent and respond to atrocities produced by civil society, academic, and other nongovernmental organizations and institutions.

(c) AVAILABILITY TO CONGRESS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be made available to all members of Congress.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “genocide” means an offense under subsection (a) of section 1091 of title 18, United States Code;

(2) the term “atrocities” means war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide;

(3) the term “transitional justice” means the range of judicial, nonjudicial, formal, informal, retributive, and restorative measures employed by countries transitioning out of armed conflict or repressive regimes to redress legacies of atrocities and to promote long-term, sustainable peace; and

(4) the term “war crime” has the meaning given the term in section 2441(c) of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 7. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the use of military force.

SA 4103. Mr. GARDNER (for Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1222, to amend the Public Health Service Act to coordinate Federal congenital heart disease research efforts and to improve public education and awareness of congenital heart disease, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CONGENITAL HEART DISEASE RESEARCH, SURVEILLANCE, AND AWARENESS.

Section 399V–2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g–13) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 399V–2. NATIONAL CONGENITAL HEART DISEASE RESEARCH, SURVEILLANCE, AND AWARENESS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, as appropriate—

“(1) enhance and expand research and data collection efforts related to congenital heart disease, including to study and track the epidemiology of congenital heart disease to understand health outcomes for individuals with congenital heart disease across all ages;

“(2) conduct activities to improve public awareness of, and education related to, congenital heart disease, including care of individuals with such disease; and

“(3) award grants to entities to undertake the activities described in this section.

“(b) ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out activities, including, as appropriate, through a national cohort study and a nationally-representative, population-based surveillance system, to improve the understanding of the epidemiology of congenital heart disease in all age groups, with particular attention to—

“(A) the incidence and prevalence of congenital heart disease in the United States;

“(B) causation and risk factors associated with, and natural history of, congenital heart disease;

“(C) health care utilization by individuals with congenital heart disease;

“(D) demographic factors associated with congenital heart disease, such as age, race, ethnicity, sex, and family history of individuals who are diagnosed with the disease; and

“(E) evidence-based practices related to care and treatment for individuals with congenital heart disease.

“(2) PERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out the activities under this section, the Secretary may, as appropriate—

“(A) collect data on the health outcomes, including behavioral and mental health outcomes, of a diverse population of individuals of all ages with congenital heart disease, such that analysis of the outcomes will inform evidence-based practices for individuals with congenital heart disease; and

“(B) consider health disparities among individuals with congenital heart disease, which may include the consideration of prenatal exposures.

“(c) AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.—The Secretary may carry out awareness and educational activities related to congenital heart disease in individuals of all ages, which may include information for patients, family members, and health care providers, on topics such as the prevalence of such disease, the effect of such disease on individuals of all ages, and the importance of long-term, specialized care for individuals with such disease.

“(d) PUBLIC ACCESS.—The Secretary shall ensure that, subject to subsection (e), information collected under this section is made available, as appropriate, to the public, including researchers.

“(e) PATIENT PRIVACY.—The Secretary shall ensure that the data and information collected under this section are made available in a manner that, at a minimum, protects personal privacy to the extent required by applicable Federal and State law.

“(f) ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a)(3), an entity shall—

“(1) be a public or private nonprofit entity with specialized experience in congenital heart disease; and

“(2) submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”.

SEC. 3. REPORT.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act of 2017, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report summarizing any activities carried out pursuant to section 399V–2 of the Public Health Service Act (as amended by section 2), including planned activities, and a summary of any research findings and ongoing research efforts, gaps, and areas of greatest need within the Department of Health and Human Services regarding congenital heart disease in patients of all ages.

SA 4104. Mr. GARDNER (for Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2076, to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes; as follows:

Beginning on page 28, line 23, strike “year for—” and all that follows through line 9 on page 29, and insert the following: “‘year for a health department of a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian tribe and tribal organization (including those located in a

rural area or frontier area), if the Secretary determines that applying such matching requirement would result in serious hardship or an inability to carry out the purposes of the cooperative agreement awarded to such health department of a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian tribe and tribal organization.”.

SA 4105. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 54, 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. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this joint resolution may be construed as authorizing the use of military force against Iran.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator RON WYDEN, intend to object to proceeding to S. 2374, The Stopping Improper Payments to Deceased People Act, dated December 12, 2018.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, December 12, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Missing and Murdered: Confronting the Silent Crisis in Indian Country.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, December 12, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “China's Non-Traditional Espionage Against the United States.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, December 12, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.”

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, December 12, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed roundtable.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Sen-

ate on Wednesday, December 12, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Implications of China's Presence and Investment in Africa.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

The Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, December 12, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “United States Navy and Marine Corps readiness.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

The Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, December 12, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “U.S. force posture in the Indo-Pacific Region.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

The Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 06, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sean Tyler, a Defense fellow in Senator YOUNG's office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Adam Berry, be granted privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, pursuant to Public Law 115-254, on behalf of the Majority Leader of the Senate, appoints the following individual as a member of the Syria Study Group: Vance F. Serchuk, of New York.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3747

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3747) to provide for programs to help reduce the risk that prisoners will recidivate upon release from prison, and for other purposes.

Mr. GARDNER. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

IMPROVING THE INSPECTOR GENERAL PROCESS FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH INSTRUMENTALITIES ACT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3748, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3748) to amend the removal and transfer procedures for the Inspectors General of the Library of Congress, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and the Government Publishing Office.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 3748) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3748

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 “Improving the Inspector General Process for Legislative Branch Instrumentalities Act”.

SEC. 2. REMOVAL AND TRANSFER PROCEDURES FOR THE INSPECTORS GENERAL OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL, AND GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE.

(a) LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.—Paragraph (2) of section 1307(c) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2006 (2 U.S.C. 185(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) REMOVAL OR TRANSFER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General may be removed from office, or transferred to another position within, or another location of, the Library of Congress, by the Librarian of Congress.

“(B) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days before the Librarian of Congress removes or transfers the Inspector General under subparagraph (A), the Librarian of Congress shall communicate in writing the reason for the removal or transfer to—

“(i) the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(ii) the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

“(C) APPLICABILITY.—Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit a personnel action (except for removal or transfer) that is otherwise authorized by law.”.

(b) OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL.—Paragraph (2) of section 1301(c) of the Architect of the Capitol Inspector General Act of 2007 (2 U.S.C. 1808(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) REMOVAL OR TRANSFER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General may be removed from office, or transferred

to another position within, or another location of, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, by the Architect of the Capitol.

“(B) NOTICE.—Not later than 30 days before the Architect of the Capitol removes or transfers the Inspector General under subparagraph (A), the Architect of the Capitol shall communicate in writing the reason for the removal or transfer to—

“(i) the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(ii) the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

“(C) APPLICABILITY.—Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit a personnel action (except for removal or transfer) that is otherwise authorized by law.”.

(c) GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE.—Section 3902(b) of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b)(1) The Inspector General may be removed from office, or transferred to another position within, or another location of, the Government Publishing Office, by the Director of the Government Publishing Office.

“(2) Not later than 30 days before the Director removes or transfers the Inspector General under paragraph (1), the Director shall communicate in writing the reason for the removal or transfer to—

“(A) the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

“(3) Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit a personnel action (except for removal or transfer) that is otherwise authorized by law.”.

ELIE WIESEL GENOCIDE AND ATROCITIES PREVENTION ACT OF 2018

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 489, S. 1158.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1158) to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States Government’s efforts at atrocity prevention and response through interagency coordination, such as the Atrocities Prevention Board (referred to in this Act as the “Board”) or successor entity are critically important, and that appropriate officials of the United States Government should—

(1) meet regularly to monitor developments throughout the world that heighten the risk of atrocities;

(2) identify any gaps in United States foreign policy concerning regions or particular countries related to atrocity prevention and response;

(3) facilitate the development and implementation of policies to enhance the capacity of the United States to prevent and respond to atrocities worldwide;

(4) provide the President with recommendations to improve policies, programs, resources, and tools related to atrocity prevention and response;

(5) conduct outreach, including consultations, not less frequently than biannually, with representatives of nongovernmental organizations and civil society dedicated to atrocity prevention and response;

(6) operate with regular consultation and participation of designated interagency representatives of relevant Federal agencies, executive departments, or offices; and

(7) ensure resources are made available for the policies, programs, and tools related to atrocity prevention and response.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States to—

(1) regard the prevention of genocide and other atrocities as in its national security interests;

(2) work with partners and allies to address the root causes of insecurity and violent conflict to prevent—

(A) the mass slaughter of civilians;

(B) conditions that prompt internal displacement and the flow of refugees across borders; and

(C) other violence that wreaks havoc on regional stability and civilian populations;

(3) enhance the capacity of the United States to identify, prevent, address, and respond to the drivers of atrocities and violent conflict as part of the United States’ humanitarian, development, and strategic interests; and

(4) pursue a Government-wide strategy to prevent and respond to the risk of genocide and other atrocities by—

(A) strengthening the diplomatic, risk analysis and monitoring, strategic planning, early warning, and response capacities of the Government;

(B) improving the use of foreign assistance to respond early, effectively, and urgently in order to address the root causes and drivers of violence, and systemic patterns of human rights abuses and atrocities;

(C) strengthening diplomatic response and the effective use of foreign assistance to support appropriate transitional justice measures, including criminal accountability, for past atrocities;

(D) supporting and strengthening local civil society, including human rights defenders and others working to help prevent and respond to atrocities;

(E) promoting financial transparency and enhancing anti-corruption initiatives as part of addressing a root cause of insecurity; and

(F) employing a variety of unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral means to prevent and respond to conflicts and atrocities by—

(i) placing a high priority on timely, preventive diplomatic efforts; and

(ii) exercising a leadership role in promoting international efforts to end crises and prevent atrocities.

SEC. 4. TRAINING OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS IN CONFLICT AND ATROCITIES PREVENTION.

Section 708 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4028) is amended in subsection (a)(1)—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) for Foreign Service Officers who will be assigned to a country experiencing or at risk of mass atrocities, as determined by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and relevant civil society organizations, instruction on recognizing patterns of escalation and early warning signs of potential atrocities or violence, including gender-based violence, and methods of preventing and responding to atrocities, including conflict assessment methods, peacebuilding, mediation for prevention, early action and response, and appropriate transitional justice measures to address atrocities.”.

SEC. 5. REPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter for the following six years, the President shall transmit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report, with a classified annex if necessary, that includes—

(1) a review, in consultation with appropriate interagency representatives, consisting of a detailed description of—

(A) current efforts to prevent and respond to situations of genocide, atrocities, and other mass violence, such as gender-based violence and violence against religious and other minorities, based on United States and locally identified indicators, including an analysis of capacities and constraints for interagency detection, early warning and response, information-sharing, contingency planning, and coordination;

(B) recommendations to further strengthen United States capabilities described in subparagraph (A);

(C) funding expended by relevant Federal departments and agencies on atrocities prevention activities, including appropriate transitional justice measures and the legal, procedural, and resource constraints faced by the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development throughout respective budgeting, strategic planning, and management cycles to support conflict and atrocities prevention activities in countries identified to be at risk of atrocities;

(D) a current global assessment of sources of instability, conflict, and atrocities, the outcomes and findings of such assessments and, where relevant, a review of activities, and the efficacy of such activities, that the Board or successor entity undertook to respond to sources of instability, conflict, and atrocities;

(E) countries and regions at risk of atrocities, including a description of most likely pathways to violence, specific risk factors, and at-risk target groups; and

(F) the atrocities prevention training for Foreign Service officers authorized under subparagraph (D) of section 708(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, as added by section 4;

(2) recommendations to ensure shared responsibility by—

(A) enhancing multilateral mechanisms for preventing atrocities, including strengthening the role of international organizations and international financial institutions in conflict prevention, mitigation, and response; and

(B) strengthening regional organizations;

(3) the implementation status of the recommendations contained in the previous review required by this section; and

(4) identification of the Federal departments and agencies and civil society, academic, and nongovernmental organizations

and institutions consulted for preparation of such report.

(b) **CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.**—The preparation of the report required by subsection (a) shall include a consideration of analysis, reporting, and policy recommendations to prevent and respond to atrocities produced by civil society, academic, and other nongovernmental organizations and institutions.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “genocide” means an offense under subsection (a) of section 1091 of title 18, United States Code;

(2) the term “atrocities” means war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide;

(3) the term “transitional justice” means the range of judicial, nonjudicial, formal, informal, retributive, and restorative measures employed by countries transitioning out of armed conflict or repressive regimes to redress legacies of atrocities and to promote long-term, sustainable peace; and

(4) the term “war crime” has the meaning given the term in section 2441(c) of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 7. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the use of military force.

Mr. GARDNER. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn; that the Cardin substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that 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 committee-reported substitute amendment was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 4102), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To make technical corrections)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the United States Government’s efforts at atrocity prevention and response through interagency coordination, such as the Atrocities Prevention Board (referred to in this Act as the “Board”) or successor entity are critically important, and that appropriate officials of the United States Government should—

(1) meet regularly to monitor developments throughout the world that heighten the risk of atrocities;

(2) identify any gaps in United States foreign policy concerning regions or particular countries related to atrocity prevention and response;

(3) facilitate the development and implementation of policies to enhance the capacity of the United States to prevent and respond to atrocities worldwide;

(4) provide the President and Congress with recommendations to improve policies, programs, resources, and tools related to atrocity prevention and response;

(5) conduct outreach, including consultations, not less frequently than biannually, with representatives of nongovernmental organizations and civil society dedicated to atrocity prevention and response;

(6) operate with regular consultation and participation of designated interagency representatives of relevant Federal agencies, executive departments, or offices; and

(7) ensure resources are made available for the policies, programs, and tools related to atrocity prevention and response.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States to—

(1) regard the prevention of atrocities as in its national interest;

(2) work with partners and allies, including to build their capacity, and enhance the capacity of the United States, to identify, prevent, and respond to the causes of atrocities, including insecurity, mass displacement, violent conflict, and other conditions that may lead to such atrocities; and

(3) pursue a United States Government-wide strategy to identify, prevent, and respond to the risk of atrocities by—

(A) strengthening the diplomatic, risk analysis and monitoring, strategic planning, early warning, and response capacities of the Government;

(B) improving the use of foreign assistance to respond early, effectively, and urgently in order to address the causes of atrocities;

(C) strengthening diplomatic response and the effective use of foreign assistance to support appropriate transitional justice measures, including criminal accountability, for past atrocities;

(D) supporting and strengthening local civil society, including human rights defenders and others working to help prevent and respond to atrocities;

(E) promoting financial transparency and enhancing anti-corruption initiatives as part of addressing causes of conditions that may lead to atrocities; and

(F) employing a variety of unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral means to prevent and respond to atrocities by—

(i) placing a high priority on timely, preventive diplomatic efforts; and

(ii) exercising leadership in promoting international efforts to prevent atrocities.

SEC. 4. TRAINING OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS IN CONFLICT AND ATROCITIES PREVENTION.

Section 708 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4028) is amended in subsection (a)(1)—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) for Foreign Service Officers who will be assigned to a country experiencing or at risk of mass atrocities, as determined by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and relevant civil society organizations, instruction on recognizing patterns of escalation and early warning signs of potential atrocities, and methods of preventing and responding to atrocities, including conflict assessment methods, peacebuilding, mediation for prevention, early action and response, and appropriate transitional justice measures to address atrocities.”.

SEC. 5. REPORTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter for the following six years, the President shall transmit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report, with a classified annex if necessary, that includes—

(1) a review, in consultation with appropriate interagency representatives, including

the Board, consisting of a detailed description of—

(A) current efforts to prevent and respond to atrocities, based on United States and locally identified indicators, including an analysis of capacities and constraints for interagency detection, early warning and response, information-sharing, contingency planning, and coordination;

(B) recommendations to further strengthen United States capabilities described in subparagraph (A);

(C) funding expended by relevant Federal departments and agencies on atrocities prevention activities, including appropriate transitional justice measures and the legal, procedural, and resource constraints faced by the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development throughout respective budgeting, strategic planning, and management cycles regarding support for atrocity prevention activities;

(D) a global assessment of ongoing atrocities, including the findings of such assessment and, where relevant, the efficacy of any steps taken by the Board or relevant Federal agency to respond to such atrocities;

(E) countries and regions at risk of atrocities, including a description of specific risk factors, at-risk groups, and likely scenarios in which atrocities would occur; and

(F) the atrocities prevention training for Foreign Service officers authorized under subparagraph (D) of section 708(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, as added by section 4;

(2) recommendations to ensure shared responsibility by—

(A) enhancing multilateral mechanisms for preventing atrocities, including strengthening the role of international organizations and international financial institutions in conflict prevention, mitigation, and response; and

(B) strengthening relevant regional organizations;

(3) the implementation status of the recommendations contained in the previous review required by this section; and

(4) identification of the Federal agencies and civil society, academic, and nongovernmental organizations and institutions consulted for preparation of such report.

(b) **CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.**—The preparation of the report required by subsection (a) shall include a consideration of analysis, reporting, and policy recommendations to prevent and respond to atrocities produced by civil society, academic, and other nongovernmental organizations and institutions.

(c) **AVAILABILITY TO CONGRESS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be made available to all members of Congress.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “genocide” means an offense under subsection (a) of section 1091 of title 18, United States Code;

(2) the term “atrocities” means war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide;

(3) the term “transitional justice” means the range of judicial, nonjudicial, formal, informal, retributive, and restorative measures employed by countries transitioning out of armed conflict or repressive regimes to redress legacies of atrocities and to promote long-term, sustainable peace; and

(4) the term “war crime” has the meaning given the term in section 2441(c) of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 7. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as authorizing the use of military force.

The bill (S. 1158), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTING GIRLS' ACCESS TO EDUCATION IN VULNERABLE SETTINGS ACT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 530, S. 1580.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1580) to enhance the transparency, improve the coordination, and intensify the impact of assistance to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children and persons, including women and girls, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Girls' Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) As of June 2018, more than 68,000,000 people have been displaced by disasters and conflicts around the world, the highest number recorded since the end of World War II, of which more than 25,000,000 people are refugees.

(2) More than half of the population of refugees are children and, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, nearly 4,000,000 school-aged refugee children lack access to primary education.

(3) Education offers socioeconomic opportunities, psychological stability, and physical protection for displaced people, particularly for women and girls, who might otherwise be vulnerable to severe forms of trafficking in persons (as such term is defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)), child marriage, sexual exploitation, or economic disenfranchisement.

(4) Displaced children face considerable barriers to accessing educational services and, because the duration of such displacement is, on average, 26 years, such children may spend the entirety of their childhood without access to such services.

(5) Despite the rising need for educational services, as of 2016, less than two percent of humanitarian aid was directed toward educational services.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is critical to ensure that children, particularly girls, displaced by conflicts overseas are able to access educational services because such access can combat extremism and reduce exploitation and poverty; and

(2) the educational needs of vulnerable women and girls should be considered in the design, implementation, and evaluation of related United States foreign assistance policies and programs.

SEC. 4. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to—

(1) partner with and encourage other countries, public and private multilateral institutions, and nongovernmental and civil society organizations, including faith-based organizations and organizations representing parents and

children, to support efforts to ensure that displaced children have access to safe primary and secondary education;

(2) work with donors to enhance training and capacity-building for the governments of countries hosting significant numbers of displaced people to design, implement, and monitor programs to effectively address barriers to such education; and

(3) coordinate with the governments of countries hosting significant numbers of displaced people to—

(A) promote the inclusion of displaced children into the educational systems of such countries; and

(B) in circumstances in which such inclusion is difficult, develop innovative approaches to providing safe primary and secondary educational opportunities, such as encouraging schools to permit children to be educated by extending the hours of schooling or expanding the number of teachers.

SEC. 5. UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR DISPLACED CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development are authorized to prioritize and advance ongoing efforts to support programs that—

(1) provide safe primary and secondary education for displaced children;

(2) build the capacity of institutions in countries hosting displaced people to prevent discrimination against displaced children, especially displaced girls, who seek access to such education; and

(3) help increase the access of displaced children, especially displaced girls, to educational, economic, and entrepreneurial opportunities, including through the governmental authorities responsible for educational or youth services in such host countries.

(b) COORDINATION WITH MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary and the Administrator are authorized to coordinate with the World Bank, appropriate agencies of the United Nations, and other relevant multilateral organizations to work with governments in other countries to collect relevant data, disaggregated by age and gender, on the ability of displaced people to access education and participate in economic activity, in order to improve the targeting, monitoring, and evaluation of related assistance efforts.

(c) COORDINATION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR AND CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary and the Administrator are authorized to work with private sector and civil society organizations to promote safe primary and secondary education for displaced children.

SEC. 6. REPORT.

The Secretary and the Administrator shall include in the report required under section 7 of the READ Act (division A of Public Law 115-56; 22 U.S.C. 2151c note) a description of any primary or secondary educational services supported by programs for natural or manmade disaster relief or response that specifically address the needs of displaced girls.

Mr. GARDNER. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. GARDNER. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 1580), as amended, was passed.

Mr. GARDNER. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGENITAL HEART FUTURES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 555, H.R. 1222.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1222) to amend the Public Health Service Act to coordinate Federal congenital heart disease research efforts and to improve public education and awareness of congenital heart disease, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CONGENITAL HEART DISEASE RESEARCH, SURVEILLANCE, AND AWARENESS.

Section 399V-2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-13) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 399V-2. NATIONAL CONGENITAL HEART DISEASE RESEARCH, SURVEILLANCE, AND AWARENESS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, as appropriate—

"(1) enhance and expand research and data collection efforts related to congenital heart disease, including to study and track the epidemiology of congenital heart disease to understand health outcomes for individuals with congenital heart disease across all ages;

"(2) conduct activities to improve public awareness of, and education related to, congenital heart disease, including care of individuals with such disease; and

"(3) award grants to entities to undertake the activities described in this section.

"(b) ACTIVITIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out activities, including, as appropriate, through a national cohort study and a nationally-representative, population-based surveillance system, to improve the understanding of the epidemiology of congenital heart disease in all age groups, with particular attention to—

"(A) the incidence and prevalence of congenital heart disease in the United States;

"(B) causation and risk factors associated with, and natural history of, congenital heart disease;

"(C) health care utilization by individuals with congenital heart disease;

"(D) demographic factors associated with congenital heart disease, such as age, race, ethnicity, sex, and family history of individuals who are diagnosed with the disease; and

“(E) evidence-based practices related to care and treatment for individuals with congenital heart disease.

“(2) **PERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATIONS.**—In carrying out the activities under this section, the Secretary may, as appropriate—

“(A) collect data on the health outcomes, including behavioral and mental health outcomes, of a diverse population of individuals of all ages with congenital heart disease, such that analysis of the outcomes will inform evidence-based practices for individuals with congenital heart disease; and

“(B) consider health disparities among individuals with congenital heart disease, which may include the consideration of prenatal exposures.

“(c) **AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.**—The Secretary may carry out awareness and educational activities related to congenital heart disease in individuals of all ages, which may include information for patients, family members, and health care providers, on topics such as the prevalence of such disease, the effect of such disease on individuals of all ages, and the importance of long-term, specialized care for individuals with such disease.

“(d) **PUBLIC ACCESS.**—The Secretary shall ensure that, subject to subsection (e), information collected under this section is made available, as appropriate, to the public, including researchers.

“(e) **PATIENT PRIVACY.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the data and information collected under this section are made available in a manner that, at a minimum, protects personal privacy to the extent required by applicable Federal and State law.

“(f) **ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.**—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a)(3), an entity shall—

“(1) be a public or private nonprofit entity with specialized experience in congenital heart disease; and

“(2) submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.”.

SEC. 3. REPORT.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act of 2017, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report summarizing any activities carried out pursuant to section 399V-2 of the Public Health Service Act (as amended by section 2), including planned activities, and a summary of any research findings and ongoing research efforts, gaps, and areas of greatest need within the Department of Health and Human Services regarding congenital heart disease in patients of all ages.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn, the Durbin substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported substitute amendment was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 4103) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CONGENITAL HEART DISEASE RESEARCH, SURVEILLANCE, AND AWARENESS.

Section 399V-2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-13) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 399V-2. NATIONAL CONGENITAL HEART DISEASE RESEARCH, SURVEILLANCE, AND AWARENESS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall, as appropriate—

“(1) enhance and expand research and data collection efforts related to congenital heart disease, including to study and track the epidemiology of congenital heart disease to understand health outcomes for individuals with congenital heart disease across all ages;

“(2) conduct activities to improve public awareness of, and education related to, congenital heart disease, including care of individuals with such disease; and

“(3) award grants to entities to undertake the activities described in this section.

“(b) **ACTIVITIES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out activities, including, as appropriate, through a national cohort study and a nationally-representative, population-based surveillance system, to improve the understanding of the epidemiology of congenital heart disease in all age groups, with particular attention to—

“(A) the incidence and prevalence of congenital heart disease in the United States;

“(B) causation and risk factors associated with, and natural history of, congenital heart disease;

“(C) health care utilization by individuals with congenital heart disease;

“(D) demographic factors associated with congenital heart disease, such as age, race, ethnicity, sex, and family history of individuals who are diagnosed with the disease; and

“(E) evidence-based practices related to care and treatment for individuals with congenital heart disease.

“(2) **PERMISSIBLE CONSIDERATIONS.**—In carrying out the activities under this section, the Secretary may, as appropriate—

“(A) collect data on the health outcomes, including behavioral and mental health outcomes, of a diverse population of individuals of all ages with congenital heart disease, such that analysis of the outcomes will inform evidence-based practices for individuals with congenital heart disease; and

“(B) consider health disparities among individuals with congenital heart disease, which may include the consideration of prenatal exposures.

“(c) **AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.**—The Secretary may carry out awareness and educational activities related to congenital heart disease in individuals of all ages, which may include information for patients, family members, and health care providers, on topics such as the prevalence of such disease, the effect of such disease on individuals of all ages, and the importance of long-term, specialized care for individuals with such disease.

“(d) **PUBLIC ACCESS.**—The Secretary shall ensure that, subject to subsection (e), information collected under this section is made available, as appropriate, to the public, including researchers.

“(e) **PATIENT PRIVACY.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the data and information collected under this section are made available in a manner that, at a minimum, protects personal privacy to the extent required by applicable Federal and State law.

“(f) **ELIGIBILITY FOR GRANTS.**—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a)(3), an entity shall—

“(1) be a public or private nonprofit entity with specialized experience in congenital heart disease; and

“(2) submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(g) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”.

SEC. 3. REPORT.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act of 2017, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report summarizing any activities carried out pursuant to section 399V-2 of the Public Health Service Act (as amended by section 2), including planned activities, and a summary of any research findings and ongoing research efforts, gaps, and areas of greatest need within the Department of Health and Human Services regarding congenital heart disease in patients of all ages.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1222), as amended, was passed.

FEDERAL PERSONAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2018

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 621, S. 3031.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3031) to amend chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code, to improve the management of Federal personal property.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 3031) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3031

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 “Federal Personal Property Management Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. FEDERAL PERSONAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT.

(a) **INVENTORY ASSESSING AND IDENTIFYING EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY.**—Section 524(a) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (11), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (12), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(13) in accordance with guidance from the Administrator of General Services—

“(A) on an annual basis, conduct an inventory and assessment of capitalized personal property to identify excess capitalized personal property under its control, including evaluating—

“(i) the age and condition of the personal property;

“(ii) the extent to which the executive agency utilizes the personal property;

“(iii) the extent to which the mission of the executive agency is dependent on the personal property; and

“(iv) any other aspect of the personal property that the Administrator determines is useful or necessary for the executive agency to evaluate; and

“(B) on a regular basis, conduct an inventory and assessment of accountable personal property under its control, including evaluating—

“(i) the age and condition of the personal property;

“(ii) the extent to which the executive agency utilizes the personal property;

“(iii) the extent to which the mission of the executive agency is dependent on the personal property; and

“(iv) any other aspect of the personal property that the Administrator determines is useful or necessary for the executive agency to evaluate.”.

(b) **THRESHOLDS FOR CAPITALIZATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY.**—Section 506(a)(1) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) **CAPITALIZATION THRESHOLDS.**—Establish thresholds for acquisitions of personal property for which executive agencies shall capitalize the personal property.

“(F) **ACCOUNTABILITY THRESHOLDS.**—Notwithstanding section 121(b), for the management and accountability of personal property, establish thresholds for acquisitions of personal property for which executive agencies shall establish and maintain property records in a centralized system.”.

BUILDING OUR LARGEST DEMENTIA INFRASTRUCTURE FOR ALZHEIMER'S ACT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 694, S. 2076.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Building Our Largest Dementia Infrastructure for Alzheimer's Act” or the “BOLD Infrastructure for Alzheimer's Act”.

SEC. 2. PROMOTION OF PUBLIC HEALTH KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE, COGNITIVE DECLINE, AND BRAIN HEALTH UNDER THE ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE AND HEALTHY AGING PROGRAM.

Part K of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280c et seq.) is amended—

(1) in the part heading, by adding “**AND PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS FOR DEMENTIA**” at the end; and

(2) in subpart II—

(A) by striking the subpart heading and inserting the following:

“**Subpart II—Programs With Respect to Alzheimer's Disease and Related Dementias**”; and

(B) by striking section 398A (42 U.S.C. 280c-4) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 398A. PROMOTION OF PUBLIC HEALTH KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE AND RELATED DEMENTIAS.

“(a) **ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE AND RELATED DEMENTIAS PUBLIC HEALTH CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in coordination with the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the heads of other agencies as appropriate, shall award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to eligible entities, such as institutions of higher education, State, tribal, and local health departments, Indian tribes, tribal organizations, associations, or other appropriate entities for the establishment or support of regional centers to address Alzheimer's disease and related dementias by—

“(A) advancing the awareness of public health officials, health care professionals, and the public, on the most current information and research related to Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, including cognitive decline, brain health, and associated health disparities;

“(B) identifying and translating promising research findings, such as findings from research and activities conducted or supported by the National Institutes of Health, including Alzheimer's Disease Research Centers authorized by section 445, into evidence-based programmatic interventions for populations with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias and caregivers for such populations; and

“(C) expanding activities, including through public-private partnerships related to Alzheimer's disease and related dementias and associated health disparities.

“(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—To be eligible to receive a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this subsection, an entity shall submit to the Secretary an application containing such agreements and information as the Secretary may require, including a description of how the entity will—

“(A) coordinate, as applicable, with existing Federal, State, and tribal programs related to Alzheimer's disease and related dementias;

“(B) examine, evaluate, and promote evidence-based interventions for individuals with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, including underserved populations with such conditions, and those who provide care for such individuals; and

“(C) prioritize activities relating to—

“(i) expanding efforts, as appropriate, to implement evidence-based practices to address Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, including through the training of State, local, and tribal public health officials and other health professionals on such practices;

“(ii) supporting early detection and diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias;

“(iii) reducing the risk of potentially avoidable hospitalizations of individuals with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias;

“(iv) reducing the risk of cognitive decline and cognitive impairment associated with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias;

“(v) enhancing support to meet the needs of caregivers of individuals with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias;

“(vi) reducing health disparities related to the care and support of individuals with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias;

“(vii) supporting care planning and management for individuals with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias; and

“(viii) supporting other relevant activities identified by the Secretary or the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as appropriate.

“(3) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In awarding grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider, among other factors, whether the entity—

“(A) provides services to rural areas or other underserved populations;

“(B) is able to build on an existing infrastructure of services and public health research; and

“(C) has experience with providing care or caregiver support, or has experience conducting research related to Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

“(4) **DISTRIBUTION OF AWARDS.**—In awarding grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under this subsection, the Secretary, to the extent practicable, shall ensure equitable distribution of awards based on geographic area, including consideration of rural areas, and the burden of the disease within sub-populations.

“(5) **DATA REPORTING AND PROGRAM OVERSIGHT.**—With respect to a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement awarded under this subsection, not later than 90 days after the end of the first year of the period of assistance, and annually thereafter for the duration of the grant, contract, or agreement (including the duration of any renewal period as provided for under paragraph (5)), the entity shall submit data, as appropriate, to the Secretary regarding—

“(A) the programs and activities funded under the grant, contract, or agreement; and

“(B) outcomes related to such programs and activities.

“(b) **IMPROVING DATA ON STATE AND NATIONAL PREVALENCE OF ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE AND RELATED DEMENTIAS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall, as appropriate, improve the analysis and timely reporting of data on the incidence and prevalence of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias. Such data may include, as appropriate, information on cognitive decline, caregiving, and health disparities experienced by individuals with cognitive decline and their caregivers. The Secretary may award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements to eligible entities for activities under this paragraph.

“(2) **ELIGIBILITY.**—To be eligible to receive a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this subsection, an entity shall be a public or nonprofit private entity, including institutions of higher education, State, local, and tribal health departments, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations, and submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(3) **DATA SOURCES.**—The analysis, timely public reporting, and dissemination of data under this subsection may be carried out using data sources such as the following:

“(A) The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System.

“(B) The National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey.

“(C) The National Health Interview Survey.

“(c) **IMPROVED COORDINATION.**—The Secretary shall ensure that activities and programs related to dementia under this section do not unnecessarily duplicate activities and programs of other agencies and offices within the Department of Health and Human Services.”.

SEC. 3. SUPPORTING STATE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS RELATED TO ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE AND RELATED DEMENTIAS.

Section 398 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280c-3) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “**establishment of program**” and inserting “**COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS TO STATES AND PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENTS FOR ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE AND RELATED DEMENTIAS**”;

(2) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in coordination with the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the heads of other agencies, as appropriate, shall award cooperative agreements to health departments of States, political subdivisions of States, and Indian tribes and tribal organizations, to address Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, including by reducing cognitive decline, helping meet the needs of caregivers, and addressing unique aspects of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias to support the development and implementation of evidence-based interventions with respect to—

“(1) educating and informing the public, based on evidence-based public health research and data, about Alzheimer's disease and related dementias;

“(2) supporting early detection and diagnosis;

“(3) reducing the risk of potentially avoidable hospitalizations for individuals with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias;

“(4) reducing the risk of cognitive decline and cognitive impairment associated with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias;

“(5) improving support to meet the needs of caregivers of individuals with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias;

“(6) supporting care planning and management for individuals with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

“(7) supporting other relevant activities identified by the Secretary or the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as appropriate.”; and

(3) by striking subsection (b);

(4) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (g);

(5) by inserting after subsection (a), the following:

“(b) **PREFERENCE.**—In awarding cooperative agreements under this section, the Secretary shall give preference to applications that focus on addressing health disparities, including populations and geographic areas that have the highest prevalence of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias.

“(c) **ELIGIBILITY.**—To be eligible to receive a cooperative agreement under this section, an eligible entity (pursuant to subsection (a)) shall prepare and submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including a plan that describes—

“(1) how the applicant proposes to develop or expand, programs to educate individuals through partnership engagement, workforce development, guidance and support for programmatic efforts, and evaluation with respect to Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and in the case of a cooperative agreement under this section, how the applicant proposes to support other relevant activities identified by the Secretary or Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as appropriate.

“(2) the manner in which the applicant will coordinate with Federal, tribal, and State programs related to Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and appropriate State, tribal, and local agencies, as well as other relevant public and private organizations or agencies; and

“(3) the manner in which the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of any program carried out under the cooperative agreement.

“(d) **MATCHING REQUIREMENT.**—Each health department that is awarded a cooperative agree-

ment under subsection (a) shall provide, from non-Federal sources, an amount equal to 30 percent of the amount provided under such agreement (which may be provided in cash or in-kind) to carry out the activities supported by the cooperative agreement.

“(e) **WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may waive all or part of the matching requirement described in subsection (d) for any fiscal year for—

“(1) a health department of a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian tribe and tribal organization, if the Secretary determines that applying such matching requirement would result in serious hardship or an inability to carry out the purposes of the cooperative agreement awarded to such health department of a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian tribe and tribal organization; or

“(2) a health department of a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian tribe and tribal organization located in a rural area or frontier area.”;

(6) in subsection (f) (as so redesignated), by striking “grant” and inserting “cooperative agreement”; and

(7) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) **NON-DUPLICATION OF EFFORT.**—The Secretary shall ensure that activities under any cooperative agreement awarded under this subpart do not unnecessarily duplicate efforts of other agencies and offices within the Department of Health and Human Services related to—

“(1) activities of centers of excellence with respect to Alzheimer's disease and related dementias described in section 398A; and

“(2) activities of public health departments with respect to Alzheimer's disease and related dementias described in this section.”.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.

Section 398B of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280c-5) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “or cooperative agreement” after “grant” each place that such appears;

(B) by striking “section 398(a) to a State unless the State” and inserting “sections 398 or 398A to an entity unless the entity”; and

(C) by striking “10” and inserting “5”;

(2) by striking subsection (b);

(3) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively;

(4) in subsection (b) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “section 398(a) to a State unless the State” and inserting “sections 398 or 398A to an entity unless the entity”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “expenditures required in subsection (b);” and inserting “expenditures;”;

(5) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “each demonstration project for which a grant” and inserting “the activities for which an award”; and

(ii) by striking “section 398(a)” and inserting “sections 398 or 398A”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “6 months” and inserting “1 year”;

(6) by inserting after subsection (c) (as so redesignated), the following:

“(d) **DEFINITION.**—In this subpart, the terms ‘Indian tribe’ and ‘tribal organization’ have the meanings given such terms in section 4 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.”; and

(7) in subsection (e), by striking “\$5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1988 through 1990” and all that follows through “2002” and inserting “\$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024”.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Collins amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, that the committee-reported substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to, and the bill, as

amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 4104) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify provisions relating to waivers)

Beginning on page 28, line 23, strike “year for—” and all that follows through line 9 on page 29, and insert the following: “‘year for a health department of a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian tribe and tribal organization (including those located in a rural area or frontier area), if the Secretary determines that applying such matching requirement would result in serious hardship or an inability to carry out the purposes of the cooperative agreement awarded to such health department of a State, political subdivision of a State, or Indian tribe and tribal organization.’”.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the bill?

Hearing none, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2076), as amended, was passed.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The bill (S. 2076), as amended, is printed in the RECORD of December 21, 2018, on page S. 8018.)

AMENDING THE FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT OF 1971

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 7120, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 7120) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to extend through 2023 the authority of the Federal Election Commission to impose civil money penalties on the basis of a schedule of penalties established and published by the Commission.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 7120) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RECOGNIZING THE HERITAGE, CULTURE, AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICAN INDIAN, ALASKA NATIVE, AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN WOMEN IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Indian Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration and that the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 444.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 444) recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women in the United States.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GARDNER. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 444) was agreed to.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 22, 2018, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RECOGNIZING THE 29TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRIBAL CANOE JOURNEY OF THE TRIBAL NATIONS OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST AND CONGRATULATING THE PUYALLUP TRIBE OF INDIANS FOR HOSTING THE 2018 POWER PADDLE TO PUYALLUP

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Indian Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration and that the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 596.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 596) recognizing the 29th anniversary of the Tribal Canoe Journey of the Tribal Nations of the Pacific Northwest and congratulating the Puyallup Tribe of Indians for hosting the 2018 Power Paddle to Puyallup.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 596) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of July 26, 2018, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

THE CALENDAR

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc: H.R. 6020, H.R. 5791, H.R. 5792, H.R. 6591, and H.R. 6780.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measures en bloc?

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bills, en bloc.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be considered read a third time and passed and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

SERGEANT DONALD BURGETT POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 6020) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 325 South Michigan Avenue in Howell, Michigan, as the "Sergeant Donald Burgett Post Office Building" was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DEPUTY SHERIFF ZACKARI SPURLOCK PARRISH, III, POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 5791) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9609 South University Boulevard in Highlands Ranch, Colorado, as the "Deputy Sheriff Zackari Spurlock Parrish, III, Post Office Building" was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DETECTIVE HEATH McDONALD GUMM POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 5792) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 North 4th Avenue in Brighton, Colorado, as the "Detective Heath McDonald Gumm Post Office" was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NAPOLEON 'NAP' FORD POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 6591) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 501 South Kirkman Road in Orlando, Florida, as the "Napoleon 'Nap' Ford Post Office Build-

ing" was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MAJOR ANDREAS O'KEEFFE POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 6780) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7521 Paula Drive in Tampa, Florida, as the "Major Andreas O'Keeffe Post Office Building" was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following bills received from the House: H.R. 6513, H.R. 6405, H.R. 6655, H.R. 6216, H.R. 6217, H.R. 6831, H.R. 4326, H.R. 6428, H.R. 5395, H.R. 5412, H.R. 6621, H.R. 1210, H.R. 1211, H.R. 3184, and H.R. 6628.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measures en bloc?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills, en bloc.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be considered read a third time and passed and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUDGE JAMES E. HORTON, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 6513) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1110 West Market Street in Athens, Alabama, as the "Judge James E. Horton, Jr. Post Office Building" was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

LANCE CORPORAL JUANA NAVARRO ARELLANO POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (H.R. 6405) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2801 Mitchell Road in Ceres, California, as the "Lance Corporal Juana Navarro Arellano Post Office Building" was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

JANET LUCILLE OILAR POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 6655) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 44160 State Highway 299 East Suite 1 in McArthur, California, as the "Janet Lucille Oilar Post Office" was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SERGEANT DAVID KINTERKNECHT POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 6216) to designate the facility of the United States Postal

Service located at 3025 Woodgate Road in Montrose, Colorado, as the “Sergeant David Kinterknecht Post Office” was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

**DEPUTY SHERIFF DEREK GEER
POST OFFICE BUILDING**

The bill (H.R. 6217) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 241 N 4th Street in Grand Junction, Colorado, as the “Deputy Sheriff Derek Geer Post Office Building” was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

**PATRICK E. MAHANY, JR., POST
OFFICE BUILDING**

The bill (H.R. 6831) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 West Main Street in Frisco, Colorado, as the “Patrick E. Mahany, Jr., Post Office Building” was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SGT. JOSH RODGERS POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 4326) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 West North Street in Normal, Illinois, as the “Sgt. Josh Rodgers Post Office” was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

FRANK LEONE POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 6428) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 332 Ramapo Valley Road in Oakland, New Jersey, as the “Frank Leone Post Office” was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

**STAFF SERGEANT ALEXANDRIA
GLEASON-MORROW POST OFFICE
BUILDING**

The bill (H.R. 5395) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 116 Main Street in Dansville, New York, as the “Staff Sergeant Alexandria Gleason-Morrow Post Office Building” was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

**ARMY SPECIALIST JOSE L. RUIZ
POST OFFICE BUILDING**

The bill (H.R. 5412) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 2nd Avenue in Brentwood, New York, as the “Army Specialist Jose L. Ruiz Post Office Building” was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

**MAJOR HOMER L. PEASE POST
OFFICE**

The bill (H.R. 6621) to designate the facility of the United States Postal

Service located at 530 East Main Street in Johnson City, Tennessee, as the “Major Homer L. Pease Post Office” was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

**PLEASANTON VETERANS POST
OFFICE**

The bill (H.R. 1210) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 122 W. Goodwin Street, Pleasanton, Texas, as the “Pleasanton Veterans Post Office” was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ENCINAL VETERANS POST OFFICE

The bill (H.R. 1211) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 400 N. Main Street, Encinal, Texas, as the “Encinal Veterans Post Office” was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

**CAPTAIN HUMAYUN KHAN POST
OFFICE**

The bill (H.R. 3184) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 180 McCormick Road in Charlottesville, Virginia, as the “Captain Humayun Khan Post Office” was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

**JAMES MARSHALL ‘JIMI’ HENDRIX
POST OFFICE BUILDING**

The bill (H.R. 6628) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4301 Northeast 4th Street in Renton, Washington, as the “James Marshall ‘Jimi’ Hendrix Post Office Building” was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

**UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—S.J. RES. 54**

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:45 p.m. on Thursday, December 13, all time be considered expired on S.J. Res. 54 and the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed, with 2 minutes equally divided in the usual form prior to each vote and no second-degrees in order: Young No. 4080, Cornyn No. 4096, Cornyn No. 4090, Cornyn No. 4095, Cotton No. 4097, Cotton No. 4098, and Sanders No. 4105. I further ask that following disposition of the amendments, the resolution, as amended, if amended, be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ORDERS FOR THURSDAY,
DECEMBER 13, 2018**

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Sen-

ate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, December 13; further, that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S.J. Res. 54 under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW**

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:22 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, December 13, 2018, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 12, 2018:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

L.T. GEN. JOHN N. T. SHANAHAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. KEVIN B. SCHNEIDER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN J. HAGER
BRIG. GEN. MARY K. LEAHY
BRIG. GEN. GABRIEL TROIANO
BRIG. GEN. JONATHAN WOODSON

To be brigadier general

COL. TINA B. BOYD
COL. BRIAN T. CASHMAN
COL. WALTER M. DUZZNY
COL. ERIC FOLKESTAD
COL. ERNEST LITYNSKI
COL. NELSON G. ROSEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. LAURA L. YEAGER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. MICHAEL M. GILDAY

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL JEFFREY W. BURKETT
BRIGADIER GENERAL JESSICA MEYERAAN
BRIGADIER GENERAL RUSS A. WALZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE

RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL JAMES R. CAMP
COLONEL WESLEY J. CLARE
COLONEL JAMES T. DEMAREST
COLONEL JOHN M. GREEN
COLONEL PETER T. GREEN III
COLONEL ROBERT C. KORTE
COLONEL DARRIN P. LELBUX
COLONEL MARK A. MALDONADO
COLONEL JAMES P. MARREN
COLONEL JOHN R. MULVEY
COLONEL JOHN F. O'CONNELL
COLONEL MATTHEW J. PETERSON
COLONEL ROBERT A. SCHULTE
COLONEL JAMES G. SILVASY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL DARRIN K. ANDERSON
COLONEL MARK D. AUER
COLONEL BUEL J. DICKSON
COLONEL KENNETH S. EAVES
COLONEL STEVEN S. LAMBRECHT
COLONEL TONI M. LORD
COLONEL GLEN A. MARTEL
COLONEL DAVID W. MAY
COLONEL GARY A. MCCUE
COLONEL THOMAS H. MORA
COLONEL JOHN W. POGOREK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. THOMAS A. DUKES, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. CHRISTOPHER L. MONTANARO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL VITO E. ADDABBO
BRIGADIER GENERAL MAUREEN G. BANAVIGE
BRIGADIER GENERAL BRIAN K. BORGEN
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOHN P. HEALY
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOHN A. HICKOK
BRIGADIER GENERAL JAY D. JENSEN
BRIGADIER GENERAL LINDA M. MARSH
BRIGADIER GENERAL TODD J. MCCUBBIN
BRIGADIER GENERAL TYLER D. OTTEN
BRIGADIER GENERAL BOYD C. L. PARKER IV

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL ELIZABETH E. ARLEDGE
COLONEL MATTHEW J. BURGER
COLONEL KENNETH R. COUNCIL, JR.
COLONEL DERIN S. DURHAM
COLONEL PAUL R. FAST
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER A. FREEMAN
COLONEL CONSTANCE L. JENKINS
COLONEL PAUL E. KNAPP
COLONEL DOUGLAS S. MARTIN
COLONEL JODY A. MERRITT
COLONEL JOHN M. OLSON
COLONEL STACEY L. SCARISBRICK
COLONEL DAVID W. SMITH
COLONEL ROGER P. SURO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. SAMI D. SAID

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

CATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601 AND FOR APPOINTMENT AS A SENIOR MEMBER OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 711:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID W. ALLVIN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS OF THE NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5142:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BRENT W. SCOTT

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN J. BARTRUM
COL. ANITA L. FLIGGE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LISA M. BADER AND ENDING WITH ILAINA M. WINGLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 18, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF SUNG-YUL LEE, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRANCISCA A. ALAKA LAMPTON AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL D. ZIMMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 13, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER GENE ADAMS AND ENDING WITH BENJAMIN PAUL ZUNIGA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 13, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN D. SIKORA AND ENDING WITH ANITA SARGENT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF LUKE M. SAUTER, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF TASHA L. PRAVECEK, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF BRIAN J. NEFF, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF CORY A. COOPER, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOEL A. SLOAN, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMIE J. JOHNSON AND ENDING WITH RENEE M. SUMMERS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 26, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF TIMOTHY B. MURPHY, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ANDREW M. DERAMUS, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF BRIANNE D. NEWMAN, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MOHAN S. AKELLA AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM E. ZUTELL III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 29, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNIFER L. GURGANUS AND ENDING WITH APRIL H. CLEMMENSEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 29, 2018.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF HAROLD E. TURKS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BENJAMIN M. LIPARI AND ENDING WITH GREGORY S. SOULE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON OCTOBER 5, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JENNIFER L. WRIGHT, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTIAAN D. TAYLOR, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SHAYNE R. ESTES, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL W. KEEBAUGH, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF HEINS V. RECHEUNGEL, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOHN R. SCHWAB, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF AMANDA L. SILVERS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RICKY L. WARREN, JR., TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ERIC R. SWENSON, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY C. ADOLPH AND ENDING WITH KAY K. WAKATAKE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 13, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT S. BRENNEMAN AND ENDING WITH KEVIN V. THOMPSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RICHARD S. TAYLOR, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON A. FERGUSON AND ENDING WITH SAMUEL M. SIEGAL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DANIEL S. MARSHALL, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER G. NEELEY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SAMUEL J. HIBRONPADILLA AND ENDING WITH SCOTT D. INGALSBE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KINDRA C. NEW, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SANDRA L. AHINGA AND ENDING WITH D014887, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 14, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RHONDA C. PUGH, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JEREMY W. LEWIS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DAVID R. DINKLOCKER, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF LOREN C. DUWEL, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RENEROSSE V. HINKLE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SARAH L. FORTIER, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DAVID A. NEVEAU, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KYLE B. HURST, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RAYMOND R. ADAMS III AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW E. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 29, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PAUL M. FUGERE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CLARENCE K. GRAHAM, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JACKSON A. KURTZMAN, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JEREMY T. TENNENT, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JONATHAN D. THOMPSON, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JAMES D. FOLEY, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT A. GREEN, JR. AND ENDING WITH JESUS S. MENDEZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 29, 2018.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSHUA C. ANDRES AND ENDING WITH TRAVIS R. VOSLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON NOVEMBER 13, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATION OF THOMAS J. ZERR, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF SHELTON L. LYONS II, TO BE CAPTAIN.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MR. STEPHEN E. BOYD

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my former Chief of Staff Mr. Stephen E. Boyd, for his years of service to the State of Alabama and Alabama's Second District.

Stephen grew up in Birmingham, Alabama, and graduated from the University of Alabama. Upon completion of his undergraduate degree, Stephen continued his education at the University of Alabama School of Law.

Prior to joining my staff in 2011, Stephen served for more than six years on the staff of former United States Senator Jeff Sessions as a senior advisor and Communications Director. Stephen also served as Communications Director for the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. After leaving my office, Stephen served as the Chief of Staff of the Office of Legal Policy at the United States Department of Justice.

Stephen currently serves as the Assistant U.S. Attorney General for Legislative Affairs at the United States Department of Justice. There is no one better suited to serve our country in this key role than Stephen Boyd. I know that he will continue to have great success in this role as the head of the Department of Justice's Office of Legislative Affairs.

During his time on Team Roby, Stephen proved himself to be a gracious leader time and time again. He possesses a keen intellect, conducts himself with the utmost professionalism and decorum, and demonstrates remarkable work ethic. I am thankful for Stephen's time on my staff, and I am grateful to call him and his wife Brecke, dear friends.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join Stephen's colleagues, family, and friends in honoring his successful career in Congress. I wish him all the best as he continues to serve our country. Congratulations, Stephen.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF U.S. MARINE CAPTAIN
JAHMAR F. RESILARD

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of U.S. Marine Captain Jahmar F. Resilard, whose life was tragically cut short during a training exercise last week in Japan.

Captain Resilard served our country with bravery and distinction. As a decorated pilot and member of the Marine All Weather Attack Squadron 242, he upheld the values and finest traditions of the United States Marine Corps, and dedicated himself to his fellow service members and the service of others.

He paid the ultimate sacrifice in the name of freedom when his F/A-18 Hornet collided mid-air with a KC-130 Hercules refueling tanker off the coast of Japan, an accident that sadly claimed the lives of six service members.

As a student at Miramar High School, Captain Resilard was an active member of the Civil Air Patrol. As a sophomore, he was one of just four students tasked with helping restore a vintage, four-engine Eastern Airlines DC-7B. As his fascination with flying grew, he joined the Marines and became a combat aviator, climbing quickly to the rank of Captain.

Mr. Speaker, listing Captain Resilard's many achievements does little to encompass his exceptional life, nor does it pay adequate tribute to the man he was. Our country has lost a great hero. While there is nothing I, nor anyone, could say to assuage the immense pain felt by his family, I hope that it is of comfort knowing that Jahmar served our country with honor, and that he leaves behind a legacy of exceptional service and dedication to the values each of us hold dear.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to Jahmar's family and friends. Our nation grieves with them, and I pray that they may find comfort during this extremely difficult time.

HONORING JIM MORRIS

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on behalf of the entire 6th Congressional District of Indiana, to recognize Jim Morris for his contribution to our state.

Jim is an institution in our state and has devoted his life to serving his community. Jim has worked in a variety of capacities over the years, including for IWC Resources Corporation, Indianapolis Water Company, Boy Scouts of America, Riley Children's Foundation, Indiana University Foundation, U.S. Olympic Committee, United Nations World Food Programme and Pacers Sports and Entertainment.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Jim for nearly two decades. To me, Jim has been a close friend, trusted advisor and loyal supporter during my entire tenure in Congress. Simply put: there is no one I admire more than Jim Morris.

I want to thank Jim for his friendship and loyalty to me over all these years. I wish him continued success in all that God has planned for his family.

HONORING PETE CORREA

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I'm honored to recognize the life, achievements,

and incredible public service of my good friend Pete Correa. His hard work, activism, and dedication to what's right for Central Texas reflects the best values of our beloved home state.

Pete has spent decades devoting himself to making Williamson County a great place to work and call home. Under his steady and forward-looking leadership, the region has seen extraordinary changes, ranging from public safety initiatives to large-scale improvement projects. Pete played a critical role in securing a hospital for Round Rock, oversaw the expansion of protections for our brave firefighters and police officers, and acquired and began development of the Old Settlers Park at Palm Valley, which today stands as a beautiful area for residents to enjoy with their families. His commitment to smart, lasting, and strategic development has improved the quality of life for all citizens and put the area on track for continued growth in the future.

Pete's commitment to investing his gifts, talents, and abilities to improve his community is a deeply held creed that speaks to the generosity and activism of a true and devoted public servant. His resume tells the story of a man unafraid to contribute both his time and energies to a multitude of causes and organizations that rely upon volunteerism and social engagement to make good communities great.

I've known Pete Correa for many years, and throughout our friendship, he has always been a man of integrity, determination, and God. I proudly join his family, friends, and colleagues in wishing nothing but the best for his richly-deserved retirement. He's been an incredible leader in this community and has done countless good for the people. I admire his commitment to service, thank him for his work, and am proud to call him my dear friend.

HONORING MRS. TORRIE MILLER
MATOUS

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my former Chief of Staff, Mrs. Torrie Miller Matous, for her years of service to the American people, State of Alabama, and Alabama's Second Congressional District.

Torrie grew up in Montgomery, Alabama, and she earned her B.A. with honors from Southern Methodist University in Dallas. Just days after graduation, Torrie moved to Washington, D.C., and began what would become a nearly decade-long career on Capitol Hill.

Prior to joining my staff in 2017, Torrie served for more than five years on the staff of United States Representative Pete Sessions as a Communications Director and later the House Committee on Rules. Torrie then went on to serve as the Communications Director for United States Senator Richard Shelby and several of his committees including the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on

• 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.

Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Torrie now serves as the Director of the Office of External Affairs for the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board. Torrie's extensive background on the Hill makes her more than qualified for this new position, and I am confident her experience will serve her well. I know that she will help lead this organization forward, and I have no doubt that she will continue to have a successful career for years to come.

During her time on Team Roby, Torrie led with a sense of grace and confidence. Her attention to detail, ability to connect with constituents and elected officials alike, and outstanding work ethic will be missed in our office. I am thankful for Torrie's time on my staff, and I will always consider her and her husband Kyle true friends.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join Torrie's colleagues, family, and friends in honoring her successful career in Congress and her dedicated service to the American people and Alabamians. I wish her all the best. Congratulations, Torrie.

**PRAIRIE ISLAND INDIAN
COMMUNITY LAND STUDY**

HON. JASON LEWIS

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight a longstanding issue facing the Prairie Island Indian Community, a tribe in my district. The Prairie Island Indian Community has long lived in the lower half of Minnesota and along the banks of the Mississippi River, and currently occupies a Reservation that is located on an island along the Mississippi River in Goodhue County, Minnesota.

In 1938, less than three miles downstream from the Prairie Island Reservation, the Army Corps of Engineers placed Lock and Dam No. 3 on the Upper Mississippi River. The operation of Lock and Dam No. 3 regularly overflows and floods portions of the Prairie Island Reservation, much of which lies within the Mississippi River 100-year flood plain. Moreover, concerns have been raised that the flooding of a significant portion of Prairie Island Reservation land may have occurred without express Congressional authorization.

In 1973, The Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant went into operation on the same island about 600 yards from the Prairie Island Reservation. The Plant is now home to over forty dry casks of spent nuclear fuel, in close proximity to tribal homes, churches, schools, the Tribe's Community Center, and tribal businesses. What's more, additional casks of spent nuclear fuel are expected to be added in the coming years.

Complicating matters further, there is only one reliable road leading on and off the island shared by the Prairie Island Reservation and the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant. This road is often blocked by railroad traffic carrying a variety of freight.

The operation of Lock and Dam No. 3, in combination with the close proximity of the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant and spent nuclear fuel to the Prairie Island Reservation, is rightfully a concern of the Community.

In order to protect the Tribe and its members and to support the Tribe's long-term health and self-sufficiency, I believe that it is necessary to work towards identifying additional reservation land for the Tribe that is located at a safe distance from Lock and Dam No. 3 and the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant.

I call upon the next Congress to work with the Community to address these issues to ensure a safe and secure future for the Community and its members.

TRIBUTE TO JANE MILLER

HON. MARK WALKER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Jane Miller who served the citizens of the 6th District of North Carolina in the Office of Representative Howard Coble, my predecessor, and Representative Gene Johnston of North Carolina. Previously, she also worked for Representative Harold Terry "Bizz" Johnson of California.

Throughout her tenure as a staffer to these Members of Congress, Jane managed the legislative portfolio related to healthcare and immigration, and also worked to facilitate casework for constituents of the 6th District. She managed both these capacities in a warm and caring way and always worked to find a resolution for a problem or a way to move forward.

Jane also served as a valued coworker and friend to all those who worked with her. She was often called "Super Mom" by both Mr. Johnston and Mr. Coble given her ability and willingness to sew a button on a jacket or bring in a special treat for all to enjoy. In this same vein, she acted as a role model for young staffers working in the office as their "Second Mom" in Washington, D.C. Each day, she exhibited love, humor, and patience with her colleagues, young and old and provided support and encouragement to all she encountered.

Jane was a mentor, friend, and resource to those who lived and served the 6th District of North Carolina during her career. Some of my staff had the privilege of working with Jane and it's my honor to pay tribute to someone who set such a high bar for service to the citizens of the 6th Congressional District of North Carolina and our nation.

**RECOGNIZING THE HONORABLE
MIKE BRADFORD**

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of The Honorable Mike Bradford. After twenty years of public service to Midland County, Judge Bradford—Mike—will retire in January 2019.

Mike served eight years as County Commissioner for Precinct Two, from 1999 to 2007. In 2006, he was then elected County Judge, and he will have served in that office for twelve years, or three terms.

While in office, Mike has shepherded Midland County through times of boom and times of bust, which is the nature of an economy based primarily on the oil and gas industry. All the while, conducting the affairs of the county with competence, professionalism, and care.

During Mike's tenure, the Commissioners Court has cut the tax rate by over forty percent, maintaining the lowest county tax rate in Texas over the last nine years, and a reduction of the county's debt. At the same time, the county facilities have been majorly upgraded with the construction of the Midland County Courthouse, Centennial Library, and Horseshoe Arena, Pavilion, and Amphitheater.

Like me, Mike was not born in the Permian Basin, but he got there as soon as he could. He graduated with, both, bachelor's and master's degrees from Texas Christian University. He moved to Midland, the hometown of his wife, Ann, in the 1970's. They have been an integral part of the community ever since. He and Ann have been married for 46 years, and they have two daughters, Lauren and Heather.

I want to thank Mike for his many years of dedicated service. Midland is a better place, because of your leadership.

**HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE PIKES PEAK FIRE-
ARMS COALITION OF COLORADO**

HON. DOUG LAMBORN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 25th anniversary of the Pikes Peak Firearms Coalition of Colorado, a leading voice for firearms rights in my congressional district. The organization's purpose is to advocate, support, and protect the right to keep and bear arms as enumerated in the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and Article II, Section 13 of the Colorado Constitution and to promote the safe, responsible, and lawful use of firearms. Initially formed in 1992 as the Colorado Springs Chapter of the Firearms Coalition of Colorado, in 1993, the group formed their own local organization as the Pikes Peak Firearms Coalition and incorporated as a Colorado non-profit.

Since then, they have advocated for firearm rights before the Colorado Spring City Council, the El Paso County Board of Commissioners, and the Colorado General Assembly. The effect of their advocacy is far reaching: They have sponsored groups that teach young people the safe handling and storage of firearms. Additionally, they provide financial support to local gun ranges including the Cheyenne Mountain Shooting Complex at Fort Carson and previously assisted in cleanup efforts for the U.S. Forest Service Rampart Range shooting area while it was in operation.

In their monthly meetings, they promote the safe and lawful use of firearms. They invite speakers to present programs on various firearm issues, equipment, training, and techniques. Hundreds of people have benefitted from the Pikes Peak Firearms Coalition of Colorado's educational and practical approach.

At their core, Pikes Peak Firearm Coalition members believe that the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to keep and bear

arms in defense of their home, person, and property and to protect against a tyrannical government. Ultimately, they believe the firearms issue to be entwined with civil rights, and object to all anti-gun proposals that limit the elderly, the poor, the handicapped, or other legally armed citizens the ability to defend themselves. Finally, they firmly believe that to control crime, we must focus on the perpetrator rather than his instrument. The irresponsible banning of a weapon based solely on emotion only serves to empower criminals, as law-abiding citizens, by definition, do not break the law.

I would like to offer my sincere congratulations on 25 years to a group that upholds and protects the Second Amendment so well.

THE SIEGE OF BÉXAR

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, between October and early December 1835, an army of Texian volunteers laid siege to a Mexican army in San Antonio de Béxar. The Mexican General Santa Anna knew of the growing resistance against him in Texas, and so he set his brother-in-law General Martin Perfecto de Cos to San Antonio de Béxar and 600 men to quell the rebellion.

In October 1835, a group of Texians volunteered to serve under Stephen F. Austin and Edward Burleson and lay siege to San Antonio de Béxar. Before dawn on December 5th of that same year, James Neill distracted the Mexican forces with artillery fire on the Alamo. At this same time, Ben Milam and Francis W. Johnson led two divisions in a surprise attack on the city.

After four days of fighting, Cos sought to consolidate his troops at the Alamo, but a large part of his cavalry decided not to continue fighting and deserted. Mexican General Cos surrendered that same day, December 9, 1835. Cos promised to return to Mexico.

When the fighting ended, Texas has between 30 and 35 casualties, while Mexican losses totaled about 150; the difference reflected the greater accuracy of the Texans' rifles. Most of the Texas volunteers went home after the battle, but Texas troops remained in town, which left San Antonio and all of Texas under the Texans' control.

This battle was one of the first significant campaigns of the Texas Revolution. Within a few weeks, Texas would declare independence from Mexico. However, after the Mexican Army was defeated, in 1835 Santa Anna was intent on recapturing the mission. In February 1836, he returned to San Antonio de Béxar with several thousand soldiers. This led to the famous Battle of the Alamo where the Texians held out for 13 days before the Alamo fell on March 6, 1836. The Mexican Army killed and/or executed all the 189 defenders.

On April 21, General Sam Houston faced off with the numerically superior army of Santa Anna and defeated it, leading to Texas independence from Mexico. Texas remained a country for nine years before joining the United States.

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF AFCEM (AVIATION PILOT) JOHN L. CULBERT

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Master Chief Aircraft Maintenceman John Culbert. Master Chief Culbert, a native of Dodge City, Kansas who faithfully served his country for 30 years.

Upon his enlistment into the Navy in December of 1940, Master Chief Culbert attended basic training at Recruit Training Command, Great Lakes Illinois. Soon after he completed Aviation Machinist's Mate (AD) A-School at Naval Air Station (NAS), Jacksonville, Florida in 1941. After graduation, Master Chief Culbert received his first duty assignment at Rodd Field, Corpus Christie, Texas and went on to transfer to NAS John Rogers, Honolulu, Hawaii in 1944. In 1945, Master Chief Culbert was accepted into flight school at the Naval Air Training Base Pensacola, Florida where he received his golden wings as an enlisted Naval Aviation Pilot.

In December of 1948, Master Chief Culbert reenlisted and received orders to Utility Squadron Three, as part of a four-year tour of drone control. In 1952, he returned to Pensacola, Florida, for helicopter school. Upon his graduation in April 1954, Master Chief Culbert transferred to Helicopter Squadron One at NAS Imperial Beach, California, serving in air and sea rescue. It was during this time he rescued an Aviation Ordnanceman who fell overboard.

In September 1955, Master Chief Culbert began flying air and sea rescues at Naval Station Sangley Point, Cavite City, Philippines. In September 1957, he transferred to NAS North Island Operations, where he flew transports. After finishing his final overseas deployment at NAS Naples, Italy from July 1960 to July 1963 as copilot for a Rear Admiral and helicopter pilot for a four-star Admiral, Master Chief Culbert transferred to NAS Miramar in San Diego, California as a test pilot for the Navy's invention of Aqueous Film Forming Foam. Master Chief Culbert retired on July 1, 1970.

During Master Chief Culbert's career, he qualified to fly 22 different types of fixed and rotary-winged aircrafts and received multiple medals across his 30 years of service. Master Chief John Culbert selflessly served this great country and his service is an inspiration for generations to come.

TRIBUTE TO MARISSA MANLOVE ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT AS PRESIDENT AND CEO OF THE INDIANA PHILANTHROPY ALLIANCE

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, Marissa Manlove, on the occasion of her retirement from the Indiana Philanthropy Alliance. Throughout her impressive career, Marissa

served as a leader within the nonprofit community in Indiana. For the past twelve years, she served as President and CEO, promoting independent, family, community, public, and corporate foundations, giving programs, and grant making organizations throughout the state of Indiana. The people of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District are forever grateful for Marissa's commitment to transforming Indiana through her roles in various nonprofit organizations.

A life-long Hoosier, Marissa attended Schulte High School in Terre Haute, Indiana, before earning a bachelor's degree in psychology from Saint Louis University. Her academic aspirations led her to Indiana University where she earned her master's degree in educational psychology. Passionate about positive change, Marissa began her career with Noble of Indiana, a nonprofit organization dedicated to serving persons with intellectual and other disabilities. She spent the next twenty-nine years at Noble in various senior program management roles, overseeing communications and marketing, special events, development and eventually becoming the Vice President of Consumer and External Relations. Ever dedicated, she still sits on their Board of Directors today.

In 2007, Marissa shifted her commitment to supporting philanthropy when she became President and CEO of the Indiana Philanthropy Alliance (IPA). IPA is a large, influential membership association for the state of Indiana's philanthropic grantmaking community. It provides training, networking opportunities, research, resources and public policy support to its members, which control over \$18 billion in assets and award over \$775 million in grants per year. Under her leadership, IPA membership grew to an all-time high and today is a national leader among regional associations of grantmakers.

In 2006, Marissa and her husband, Kim, founded the 24 Group in honor of their late son, David. The all-volunteer nonprofit organization is led by a group of parents with the common experience of losing a loved one who struggled with addiction. Their work is dedicated to informing and educating the Central Indiana population about addiction and recovery. In addition, she has continued to be a community leader through her service on the boards of the United Philanthropy Forum, Indiana Society of Association Executives, Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers, Bowen Center for Public Affairs, Hope Academy, the Indiana Nonprofits Advisory Board, and Fairbanks.

Her many awards are a testament to the exceptional work ethic of this incredibly talented individual. In 2006, Marissa received the Keeper of the Light Award from The Indiana Commission for Women for her extensive and change producing work. She also received the Circle of Hope Award from Fairbanks Hospital, the Salute to Families award from Family Services of Central Indiana, and the Parent Advocate award from Drug Free Marion County. Notably, in 2015, Marissa was named one of the top 20 women in philanthropic work by Michael Chatman, who hosts the Giving Show and features leaders committed to creating a more generous world through philanthropy. She shares this title with the likes of Oprah Winfrey.

Marissa has made a remarkable impression on her community through her lifetime commitment to service. She has truly left a legacy of

success at the Indiana Philanthropy Alliance that will be built upon for years to come. On behalf of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District, I congratulate Marissa on her extraordinary career and extend my gratitude for all the wonderful contributions she has made to our Hoosier community. While I know Marissa will be missed at the Indiana Philanthropy Alliance, I wish the very best to her husband, Kim, and the rest of her family as she moves into the next phase of her life.

HONORING AL AND KATHY
HUBBARD

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on behalf of the entire 6th Congressional District of Indiana, to recognize Al and Kathy Hubbard for their contribution to our state and country.

Al has had an incredible career, serving our state and country in a variety of roles over the years. He served as the Chair of the Indiana Republican Party, the Director of the National Economic Council, and founded E&A Industries. He also serves on the Board of Directors of the Simon Property Group, the Heritage Group, the Lumina Foundation and the Indiana Commission for Higher Education. It has been an honor to work with him in advancing our shared Republican principles.

Kathy is an accomplished education reformer who has made a tremendous impact on our state and nation. She serves on the board of directors of several organizations, including DePauw University, the Indianapolis Zoo and Choice Charitable Trust. She also was appointed by President George W. Bush to serve on the J. William Fulbright Board.

On a personal note, I have had the pleasure of knowing Al and Kathy Hubbard for nearly two decades. Al and Kathy have been good friends, loyal supporters and trusted advisors during my entire tenure in Congress. Al and I are also proud alums of Vanderbilt University.

I want to thank Al and Kathy for their friendship, mentorship and loyalty to me over all these years. I wish them continued success in all that God has planned for their family.

CRIME STOPPERS GLOBAL SOLUTIONS:
TURNING CONCERNED
CITIZENS INTO COMMITTED
TRANSNATIONAL CRIME WAR-
RIORS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have learned—and had reinforced repeatedly—the lesson about the importance of a strategic asset that is both the decisive advantage and critical success element in American engagement around the globe. Whether it involves prosecuting conventional war, combating terrorism, conducting intelligence operations, or fighting transnational crime, we can never underestimate the significance and necessity of the human factor. Not only do men and

women make a difference, they are the difference between success and failure in these endeavors.

We spend billions of dollars on advanced weapons systems, equipment, technology, and more to defend and protect our nation and help it execute and achieve manifold missions. Yet these are only tools—albeit expensive and effective tools—but tools nonetheless. They exist to serve the talented, dedicated men and women in our federal government who drive and deliver the critical results daily that ensure American leadership, influence, and power worldwide.

It is this recognition of the importance and impact of people and reliance on people power, engagement, and tools that prompt me today to bring Crime Stoppers Global Solutions (CSGS) to the attention of my colleagues.

This 501(c)(3) organization proactively and aggressively combats serious transnational crime such as human trafficking, terrorism, illicit trade, illegal arms dealing, narcotics smuggling, corruption, and cybercrime. Terrorist organizations and criminal enterprises engage in these activities to finance their campaigns of death and destruction and earn their illicit profits.

From my vantage point as chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade of the Foreign Affairs Committee and as a member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations of the Judiciary Committee, I see firsthand the growing threat of global terrorism and transnational crime to U.S. national security. Throughout my service in Congress, I have been committed to and engaged in combating both.

We are in a prolonged war that threatens America's existence, challenges our leadership and power, and tests our national will and resolve at every turn. To defeat these twin global enemies, I remain convinced that we must declare all-out war and withhold nothing. It is absolutely imperative that we marshal and commit all human resources and tools available, whether government or private, to the aim of destroying global terrorism and transnational crime.

Crime Stoppers Global Solutions is a natural and ideal ally to the federal government in our must-win campaign. It combines the dual strengths of engaged citizens and advanced wireless technology into an effective weapon. This powerful weapon helps trusted law enforcement, media, and government not only to disrupt and disable transnational criminal enterprises, but also to take down their members and bring them to justice.

The organization's crime-fighting initiative turns concerned citizens into committed transnational crime warriors. It arms this mighty citizen force with new, innovative wireless tip technology. Using a free, secure, downloadable phone application, citizens can report crimes they see, hear, or know about with the guarantee of absolute anonymity and without the fear of revenge from apprehended criminal suspects.

Crime Stoppers Global Solutions is built upon the successful foundation of Crime Stoppers USA that has operated in the United States for 40 years and relied on a simple anonymous telephone tip reporting model. But Crime Stoppers Global Solutions has innovated its own proprietary reporting application

and model using new technological advancements. Its solution is designed for a global mission.

This new application is several generations in technological innovation, sophistication, and function beyond the now primitive and outmoded technology that once served the cause of domestic citizen-engaged crime-fighting so ably and faithfully nearly a half century ago. Crime Stoppers Global Solutions has developed an application that is at home and functions well today in our connected world of hand-held mobile devices.

It is a commendable and valuable effort on the part of the CSGS leadership and its team of distinguished experts to support, through its own initiative and independent efforts, the federal government, as well as foreign governments in the global fight against terrorism and transnational crime. Especially important are the vision and leadership CSGS is exhibiting in targeting global transnational crime at its source or in transit to protect us here at home.

This is why I am especially pleased to report that the CSGS team has identified a vital region to bring their mission to: the Balkan Peninsula. This region is of immense geopolitical relevance and strategic and security interest to the United States. The "Balkan route," as it is known, is a major gateway and transit route for transnational crime between the Middle East and other regions and the West. We continue to see crime surging in this area.

As the co-chairman of the Congressional Serbian Caucus, I am delighted that the first country in the Balkans to open its doors to the mission and the team of CSGS is the Republic of Serbia. I commend President Aleksandar Vučić and his government, Minister of Interior Nebojsa Stefanovic, and the office of Prime Minister Ana Brnabic for their interest in learning about Crime Stoppers Global Solutions and exploring a possible partnership.

I am happy to report that since this initial outreach and dialogue, two Serbian non-governmental organizations have signed partnership agreements with Crime Stoppers Global Solutions, joining the global fight against terrorism and transnational crime. I encourage President Aleksandar Vučić to continue demonstrating the leadership and courage he has shown thus far not only to lead his nation in this area but also to be an example for other Balkan nations to emulate.

I have spent many years serving and believing in the longstanding friendship and alliance that exist between the United States and Serbia and our peoples. One of the most important pillars of this relationship is the many Americans of Serbian ancestry who have helped contribute to, build, and enrich this country. Nikola Tesla, Mihajlo Pupin, Helen Delic Bentley, and countless more American Serbians in science, business, sports, the arts, public service, and other fields have achieved much and added much to America's greatness. The support of the American Serbian community, including the American Serbian Association, the largest and most influential membership organization of its kind nationwide, is of vital significance.

It is not only out of genuine affinity and affection for the Serbian people that I wish to see Crime Stoppers Global Solutions engage in and succeed in Serbia, but also out of sincere interest in and concern for their welfare and protection from global terrorism and transnational crime.

The United States has strategic interests in Serbia and the Balkan region. Increasingly, what happens there—especially transnational crime such as human trafficking, drug smuggling, terrorism, and more—impacts us here at home. This is because crime is no longer localized in a neighborhood or community or city or country. It is global in presence, scope, reach, and impact.

So, when we are engaged in combating terrorism and transnational crime in the Balkan region, we are not only protecting citizens there, we are also protecting citizens here.

Our federal government is a fierce and determined combatant in the war on global terrorism and transnational crime. But its ferocity and determination are every bit as matched by terrorists and transnational criminals. No one entity—be it a government, non-governmental organization, or other group, even one with considerable human resources and tools—can singlehandedly take on these enemies and prevail against them in the long run.

But by joining forces with and making common cause with organizations like Crime Stoppers Global Solutions, the federal government is stronger and more capable of dismantling terrorist organizations and transnational criminal enterprises and bringing their leaders and foot soldiers to justice.

Crime Stoppers Global Solutions offers the powerful twin assets of people and technology to enhance the efforts and effectiveness of the federal government in its global mission of combating terrorism and transnational crime. These are true and proven force multipliers in crime fighting.

For these reasons, I strongly encourage Secretary of State Pompeo and the secretaries of the Departments of Defense, Homeland Security, Justice, and the Treasury, as well as the heads of relevant federal agencies to partner with Crime Stoppers Global Solutions.

The war on global terrorism and transnational crime is winnable. It takes a team approach. By partnering with Crime Stoppers Global Solutions, the federal government can pool, share, and leverage powerful human resources—engaged citizens—and new tools—advanced wireless technology—that far exceed the capabilities of our enemies and their ability to respond in kind. This joint forces approach has the greatest potential for defeating our enemies and ensuring the safety and wellbeing of Americans and Serbians alike for the long term.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING BOB COURTNEY

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on behalf of the entire 6th Congressional District of Indiana, to recognize Bob Courtney for his contribution to Jefferson County, and our state.

Bob is a positive leader and hard worker who has been a great advocate as County Chair in Jefferson County. Over the years, he

has worked tirelessly to advance Republican values and to improve the quality of life for Hoosiers living in Southern Indiana. He has also had an incredible career in the private sector, working as an investment banker to provide the necessary capital to help employers grow and create Hoosier jobs. It has been an honor to work with him. Our state and Jefferson County are better off today because of his extraordinary leadership and service.

On a personal note, Bob is my friend who I could always count on for a positive word and consistent support. I want to thank Bob for his friendship and loyalty to me over all these years. I wish him continued success in all that God has planned for his family.

RECOGNIZING CARWYN JONES

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Carwyn Jones, who stood down as the First Minister of Wales on December 11. Throughout his nine years as First Minister, Carwyn consistently acted to strengthen the enduring bond between the Welsh and the American peoples.

From its earliest days, the Welsh people have maintained an active and important presence in the United States. People of Welsh descent signed our Declaration of Independence and served as President. Welsh immigrants worked on the farms, in the mines, and in the mills that drove our country's economic ascendance.

Today, an estimated 11 million people in the United States possess Welsh ancestry. Their proportion of the population is highest in Appalachia and the mid-Atlantic states, but they can be found across the country. The ties between Wales and the United States are also economic, as over 250 American-owned companies are based in Wales, and many Welsh businesses conduct operations in the United States.

As First Minister, Carwyn Jones has been a champion of the long-lasting friendship between Wales and the United States. He has been a strong supporter of the Congressional Friends of Wales Caucus, which raises the profile of Wales in Washington, D.C. As an advocate for greater economic ties between our nations, he has worked to increase prosperity on both sides of the Atlantic. His belief in the continued importance of the historic ties between Wales, the wider United Kingdom, and the United States made him a valued friend and partner of our country.

As the founder and chairman of the Congressional Friends of Wales Caucus, I value Carwyn's contributions to our success, which includes his repeated attendance at the annual St. David's Day receptions in Washington, D.C., and other U.S. locations. His efforts on behalf of Welsh-American friendship have yielded economic, political, and cultural benefits that will be enjoyed by both of our nations for years to come.

RECOGNIZING MATT ZWEIG

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express gratitude to Matt Zweig, and to commend his over 17 years of service on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Matt came to the Committee in 2001, as support staff and quickly worked his way up the ladder to become a Senior Professional Staff Member.

Matt has served the Committee in many different capacities. He was the staff member responsible for providing expertise on sanctions and illicit finance—from Iran, to North Korea, to Burma and Russia. He has been the primary staffer responsible for coordinating the National Defense Authorization Act process for the Committee—an annual exercise that involves dozens, and sometimes hundreds of provisions that fall within our Committee's jurisdiction. In this role, he negotiated some of the most critical measures to pass both chambers and be enacted into law—from the two bills that formed the legislative basis for sanctions against North Korea, to innovative measures to confront Iran's terrorist proxy, Hezbollah. Throughout, Matt has maintained critical relationships on both sides of the aisles in the House and Senate that have allowed the Committee to move so much critical legislation. Matt worked many long hours in service to the Committee and country, and I want to thank his wife Behare and their children—Ari, Isabel, and David—for sharing him with us. We wish Matt the best as he departs the Committee for a new mission.

HONORING ANDREW FORRESTER

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on behalf of the entire 6th Congressional District of Indiana, to recognize Andrew Forrester for his contribution to Jefferson County and the City of Madison.

Andrew is a positive leader and hard worker who has served the City of Madison with honor and distinction for years. As the City Director of Community Relations, Andrew has been responsible for representing the City and advancing efforts to improve the quality of life for Madison residents. It has been an honor to work with him.

On a personal note, Andrew is my friend who I could always count on for a positive word and consistent support. Andrew and I are both proud alums of Wabash College, too. I want to thank Andrew for his friendship and loyalty to me over all these years. I wish him continued success in all that God has planned for his family.

AN INTERVIEW ON WHAT THE CONGRESSIONAL CLASS OF 1974 CAN TEACH US ABOUT POLITICAL CHANGE

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today at the request of Mr. John Lawrence. Before this most recent election, Mr. Lawrence wrote a book about what the Congressional Class of 1974 can teach the incoming Congressional Class. As a member of that class myself, I'm sure others will find this interview and the book it's about as interesting as I did.

THE WATERGATE BABIES

(Claire Potter and John Lawrence)

It is less than ninety days until Election Day in the United States, when Democrats hope to achieve one of the biggest sweeps of Congressional seats in recent American history. Many of these Democratic hopefuls are veterans. As longtime political strategist Joe Trippi put it back in March, these are candidates who are new to the electoral arena, people who "served the country without worrying about who's a Democrat and who's a Republican" and just want to "get the damn thing done." And a record-breaking 40% of the Democratic House candidates this primary season are women, some of them veterans as well.

If the Democrats' hopes are fulfilled, will this be unprecedented? Not really. On July 24 2018, we published an excerpt from a book written by historian John Lawrence, former chief of staff for Speaker Nancy Pelosi. In *The Class of '74: Congress after Watergate and the Roots of Partisanship* (Johns Hopkins, 2018), Lawrence tracks this earlier revolution, its achievements, and its flaws.

John sat down to talk to us about the book this week, and its implications for our current political situation.

Claire Potter: John, thanks for joining us at Public Seminar. You were trained as a professional historian, and then went into politics, a career path that, as you noted in this essay, mystified your advisors at Berkeley. First, I want to ask you: how did a Ph.D. in history prepare you for a career that eventually led you to becoming Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi's chief of staff?

John Lawrence: Many of the people working on Capitol Hill in key policy and management roles have legal training or campaign experience. Both are valuable, but don't train people to contextualize current issues into a broader narrative. Training in history provided that skill, particularly research methodology and, perhaps most significantly, writing skills. Politics is often a very presentist business. While attorneys certainly are aware of judicial and legal precedents, historians have the ability to view contemporary debates through a unique prism that helps explain the evolution and nature of complex issues.

CP: OK, now I want to turn that question around. How did your work in politics support the writing of *The Class of '74*? What did you bring to writing this book that a scholar who has not spent 38 years working in the House of Representatives would not have?

JL: Politics is an intensely personal business. Working in Congress for nearly four decades enabled me to develop close relationships with dozens of members, staff, reporters and others whose decisions shape the making of public policy and the design of political strategies and campaigns. These connections enabled me to gather material for

The Class of '74 that, I have no doubt, would have been impossible for a researcher without my experience.

Many who write about Congress without this personal connection often miss the nuances of why legislators make certain decisions because motivations can be tied to personal relationships and other factors that are difficult to quantify. I think this is why political scientists, in particular, who frequently eschew the narrative in favor of data analysis of voting patterns, often miss much of what really explains how Congress, and politics more broadly, works.

CP: Thanks. Now let's get to the book prior to 1974, the mood in Congress was changing, and not just because of Watergate. Reflecting some of the disdain for authority that was moving politics in the street, younger Representatives were pushing back against the way the institution ran. What were the issues?

JL: Certainly, the most significant stimulus to the changing mood in Congress was Vietnam. The war was important on many levels: the reassertion of congressional prerogatives against the Imperial Presidency that developed and promoted the war; the rise in the use of oversight to challenge official accounts of the status of the war; the resistance to the draft; the emergence of an investigative, aggressive journalism that often worked collaboratively with dissidents in Congress.

There were other issues that raised passionate concerns among newer members of Congress too: civil rights, women's equality, the environment, energy policy, consumer protection, among them. Within Congress, reformers also resented the structure of the institution. Power was lodged largely in autonomous chairmen who did not need to be responsive to the views of the broader membership because their chairmanships were virtually guaranteed by the seniority system—instituted after the 1910 revolt against Speaker Joseph Cannon. Increasingly in the late 1960s and early 1970s, it became evident to the younger reformers that it was essential to challenge the awarding of chairmanships on the basis of duration of service alone. If chairmen did not have to be responsive to the broader membership, then the issues that the younger, more progressive, cohort wished to elevate could be (and often were) suppressed by more conservative chairs.

CP: In 1974, in a far bigger sweep than was anticipated, 76 Democrats were elected to the House, 49 replacing Republican incumbents. What set the stage for this colossal shift in power?

JL: Longstanding disapproval of the Vietnam policy played a significant role in encouraging reformers to run and in their winning. So, too, did the recent oil embargo which had elevated public anxiety and accentuated the need for a national energy policy. By 1974, Watergate, with all of its turmoil within the Executive Branch and Congress, as well, helped create a demand for reform of what was viewed as a corrupt White House. Certainly, the revelation of the Nixon tapes and Nixon's subsequent resignation complicated the re-election of many loyalists who had stood by the President as the crisis deepened.

President Ford's pardon of Nixon, coming just weeks before the election, further cemented the idea that corruption was rampant in Washington and a housecleaning was in order. Lastly, the continuing poor economy, and the ineffectual response of the Ford Administration—the Whip Inflation Now campaign—created a toxic political environment for many Republicans: corruption, recession, energy disruptions and price hikes. The climate was perfect for new, opti-

mistic, earnest young candidates like the Class of '74.

CP: Sounds like a perfect political storm. Vietnam was obviously huge, as was inflation that would soon push the American economy into a real crisis. What were the other concerns these "Watergate babies" had in common—and what policy problems divided them?

JL: The issues around which the Class of '74 were most united were the internal reforms that disseminated power in Congress. The changes they made, effectuated in December, 1974, gave heightened power to the Caucus and strengthened the role of subcommittees on which freshmen and other reformers enjoyed disproportionate strength, enabling them to raise and promote issues. These changes benefitted all new members by increasing their participatory rights, regardless of their ideology or view on specific issues.

When the freshmen were faced with policy questions where their constituents had particular interests, or where constituents had strongly held views—issues like abortion, school busing, labor law and energy—the unanimity within the freshmen caucus proved somewhat more difficult to maintain. However, it should be noted that overall, the freshmen not only voted with significant consistency but they were also among the most loyal to the Democratic leadership's positions.

CP: 1974 was also, in some ways, the twilight of Republican liberalism: you point out in the book that while many Republicans shared the majority's "goal of democratizing House procedures," their "objectives were quite different." Can you describe these differences?

JL: Newer members in both parties stood to gain from changes that extended greater participation to those with less seniority. And Republicans in general were supportive of reforms that not only benefitted the minority (for example, the ability to hire more staff on committees) but members in general. Whereas Democratic freshmen used expanded rights to raise issues and offer amendments in committee and on the floor to promote more progressive ideas, Republicans increasingly became skilled at exploiting the more open rules to force less secure Democrats into casting controversial votes that could render them vulnerable to political challenge.

Similarly, Republicans very successfully learned to utilize the coverage of committee and floor proceedings by television cameras to send messages to supporters and to raise issues that favored GOP policies. When Democrats rescinded some reforms that constrained the ability of Republicans to exploit divisive issues, strategists like Newt Gingrich were able to make a case against the majority for being heavy-handed and unfair, which they cited as justifying a change in control of the House.

CP: By the late 1970s, the political terrain in the United States was quite different: what changed in the 1970s, and how did that set the stage for the polarized politics of the 21st century?

JL: The signs of a more polarized politics were developing quite markedly in the mid-to-late 1970s, although many date the emergence of a revitalized conservatism to the 1980 and the Reagan Era. Many of the key changes were driven by demographics, especially the movement of many conservative white voters from the Northeast and Midwest to the border and southern states in search of jobs. Reaction to the civil rights movement, the anti-Vietnam and student protests and the whole litany of "sex, drugs and rock-and-roll" cultural divisions all

helped fuel a revitalization of the long-dormant Republican Party in the South, especially after the George Wallace campaign of 1968 convinced many conservatives to bolt from the Democratic Party.

The renewal of southern Republicans was also aided by a highly politicized evangelicism, and cultural issues proved crucial to the success of this strategy. Changes in federal laws made it easier for a significant expansion of independent campaign fundraising and grassroots mobilization based around single issues rather than being subject to party leaders. The election of many conservative Republicans in the South in the late 1970s and early 1980s deprived Democrats of the security of an invincible majority, and the heightened competition for majority control drove money, activism and legislative strategy into increasingly partisan directions.

While the reforms of 1974 did not “cause” partisanship, the availability to raise and promote divisive issues that was permitted by a more open and participatory Congress inadvertently provided Republican with greater opportunities than they would have enjoyed under a more closed system.

CP: Finally, John, we have an election in less than three months, one in which the House seems to be, once again, up for grabs. A key theme driving this reversal is the Trump presidency. Some commenters see a possible Democratic House as a check on the Trump policies that Congressional Republicans have mostly supported; others talk about the possibility of the new majority moving forward on impeachment.

Are we back in 1974?

JL: The idea of a Democratic House as a check on the Trump agenda seems to me to have the most salience. Even though the President would retain significant authority through the use of executive orders and other presidential powers, a Democratic House would check legislative attacks on key Democratic policies like the Affordable Care Act, the Clean Air Act and the Endangered Species Act.

Of course, a Republican Senate would still enable Trump to appoint people of his choosing to the federal courts and executive agencies, but a Democratic House would have the power of oversight and subpoenas to investigate possible misuses of power that today go unexamined. I suspect there would be strong resistance in a Democratic majority to moving ahead with impeachment: here are no prospects for success in the Senate. More importantly, there would be a clear perception in this new freshman class that the American people had voted for Democrats in order to pursue other policies in the area of economics, children, the environment, energy and corruption in government.

However, should Special Prosecutor Mueller ultimately recommend that Congress look into presidential abuses of authority, it would be very difficult to dampen the demands for an impeachment inquiry.

CP: What advice would the Class of 1974 have for today's Democratic party?

JL: If you asked those in the Class who were most successful during their careers, I think they would likely advise newcomers to learn how the institution works, develop close relations with colleagues, find areas of policy on which they would like to focus (rather than be a gadfly with something to say on every issue.) Newcomers will want to pay attention to building and strengthening your networks with constituents, without whom you have no power to accomplish your goals.

As I say in my book, “before you save the world, you have to save your seat.” I also think that, at least some would advise the freshmen of 2019 not to spend a lot of time

looking over their shoulders trying to avoid controversial positions that some voters might dislike. Many in the Class of '74 were surprised to have won in the first place, and they were determined to make their impact as swiftly and decisively as possible because they did not expect to remain in Congress very long.

So, I think the message would be, “Don't spend a lot of time trying to figure out if an issue or a vote plays positively or negatively. Do what you think is right, explain your position frankly to your constituents, and you'll be surprised how often they support your decision.”

HONORING JIM KITTLE

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a longtime friend and colleague, Jim Kittle, for his service to our state.

Jim is an institution in Indiana and is widely regarded as one of the state's top political minds. Jim was the “founding father” of the political movement that first elected Mitch Daniels and revolutionized our state. He's also an extraordinarily successfully businessman and has grown Kittle's Furniture into one of the largest furniture companies in the country. There's no doubt that I wouldn't be where I am today without Jim's counsel and help every step of the way.

I've known Jim for more than two decades. During that time, he has become one of my closest and most trusted friends in politics and life. He calls me his brother, and I think of him as a father.

I want to thank Jim for his friendship and loyalty to me over all these years. I wish him continued success in all that God has planned for his family.

CABEZA DE VACA: EXPLORER OF THE LONE STAR STATE

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in November of 1528, Conquistador Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca and his crew of 90 Spaniards crashed on Galveston Island. He was the first European to set foot on the land that would become the Lone Star State and is considered to have undertaken one of the most remarkable journeys in the history of American exploration.

From 1528 to 1532, the crew steadily died off from illness, accidents, and attacks until only Cabeza de Vaca and three others remained. During those four years, Cabeza de Vaca became a merchant, and traded sea shells and “beads of sea” (though now called pearls) for bison skins and red ochre. He also gained a reputation as a healer, which gave him freedom to travel between different tribes.

The Karankawa Indians, a group of Coahuiltecos known to be cannibals, enslaved these men until, in September of 1534, the four men snuck away from the Karankawas and fled south towards the Rio

Grande River. The following spring, they finally crossed the Rio Grande and made it to Mexico. To avoid hostile tribes, the men turned west towards the Pacific and crossed northern Mexico.

Cabeza de Vaca and his companions eventually arrived in Mexico City in 1536.

They had traveled nearly 2400 miles over eight years in Texas and the Mexican borderlands.

Cabeza de Vaca spent years interacting with Native Americans and learning their language. This allowed him to write and publish in 1542 the first book about Texas, the *Relación*, which contained information about the region's geography, landscape, and Coahuiltecan tribes. This account of his journey inspired other conquistadors and Spaniards to cotne and explore Texas.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING EARL A. POWELL III, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Earl “Rusty” Powell III, on the occasion of his retirement, after 26 years as director of the National Gallery of Art, located in Washington, D.C.

Rusty is a graduate of Williams College in Williamstown, Massachusetts. After graduating with degrees in art history and European history, Rusty served three years of active duty as an officer with the United States Navy, including a tour in Vietnam before joining the reserves. After his service, Rusty continued his education at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts earning both his masters and doctorate degrees in art history. Prior to his directorship at the National Gallery, Rusty served as a professor of art history at the University of Texas and was director of the Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

In 1992, Rusty was named director of the National Gallery of Art. During his tenure, the Gallery has undergone major renovations including the creation of the Sculpture Garden and the expansion and complete renovation of the East Wing. In addition to the growth of the physical structure, the National Gallery's collection has continued to grow while increasing recognition for underrepresented and living artists. Rusty focused on utilizing the permanent collection in new ways rather than large loan exhibits.

In addition to his work at the National Gallery, Rusty serves as the chairman of the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts and a trustee of the American Federation of the Arts, the Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, the Norton Simon Museum, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the White House Historical Association. He is a member of numerous arts organizations, including the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Academy Commission on the Humanities and Social Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, and the Committee for the Preservation of the White House, among others. Rusty's awards include the Chevalier

de la Légion d'Honneur and the Officier dans l'Ordre des Arts et des Lettres, both from France; the Commendatore dell'Ordine al Merito della Repubblica Italiana; the Mexican Order of the Aztec Eagle; Norway's King Olav Medal; the Williams College Bicentennial Medal; the Centennial Medal, awarded by the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences; the Officer's Cross of the Order of Merit of the Republic of Hungary; and the Officer's Cross of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany, 2014.

With Rusty's leadership and support over the last 26 years, every division at the Gallery has experienced tremendous growth and contributed to art historical scholarship, conservation, and museology at the highest standard of excellence. Since Powell's first year as director in 1992, the Gallery has welcomed more than 122 million visitors.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating Rusty, on the occasion of his retirement, after 26 years of exceptional service to the National Gallery of Art.

HONORING JEAN ANN HARCOURT AND TERRY SHOWALTER

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on behalf of the entire 6th Congressional District of Indiana, to recognize Jean Ann Harcourt and Terry Showalter for their contribution to our state.

Jean Ann is an institution in our state and is widely regarded as one of the state's top political minds. She owns and operates Harcourt Industries Inc. in Milroy, which produces school supplies, school spirit items and political signage. She also serves on the Board of Trustees at Ball State University. Jean Ann and Terry have been continually recognized throughout the years for their extraordinary contributions to Rush County and our state.

Most importantly, Jean Ann and Terry are my friends. I want to thank them for their friendship, wise counsel and loyalty to me over all these years. I wish them continued success in all that God has planned for their family.

RECOGNIZING DIWALI

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Diwali, a festival of lights celebrating the Hindu New Year. Originating in India, Diwali is the largest and one of the most important celebrations observed within the Hindu religion. Diwali's festival of lights symbolizes the spiritual victory of light over darkness, good over evil, and knowledge over ignorance.

Diwali festivities include deep cleaning and extensive decorating of office buildings, temples, and homes. The celebration begins by lighting clay lamps in temple windows in honor

of Lakshmi, the Hindu goddess of prosperity and wealth. Traditional Indian feasts take place with friends and loved ones, during which, sweets and presents are prepared and shared.

The significance of this event is not exclusive to India. Today, where there are Hindus they honor their traditions and observe this important day. Here in Colorado, for example, we have a thriving and growing Hindu community. The Hindu Temple and Cultural Center of the Rockies also known as the Hindu Temple of Colorado located in the City of Centennial, and the 6th Congressional District exemplifies this.

It is with great pride that I join all in recognizing Chairman Ved Nanda, President Sudhir Verma, Vice President Sridhar Talanki and Board Members: Arjun Sen, Mahesh Anandan, Anshuman Purohit, Asha Vasant, Deepak Malhotra, Madhu Bhat, Rajesh Agarwal, Rajesh Kaul, Ravi Raj, Reva Nayar, Sanjai Natesan, Sony Das; and volunteers Rahul Mirchand, Poonam Kakkar, Satish Kumar, and Suresh Lakkaraju.

I wish them and all the Temple's members well as they celebrate Diwali.

STANDING WITH OUR GEORGIAN FRIENDS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Georgia is a beacon of democracy in a part of the world which has struggled to break the legacy of Soviet oppression. While Georgia successfully achieved independence in 1991, Moscow is still attempting to bully the small nation back into its orbit.

In 2008, Russian troops invaded the country, seizing nearly a third of Georgia's territory that is still occupied today. Despite Russia's persistent human rights abuses and aggressive tactics, the Georgian people remain defiant. They continue to express a clear desire to determine their own futures and integrate with the Euro-Atlantic community. Putin hates Georgia's path to liberty because successful democracies positioned on Russia's border are a threat to his despotic rule. To deter Russia's continued belligerence, we must boost Georgia's ability to defend itself and make an ironclad commitment to our Georgian friends. For peace and freedom to preserve in the Caucasus, it must become clear to Putin that undermining Georgia's independence will be a costly endeavor.

To help Georgia repel future Russian aggression, Rep. Connolly and I have introduced H.R. 6219, the Georgia Support Act. This important bill calls on the State Department to provide a strategy to Congress to help bolster Georgia's defenses. Specifically, it calls for efforts to strengthen Georgia's cyber security capabilities and resiliency to Russian disinformation campaigns that undermine its fragile democracy. The bill also requests the President to impose sanctions on Russian individuals who commit human rights abuses on Georgia territory.

For more than two decades, Georgia has been a steadfast ally of the United States and the Euro-Atlantic community. We must not

abandon our Georgian friends in the face of continued Russian aggression. To do so only invites Putin to further pursue his goal of rebuilding the Soviet Empire. America must stand with Georgia and demand complete respect for our ally's territorial integrity and sovereignty. This bill must pass to send a clear message of defiance to Putin and a message of hope to our Georgian friends.

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING P.E. MACALLISTER

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on behalf of the entire 6th Congressional District of Indiana, to recognize P.E. MacAllister for his contribution to our state.

P.E. is widely regarded as one of the most distinguished Hoosiers to ever grace our state. P.E. built a business empire at MacAllister Machinery. Some have referred to him as the "founding father of modern Indianapolis" for his extraordinary commitment and service. It has been an honor to work with him in advancing our shared Republican principles.

I have had the pleasure of knowing P.E. for nearly two decades. To me, P.E. has been a friend, supporter and trusted advisor during my entire tenure in Congress. Simply put: there is no one I admire more than P.E. MacAllister.

I want to thank P.E. for his friendship and loyalty to me over all these years. I wish him continued success in all that God has planned for his family.

RECOGNIZING BRAD D. SMITH ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM INTUIT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a highly respected Silicon Valley leader, a friend and a constituent, Brad D. Smith, on his retirement as President and Chief Executive Officer of Intuit, Inc. During his 11 years at the helm of the company, Brad's exceptional leadership doubled Intuit's customer base and tripled the company's earnings. His commitment to Intuit's employees and workplace culture has made Intuit one of the best companies to work for in America according to Fortune.

Brad D. Smith was born in Huntington, West Virginia, on April 6, 1954, and grew up in the nearby town of Kenova, a community of 3,500 that Brad credits with teaching him integrity, humility, and teamwork during his formative years. He graduated from Ceredo-Kenova High School and was accepted by and entered the United States Military Academy at West Point. He ultimately decided to return to West Virginia and enroll at Marshall University where he graduated in 1986 with a degree in Business Administration.

Brad has been a very generous benefactor of Marshall University over the years, and in November, 2018, Brad and his wife, Alys

Smith, made a \$25 million gift to the University's Lewis College of Business. Brad and Alys also established the Brad and Alys Smith Family Scholarship at Marshall University for West Virginia and Ohio students, with a preference for first-generation college students.

Brad joined Intuit in 2003 as Vice President and General Manager of Intuit's Accountant Central and Developer Network in Plano, Texas. Intuit is headquartered in Mountain View in California's 18th Congressional District and is the highly successful maker of TurboTax, QuickBooks, and related tax preparation and accounting software. Over the next five years, Brad held a number of executive positions and headed each major division of Intuit before being named President and Chief Executive Officer in 2008. While serving as Intuit's CEO and President, the company grew to 9,000 employees worldwide, its revenue doubled, and its stock rose from \$31 in January 2006, to \$205 as of December 2018. In January 2016, Brad cemented his legacy with the company when he was appointed Chairman of the Board of Directors.

Brad Smith is a trusted friend who has informed my thinking and my understanding of a number of important public policies and as he prepares to begin a new chapter of life, I congratulate him on a job done exceedingly well and wish him every success in his future endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. CLAUDE
EUGENE JORDAN

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the service of Mr. Claude Eugene Jordan and his long and honorable career as a firefighter. Mr. Jordan has honored his country with over 30 years of service in civilian firefighting, demonstrating not only skill at his craft, but devotion to our nation.

Before his career in firefighting began, Mr. Jordan grew up in Prince George's County, Maryland where he served as a volunteer firefighter with the Accokeek Volunteer Fire Department since 1980. On May 11, 1987, he began his employment with the Dahlgren, Virginia Fire Department.

By November 5, 1989, Mr. Jordan was promoted to Supervisory Captain. Over his long career at Dahlgren, Mr. Jordan has served in nearly every position starting as a firefighter and ultimately, on February 5, 2015, he was promoted to his current role of Battalion Chief of Operations for Naval District Washington Fire and Emergency Services at Naval Support Activity South Potomac in Dahlgren, Virginia.

Mr. Jordan is married to Tina Jordan, and together they have happily raised five daughters: Brittany Lambdin, Emilie Jordan, Madison Jordan, Kaleigh Jordan, and Makenzie Jordan.

Today, we honor Claude Eugene Jordan and his 30 years of exemplary service to the Navy as a civilian firefighter. His hard work, devotion, and strong character will be missed by his fellow firefighters as he transitions to a joyful retirement. His spirit of selflessness is an enduring example to us all as I am told that Mr. Jordan is the type of man who spent his

career worrying about his colleagues rather than himself.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in recognizing Mr. Claude Eugene Jordan's lifetime of accomplishment and dedication. An admirable illustration of leadership and service, and an outstanding member of our community, may God bless Mr. Jordan and his family as they begin a new chapter in life. On behalf of America's First District, we say thank you.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF 1ST
JUDICIAL DISTRICT CIRCUIT
COURT JUDGE JIM POUNDS

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retirement of one of Mississippi's most devoted citizens and public servants, the Honorable Jim Pounds. Judge Pounds is a man of distinction who has demonstrated an outstanding devotion to God, family, and his fellow man. Throughout his exemplary personal and professional life, Judge Pounds defined what it means to be a good and faithful public servant.

Judge Pounds, a native of Booneville, Mississippi, graduated from Booneville High School in 1972. Upon graduation, Judge Pounds attended Northeast Mississippi Community College, where he pursued an Associate Degree in Business Administration. Barbara Hughes, a retired NEMCC Business Division Instructor, said Judge Pounds was a standout student who once served as the state president of the Phi Beta Lambda (PBL) Mississippi chapter. "As a Phi Beta Lambda advisor, I had the opportunity to work closely with Judge Pounds," Mrs. Hughes said. "Our paths would continue to cross as we are both residents of Booneville and members of the Booneville First United Methodist Church. Judge Pounds has and continues to play an active role in our church. He taught the Senior High School Sunday School Class for 12 years and served two terms as the Pastor Parish Relations Chairman and the Church Leadership Chairman. He also served as a member of the Board of Trustees. He is a good family man, honest, sincere, and a person you can easily talk to. I was proud to see Judge Pounds inducted into the Northeast Mississippi Community College Alumnus Hall of Fame in 2013. I am even more proud to have him as a dear friend."

Following the completion of his studies at NEMCC, Judge Pounds attended Mississippi State University, where he pursued a degree in Banking & Finance. After receiving his degree, Judge Pounds intended to follow his father's footsteps and work at the Peoples Bank. A rule preventing family members from working together led to a career change which brought Judge Pounds to law school. "God had a different plan," Judge Pounds said. "He wanted me to be an attorney and a judge rather than a banker."

Prior to graduating from the Mississippi College School of Law in Jackson, Judge Pounds married his high school sweetheart, Susan Echols. During their 38 years of marriage, Judge Pounds and his wife raised two children, Seth and Kala. Judge Pounds took an

active role in his children's lives serving as an Assistant Scout Master in the local chapter of the Boys Scouts of America Troop 37 and coaching little league baseball for 20 years. "I am so proud of his many accomplishments," Mrs. Pounds said. "His devotion to family is unending. I've witnessed that same devotion in our church, his work, and in our community. I could say so much about his good works, but one of his finest accomplishments was Kids Town, a project for which he served as coordinator. It is one of the largest community-built playgrounds in Mississippi. He also served as co-coordinator for the playground built at the Corinth City Park."

In 1981, Judge Pounds worked as a senior attorney for the Mississippi State Tax Commission and the Alcohol Beverage Control Division. His career path would lead him to the 1st Judicial District Attorney's Office, where he served as an assistant district attorney for 18 years. John Weddle, 1st Judicial District Attorney, said Judge Pounds will be missed. "Jim Pounds has been an indispensable asset to the First Circuit Judicial District, not only as a prosecutor, but during his years as Circuit Court Judge as well," Weddle said. "The district attorney's office is grateful for his integrity, as well as his balance of toughness on crime with compassion toward people involved in the criminal justice system."

In 2006, Judge Pounds was elected to serve as the 1st Judicial District Circuit Court Judge. He was known for his fair and measured decisions in and out of the courtroom. In 2008, Judge Pounds' passionate concern for the wellbeing of others led him to pursue what would become one of the most important roles of his long and remarkable career. Judge Pounds and former 1st Judicial District Circuit Court Judge Sharion Aycock formed the 1st Judicial District Drug Court. Jennifer Cummings, 1st Judicial District Drug Court Coordinator, said Judge Pounds did not receive any compensation for the extra workload that came with the drug court docket. "To me, that shows a true desire to help others," Mrs. Cummings said. "Judge Pounds has made a tremendous difference in the lives of those addicted to drugs and alcohol. He has been instrumental in helping to rehabilitate participants, so they will become productive citizens. I have seen him cheer on those who have successfully completed the three-year program. I have also seen his tears while participants read their testimonials. Judge Pounds has saved many lives. Under his leadership, there have been more than 50 drug-free babies born."

Darren Herring, a former investigator for the 1st Judicial District, also praised Judge Pounds for his devotion to helping others lead drug-free lives. "Judge Pounds' dedication to the 1st Judicial District of Mississippi is reflected by the numerous participants that successfully completed drug court under his guidance," Herring said. "By his tireless efforts, Judge Pounds transformed many lives from that of drug dependency to being productive members of our society."

Good leadership is about building and maintaining strong relationships, a quality Judge Pounds has demonstrated throughout his life. Prentiss County Sheriff Randy Tolar said his relationship with Judge Pounds has and continues to have a profound impact on his life. "He influenced my career as a young, rookie law enforcement officer—a relationship that

formed the foundation of my career as a five-term sheriff," Sheriff Tolar said. "He has been an inspiration to me and to so many others, including drug court participants. He wants to see people do better and turn their lives around. No one in the criminal justice system has impacted lives more than him. His compassion for people is unparalleled."

In November 2018, a retirement reception was held for Judge Pounds at the Booneville First United Methodist Church. Mississippi State District 3 Representative Tracy Arnold, a Prentiss County native, was among scores of people who came to greet Judge Pounds and his family. Rep. Arnold has known Judge Pounds for most of his life. "He is a pillar of the community," Rep. Arnold said. "He is a man of incredible stature and character and is revered for his impeccable expertise and dedication to public service."

Judge Pounds said his decision to retire was not an easy one, but he wants to spend more time with their children and three grandchildren; Jackson and George Pounds, and Tays LeGrand. I wish Judge Pounds and his family many more years of happiness. Judge Pounds' service to the 1st Judicial District and to his community will always be remembered and celebrated.

HONORING JEFF KITTLE

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on behalf of the entire 6th Congressional District of Indiana, to recognize Jeff Kittle for his contribution to our state.

Jeff has dedicated his career to helping low-income individuals access affordable housing and to creating jobs in Indiana. He is the President and CEO of Herman & Kittle Properties, Inc., which owns and manages low-income housing properties all across our state. I have no doubt that our state is better off due to Jeff's extraordinary leadership and service.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Jeff for nearly two decades. To me, Jeff has been a close friend, trusted advisor and loyal supporter during my entire tenure in Congress.

I want to thank Jeff for his friendship and loyalty to me over all these years. I wish him continued success in all that God has planned for his family.

HONORING THE NORTH COUNTRY FAMILY HEALTH CENTER FOR THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS SCHOOL-BASED HEALTH CENTER AT NORTH ELEMENTARY

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the North Country Family Health Center for the 25th anniversary of its School-Based Health Center at North Elementary.

The North Country Family Health Center (NCFHC) is a Federally Qualified Health Center that provides care to the underserved. In

1993, the NCFHC expanded its reach by opening a School-Based Health Center (SBCH), the first in the region, at North Elementary in Watertown, New York. Over 550 elementary school students initially registered for the program, and now, North Elementary SBHC provides care to all Watertown City School District elementary students.

For the past 25 years, the North Elementary SBHC has broken down barriers to care by offering integrated medical, behavioral health, and dental services at the convenience of parents, students, and teachers alike. Every student is welcome to use the SBHC regardless of income or insurance, and all services are provided with no out-of-pocket costs. The North Elementary SBHC is just one of six SBHCs operated by the NCFHC, which reaches thousands of students in the Watertown City and South Jefferson School Districts.

On behalf of New York's 21st District, I want to thank the North Country Family Health Center for its dedication to providing young students with high quality care. Its School-Based Health Center at North Elementary has provided an important service to families across Jefferson County for the past 25 years, truly serving as an asset to the community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call 430, I am not recorded.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 430.

HONORING FRED KLIPSCH

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the entire 6th Congressional District of Indiana, to recognize Fred Klipsch for his contribution to our state.

Fred is an institution in our state and is widely regarded as one of our state's top political minds. Fred built an extraordinary career in business. And, I worked closely with Fred as the President and CEO of School Choice Indiana, where we successfully passed one of the largest school choice programs in the country. Together, we helped improve educational opportunities for hundreds of thousands of Hoosier kids and Hoosier families.

On a personal note, I've had the pleasure of knowing Fred for more than two decades. He is my friend and mentor. It is not exaggeration to say that when I grow up, I hope to be a whole lot more like Fred Klipsch. He is a strong leader who brings positive results everywhere he goes.

I want to thank Fred for his friendship and loyalty to me over all these years. I wish Fred and Judy continued success in all that God has planned for their family.

TRIBUTE TO CHUCK STALEY ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT AS PRESIDENT OF THE FLAGSHIP ENTERPRISE CENTER

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chuck Staley on the occasion of his retirement as President of the Flagship Enterprise Center in Anderson, Indiana. Chuck has devoted his life to making a positive impact on his beloved community of Anderson. Focused on community redevelopment, Chuck built a robust business center focused on collaborative partnerships with Anderson University, the City of Anderson, the Indiana Economic Development Corporation, and many other partners. His hard work and dedication to success has developed advanced economic and educational opportunities while creating nearly 2,000 jobs. The people of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District are forever grateful for Chuck's commitment to economic development throughout the City of Anderson, Madison County, and the State of Indiana.

A life-long Hoosier, Chuck attended Anderson High School in Anderson, Indiana, before enlisting in the United States Marine Corps during the Vietnam War in 1964. He served faithfully until he was honorably discharged in 1967. After his time in the Marine Corps, Chuck attended Ball State University where he received a B.S. in Geography and Geology in 1971. Dedicated to furthering his education, he went on to earn a Master's Degree in Geography from Ball State in 1973. After graduation, Chuck began his career as plant supervisor at Delco Remy, an American manufacturer, remanufacturer, and distributor. In 1980, Chuck became the Director of Anderson University's physical plant until becoming their Director of Real Estate programs in 1985 and Executive Director of Facilities and Real Estate in 1991. Since 2004, Chuck has served as the Anderson University Special Assistant to the President for Engagement.

In 2003, he shifted his commitment to supporting community development when he became President of the Flagship Enterprise Center (Flagship). Flagship is a large public-private partnership. The public side is comprised of the City of Anderson, State of Indiana, and multiple federal agencies; and the private sector is represented by Anderson University. Flagship's mission is to encourage and nurture entrepreneurial spirit in communities by providing mentoring, networking, business services, educational opportunities, and access to capital. Under Chuck's leadership, Flagship now spans 300,000 square feet of space in five buildings and nurtures 150 companies both nationally and internationally.

An exceptional leader, Chuck advanced Flagship's impact as a business incubator and an advanced-stage business center through his dedication to innovative ideas and solutions. With a focus on collaboration, and diversifying the economy, Flagship not only provided skilled jobs in a struggling community, but became a regional leader with a strong international reputation. During his tenure, he challenged local officials to help develop a

skilled workforce to meet Flagship's vacancy demands and keep up with a more diverse economy.

Chuck's dedication to his community is evident through his service on the boards of Community Hospital, Energize East Central Indiana, Extreme Defense Systems, Anderson University Students in Free Enterprise, and Anderson/Madison County Chamber of Commerce. Chuck chaired the Committee for North Anderson Church of God and the Steering Committee of the World Class City Forum. Notably, he served as Chairperson on the Blue Ribbon Committee, responsible for negotiations and an exit strategy with General Motors in Anderson. He also served as President of the Anderson City Planning Commission and the White River Development Commission.

His many awards are a testament to the exceptional work ethic of this incredibly talented individual. In 2006, Chuck received the Community Image Award from the Anderson/Madison County Chamber of Commerce as well as two awards from the Anderson Rotary both for his personal contributions and for his Flagship contributions. In 2003, Governor Mitch Daniels awarded him the Distinguished Hoosier Award for his work in the community. He also received the Chief Anderson Award by the City of Anderson in 2003, the Distinguished Citizen Award from Boy Scouts of America in 2013, and the Sagamore of the Wabash from Governor Mike Pence in 2013.

Chuck has made a remarkable impression on his community through his lifetime commitment to service. He has truly left a legacy of success at the Flagship Enterprise Center that will be built upon for years to come. On behalf of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District, I congratulate my friend Chuck on his extraordinary career and extend my gratitude for the wonderful contributions he made to our Hoosier community. While I know Chuck will be missed at the Flagship Enterprise Center, I wish him a happy retirement, with his wife Lynn, enjoying more time with family and friends.

COMMEMORATING THE PAST EIGHT YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, as the 115th Congress comes to a close, so does my time here in Washington.

First and foremost, I want to thank the people of Pennsylvania's 11th District who sent me here, who trusted me to make Washington work for them. It has been an honor to serve them in the U.S. House of Representatives over the past eight years.

During my time in Congress, I never once forgot that the people of Pennsylvania were the reason why I was here, and I am proud of what I was able to accomplish on their behalf.

From initiating the largest reform to our nation's disaster preparedness system since Hurricane Katrina, to participating in the groundbreaking of the Harrisburg courthouse after years of fighting to make it a reality, to watching my legislation to help newborn babies suffering from opioid withdrawal get

signed into law, I am proud of the work I have done to improve not only our district and state, but the nation as a whole.

As a Member of this body I have had the opportunity to help so many of my fellow Americans, and for that I am grateful.

Nothing will ever compare to the day ten-year-old Sarah Murnaghan finally got her life-saving lung transplant, or to when I was able to present our nation's veterans with long overdue medals they so rightfully deserve.

I will never forget the sense of amazement I felt meeting with students from the SHINE afterschool program as they showed me how to program a 3D printer and told me how they planned on running their future businesses, knowing I fought to save the federal funding that makes their program possible.

And those moments were just a few of the highlights.

Over the last eight years, my office has assisted over 14,000 constituents with casework requests, sponsored over 267 ambitious young people dreaming of attending prestigious military service academies, and secured over \$9 million for our local first responders through fire grants, as well as \$1.2 million for our law enforcement officers.

I have fought to provide small businesses with the tools they need to succeed, eliminated government waste and saved taxpayers \$4.4 billion through better management of federal real estate, and worked to make our communities more resilient before disaster strikes through local infrastructure projects, like the Bloomsburg flood wall.

I can confidently say that I leave Washington knowing that the people of Pennsylvania are better off than when I first arrived.

Growing up, I never imagined that I could become the mayor of my hometown, let alone hold a seat in Congress. I could have never made this journey without the support of my family, and in particular my wife, Mary Grace, who has always stood with me from city council to the U.S. House of Representatives.

I also want to thank my staff. Their hard work and dedication to the people of Pennsylvania's 11th District is part of why we were able to accomplish all that we did. It has been a privilege to watch them grow into great professionals, and I have no doubt they will continue to do great things.

As I prepare to leave this position, the last few weeks have given me the opportunity to look back and reflect on all that my staff and I have been able to do, and I couldn't be more proud.

It is my hope that those elected to this office from this point forward will continue to build upon the important work my office has done and always fight to ensure that Washington is working for the people back home.

Mr. Speaker, it has been the greatest honor of my lifetime to represent the people of Pennsylvania's 11th District for four terms in the U.S. House of Representatives, and I thank them for giving me this opportunity.

HONORING HART HASTEN

HON. LUKE MESSER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on behalf of the entire 6th Congressional District

of Indiana, to recognize Hart Hasten for his contribution to our state.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Hart for nearly a decade. He has been a good friend, wise advisor and loyal supporter during my entire tenure in Congress.

Hart is a legend in Indiana politics, both for his business leadership and extraordinary advocacy for Israel. Hart is the founder of Silverock Group, an international real estate developer and the author of the book "I Shall Not Die," which details his experience as a Holocaust survivor. Without a doubt, Hart is one of the most remarkable people I have encountered during my time in Congress. Every day, I strive to be a little more like Hart Hasten.

I want to thank Hart for his friendship and loyalty to me over all these years. I wish him continued success in all that God has planned for his family.

INFORMATION ON THE PATIENT'S BILL OF RIGHTS

HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today at the request of Mike Menning who hopes that, by sharing his story, no other family will have to go through what he and his family have.

DROPPED OFF THE OPERATING TABLE

DAWN MENNING WAS DROPPED OFF THE OPERATING TABLE AT INTERMOUNTAIN MEDICAL CENTER HOSPITAL, SALT LAKE CITY, UT ON MARCH 3, 2017

Dawn Menning's Narrative About Injury and Pain

Let me begin by recalling what I can about the abdominal hernia surgery and resulting incident.

At least a year prior to March 2017 I visited Dr. Kelly Nolan about the growth in an abdominal hernia I was observing. She noted that it would be a repair of an earlier surgery in 1996 and would require a more invasive approach.

In early 2017 after visiting my regular health care physician, Dr. Nancy McLaughlin, Madsen Clinic—University of Utah, and recognizing that the hernia had indeed grown I made the decision to go forward with the surgery.

I visited Dr. Nolan at IHC for a pre-op appointment. I spoke to her at length about my concern about the Homozygous Factor V Leiden blood condition that I have—the challenge and potential for blood clotting following surgery. She asked if I could seek advice from my regular doctor or a hematology specialist. Since I had never seen a specialist I contacted Dr. McLaughlin who consulted with Dr. David Kaplan at the University of Utah Clinic. He strongly advised against using regular anticoagulants since the surgery was going to be in the abdomen area and the shots, Lovenox, are administered into the belly area. He suggested the use of a pill instead.

I contacted Dr. Nolan who called me back to say she had not used the pill and advised to use Lovenox as she had prescribed. I purchased the Lovenox 100 mg. on February 28. I began using the shot one time on March 2, the day before scheduled surgery.

I was told to NOT use the Lovenox 100 mg. on March 3, the day of surgery, but resume using it the day after for ten days following

surgery—two shots into the belly area each day.

Now onto the day of surgery as best I can remember. I entered surgery feeling very well and was wondering how I would feel following. I felt I was a pretty strong, healthy 70-year-old woman.

I waited for quite awhile in the hall prior to surgery and noted that the attendant reached for a green flat toboggan like piece of equipment that I assumed was placed under a patient for transport. It had handles on the side as I remember. I even thought, well, I suppose that's how I will be transported from the gurney on which I was lying to the operating table.

The anesthesiologist came into the hall to introduce himself and assured me that they would monitor that I was asleep during the surgery.

Finally I was wheeled in. They asked if I felt comfortable moving myself onto the table and I assured them that I was able. I do not remember what was or if there was anything under my body.

Very soon I was off into another world.

The next thing I knew I was wheeled out of the operating room by a female attendant and greeted by my husband who was very alarmed. His first words were something like—I am so glad you are alive or something close to that. I asked him what in the world he meant. He said, “Well, did you know that you were dropped to the floor while being moved to the gurney?” I actually thought he was joking and said the same.

Marion responded with, “No, I am not joking! They came out and told me that while they were moving you the gurney was not properly locked and you fell to the floor. The anesthesiologist tried to brake the fall by extending his leg and even hyperextended his knee.” He said Dr. Nolan had come to tell him and said they had examined me and found no evidence of injury but would be sure to examine me further before discharge.

I was wheeled back to the room and did not lose consciousness again. Very soon I was pretty stable and the attendant suggested that I could get dressed and leave as soon as I wished. She recommended that Marion attend me in dressing and take a look if there were any bruises or evidence of injury. There was no one else of hospital personnel who took a look at my backside or the incisions. Dr. Nolan told me at my post-operative exam that she had come to see me but I had already left for home. (It would seem that in the case of the fall she would have been there soon to see how I was doing.)

We arrived at the hospital in the morning and less than five hours I was back home.

I had been prescribed pain medication (Norco 5 mg 1 to 2 tablets every four to six hours as needed) and used it as prescribed.

I resumed the use of the Lovenox 100 mg two times a day for five days. Since I would not have enough 10 more doses on March 8.

The weekend was rough—I experienced much pain and discomfort. I was not able to get up off the couch and was thankful for a bar next to out toilet. Getting into bed required the help of Marion, lifting my legs into bed and even helping me to get up off the bed and turning.

By Monday morning the pain was increasing—rising into my right side rib cage area. By then bruising in the abdominal area had grown far beyond the incision area.

We called Dr. Nolan's office and were invited to come to the office for examination. She checked my incision noting that it was no oozing and agreed to order x-rays. She checked the x-ray and said there was no evidence of cracked ribs and said I should try to cut back on the pain medication as I was able, perhaps using some Ibuprofen in between doses of Norco since it has a high risk

of addiction and dependence and a side effect is constipation which is always a challenge for me. Dr. Nolan also explained that she had not seen exactly what had happened since she was doing charting off to the side and didn't see anything until she heard a commotion and saw I was on the floor. She did not offer details of number of people but did retell us that the anesthesiologist had hyperextended his knee.

I resumed my recovery at home. My husband made a visit to the hospital to inquire about the fall. He did not receive too much information but invited the Risk Management Staff to at least offer an apology and visit me at home.

The rest of the week went pretty much the same although in addition to the bruising my abdomen area was swelling and tender. The bruising had spread out, down and up.

On March 8 by recommendation of the Dr. Nolan I purchased a pain medication that would assist the transition from narcotic medications to less strong medications—Triamino 20 mg. I tried using this but was longing for the Norco since the pain was so intense.

During the night on Thursday, March 9 I had so much pain and the pain medication was not helping. We went to the ER at IMC. They noted intense pain, tender to the touch on my abdomen. They started me on an IV for fluids. I begged for a stronger pain medication but did not receive if for several hours.

They did chest x-rays. An ultrasound and I don't remember what else—but the ultrasound clearly showed that I had a large hematoma in the abdomen area! This was obviously the cause of the increased pain—the pressure on the incision and the mesh that was used was causing intense pain.

Twelve hours after arriving I was admitted to a room. They finally started me on an IV pain medication. After just a few hours they said I could be discharged and they would give me a stronger pain medication to take home. I declined insisting that I wanted to be sure I was ahead of the pain before going home. They also discontinued the use of the Lovenox shots. The explanation was that since I had developed a hematoma the blood thinner could interfere with my body's ability to absorb the blood in that area. They explained that since blood in a hematoma is very sticky it wasn't possible to drain the collection but it would be a long process for my body to deal with this. I was told to NOT use Ibuprofen since that is a mild anticoagulant.

I returned home on March 11. I was given Norco 7.5 mg—a stronger dose—one tablet every 4-6 hours. I was eager after four hours!

The next week is kind of a blur—time passed with a perch on the couch, in our bed (continued needing help to lift my legs) and a few visitors.

On Monday, March 13 we had a visit from IHC. They brought a lovely bouquet of flowers and were very sympatric but oh, so careful about what had actually happened. They were evasive about how many people were present.

That week I tried to resume some sort of “normalcy” to my life. I went out for short periods of time. I was able to move a little easier and didn't need assistance for getting in and out of bed. However, the pain never left me.

Now onto March 23—I went to visit my primary doctor, Nancy McLaughlin, to report what had happened. She was very alarmed and concerned about the resulting blood problem. I reported a very poor urinary stream and she assured me that this could all be the result of weakened muscle tone and should improve in time.

Time moved on and I even tried unsuccessfully to resume water aerobics that I enjoy. The pain was too much.

On May 3 I visited Dr. McLaughlin again. She noted abdominal pain and pain in my right buttock. She spoke to me again about the H/O hypercoagulable state. She was also pleased that I was scheduled to visit a hematology specialist.

On May 4 I visited Dr. David Kaplin, Hematology. He noted the evidence of a rectus sheath hematoma, sequel and Homozygous Factor V mutation. He was careful how to cast blame but said he certainly would not have recommended the Lovenox shots since they thin the blood and area administered right into the area close to the incisions. He said there are articles speaking of the ill effects of using this anticoagulant for abdominal surgeries. When I asked him—could this have been caused by the fall he answered—caused, yes perhaps but surely exasperated by the presence of blood thinners. He said in a court of law would he be willing to say one or the other was the cause? No, but surely both played a part. I went home with more information than I had come with.

Life went on—the pain was not gone. The swelling had reduced but the muscle tone in my abdomen was very poor. I tried resuming some exercise but experienced pain if I pushed a bit too hard.

The pain in my right buttock improved through recommendations from a physical therapist friend to do a set of exercises in our home.

I can honestly say that I had pain, a kind of pulling muscle pain, well into July 2017. I was cautious with lifting and reaching. Sudden twisting caused a jolt. My stomach area remained sensitive.

Today—I do have occasional pain in my abdomen area but I have no way of determining if that is from the surgery and invasion of four incision point and the one small incision where the mesh was inserted OR the residual effects of the hematoma.

In looking back it appears to me as if there were a succession of errors that caused my pain and suffering.

THE STORY

As told by Mike Menning, Husband/Power of Attorney

On Friday, March 3, 2017 my wife, Dawn Menning, a 70-year-old woman, was dropped from the operating table onto the floor as she was being transferred from the operating table to the gurney at the Intermountain Medical Center. Dawn had what was supposed to be a routine surgical procedure to repair an abdominal hernia. After the procedure Surgeon Dr. Kelly Nolan came to report to me how things went. She explained that the surgery went well, however at the end she said, “there is one other thing that you should know. Your wife was dropped from the operating table onto the floor.” Dr. Nolan went on to say that she didn't think Dawn received any major injury. She did add that I should ask the nurse in charge to check Dawn over for any major bruises before she was released from the hospital. Although I asked the nurse in charge to do so, she did not.

A little background—not much consideration was given before surgery in regard to the fact that Dawn has a blood clotting condition, Factor 5 Leiden. Consequently extra precautions needed to be taken to respect the potential of blood clots following surgery. Advice from her primary physician was to use an oral medication to deter clotting. However, the decision from Dr. Nolan was that she would begin shots of Lovenox given into the belly three days prior to surgery and ten days following. This medical condition should have been emphasized to the surgical staff so that precaution and extra concern should have been a high priority during and

following surgery. Extreme caution and tender handling should have been taken in the move to prevent possible bruising or even a hematoma in the area of the surgery—right near the point of entry of the blood thinner.

I stayed in the waiting room bewildered by this news until I received the call from recovery to meet Dawn. It took a very long time before I received the call that she was on her way. I met an attendant coming out of the elevator pushing Dawn on the gurney. I expressed my joy in seeing her and asked her if she knew what had happened. I told her that she had been dropped off the operating table onto the floor. She didn't believe me at first, she thought I was joking. The nurse said, "Yes, she was dropped, but it was a controlled fall." This is the first I heard the words, "controlled fall." I thought, now what does that mean? It was very obvious that the reason it took so long to get her out of recovery may have been because the medical staff had to have time to get their story together and make sure they were all on the same page.

That afternoon, even before Dawn was discharged, I went to see the IMC administrator Joe Mott. He called in Ms. White, Patient Relations. I explained what had happened. Mr. Mott said to me, "What do you want me to do about it?" I said your surgical staff violated my wife's unconscious body and personhood. The least you could do is apologize. He said they would stay in touch.

Dawn was discharged and did not see the surgeon again that day. The medical staff completed no further examinations. The nurse suggested that when it was time for my wife to get dressed, I should assist her and I check for any evidence of bruising.

On Monday, March 6 Dawn and I went back to visit with the surgeon, Dr. Kelly Nolan. Dawn was experiencing very sharp pain in her right abdomen and wondered if she could have broken ribs. Dr. Nolan ordered x-rays. She said although she was in the operating room at the time of the fall she did not see what was happened until she saw her patient on the floor. She also explained to us what was meant by the "controlled fall." Apparently the anesthesiologist stuck out his leg under her head and supported her as she fell as best he could. We were not told what appliances or means were being used to transfer. They claim the gurney was not locked and slid away. Who, why and how many were involved—we did not know. The unanswered questions did not help to answer the question, "why did she have so much pain in a large area of her abdomen?"

NOTE: Years ago I served on an volunteer ambulance team in our hometown in Minnesota. I was a trained in Advanced First Aid for ambulance personnel—today's equivalent of an EMT I know from personal experience if the transfer is properly done, it is almost impossible to drop a patient.

Three days later the pain was increasing—not getting better at all. During the night of Thursday, March 9 Dawn was experiencing uncontrollable pain, even using the strongest pain medication she had been prescribed. I took her back to the hospital to the emergency. They kept her there for a LONG time, in fact, twelve hours, attempting to get her pain under control—not successfully. They did recommend the Lovenox be stopped—only after further tests—CAT and ultrasound—which clearly showed a large hematoma. Her abdomen was filled with blood!

Pain continued for months, including a bout with extreme pain far below the site of the incision as well as pain down the right side of her backside and leg.

About ten days after the "incident" two people from IMC came to our home, one from the Risk Management Department and one from Patient Relations. They apologized for

what happened and gave Dawn a bouquet of flowers. I asked if we could see a copy of the "incident report." We were told that was not possible because under the law it is sealed. Risk management controls IMC's risk WOW—not comforting when my wife continued to experience severe pain. Risk Management repeated the report about "controlled fall."

My wife did go to the Department of Records to obtain the medical records from the hospital. They made reference to the fall, but did not explain how it happened or what really happened. IMC did not release the incident report, because under law the incident report is sealed, property of the hospital.

My Response in the Weeks Following the Incident

I consulted attorneys from four well-known law firms. Each one told me that they would NOT take the case because under Utah law it is impossible to win in the courts. They further informed me that under Utah law, when an unconscious person is dropped from the operating table during or after the surgery that the patient and her legal representative are not allowed access to the incident report. Under present Utah law patients taking a case like this to court and winning is out of the question because incident reports are sealed, therefore the medical personnel and the hospital are immune from prosecution. So, the result is; it is impossible to know what has happened or how it happened. Therefore, there is a great need for The National Unconscious Patient's Bill of Rights.

Interesting Thought for Consideration

"Assume that you purchased your first car 50 years ago, a 1947 Cadillac convertible. You took immaculate care of the cherished automobile; own the car today, and then took it in for repairs. Also assume that you entrusted your beloved car to one of the most modern and reputable repair centers in the city, leaving it in the hands of highly qualified, professional mechanics. You were invited to wait in the service garage waiting area because garage and insurance concerns do not permit you to watch the repairs being made. A couple hours later the head mechanic meets you in the waiting area to tell you that your car was dropped off the hoist onto the concrete floor. No more information is given and all you can do is take your broken car home. Later, you go back to the repair center seeking answers and help for your car. You see the repair center's manager and tell him what the car meant to you. His response is, "Well, what do you want me to do?" You say, "Maybe you could start by apologizing." About ten days later he and a couple of people from the repair center come to your home to apologize and deliver a bouquet of flowers. He says, "You will be charged for the original repairs and you need to know that under special legislation for 'repair shop and mechanic protection', you cannot get the report of how it happened or a report of the damage to your car."

You may say, this is really a terrible comparison, and it is. You see this happened to my wife, Dawn, whom I have loved and cherished for more than 50 years. And now I compare her to an old car—not even close—even an insult, but I think you get the point.

DAWN MENNING SEEKS RESOLUTION BY PROMOTING THE NATIONAL UNCONSCIOUS PATIENT'S BILL OF RIGHTS

I will work to introduce and seek the passage of "The National Unconscious Person's Bill of Rights." This legislation will include language requiring all medical surgical procedures to be recorded by audio and video.

In my search and input from a University of Utah doctor, we can only find four times

in recent U.S. medical history that unconscious patients have been dropped off hospital's operating tables.

In the early 90's a lady from Denver area was dropped off the operating table and was paralyzed from the neck down

In the late 90's a 28 year old lady was dropped from the operating table at the Clarion Hospital in Pennsylvania, resulting permanent injuries

In 2012 a 75 year old patient was dropped off the operating table at Duke University Health System Hospital, he died of complications a short time later

In 2010 a patient was dropped off an operating table at St. Joseph Hospital, Minneapolis MN, he died a short time later of complications.

We praise God that Dawn did not die from injury complications or was paralyzed in the process.

Now Intermountain Medical Center is recorded in these statistics.

THE NATIONAL UNCONSCIOUS PATIENT'S BILL OF RIGHTS

The National Unconscious Patient's Bill of Rights shall be placed in Federal Law; such shall include, but not be limited to:

1. All surgical procedures must be recorded by mounted video camera and be kept in the patient's permanent record for a period of two years.

2. In the event of an incident or accident concerning an unconscious patient, the hospital or medical clinic shall maintain the recording as part of the patient's permanent record.

3. The incident reports and video shall be made available to the patient and the patient's legal representative and can be presented as evidence in a court of law.

4. A patient shall have the right to know the names and roles of the members of such person's health care team (taken from the Virginia Commonwealth University Health System).

RECENT HISTORICAL GROUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL UNCONSCIOUS PATIENT'S BILL OF RIGHTS

Legislators and others can lay the foundation for the passage of legislation making video cameras mandatory in medical clinics and hospitals where surgical procedures are performed using the following examples. With today's modern technology video recording of surgical procedures can be provided at minimal cost.

Consider previous precedents—

1. In the State of Utah and other states the Departments of Motor Vehicles mandate that all motor vehicle and emission inspection technicians are videoed by camera as they do the inspections. Any MV (motor vehicle) inspection facilities shutting off the state-mandated video camera shall be fined and/or have their license revoked. Surely if the State of Utah requires the Motor Vehicle inspection to be videoed doing their work, the legislature can pass legislation requiring hospital to video patients under anesthesia the same privilege.

2. In the case of Andrea Constand vs. William Cosby Jr, one of the issues was that Ms. Constand was abused while she was in an unconscious state. Similarly, should a Utah law remain on the books giving medical professionals and the Intermountain Medical Center immunity from the law when a 70-year-old woman, my wife, was clearly abused while in an unconscious state? The question is—was it an accident? Or was it an incident? Whatever happened, we will not know because there is no video and there are no means to obtain the information legally. This is the heart of the matter.

3. Most state and local officials, as well as the public, encourage and support body and car cams for law enforcement. These video cameras have been proven to be very helpful for protection of policeman and the public.

4. Consider the most recent case of Nurse Alexandra Wubbels barring police from drawing blood from an unconscious patient. Her position was that the unconscious patient has a right to know what is happening to their body. She stood her ground. The police thought they had a right under the law, it didn't play well in the media. The end result, Salt Lake City and the University Hospital settled for \$500,000 payment to Ms. Wubbels.

Today's society will not longer accept gross mistreatment of unconscious patients presently shrouded in secrecy. The National Unconscious Patient's Bill of Rights will promote the use of modem technology, cameras mounted and in use during surgical procedures. Upon request from the patient such recordings must be available to patient or assigned legal representative. Doctors and medical staff will be held responsible for their actions.

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, December 13, 2018 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

DECEMBER 14

10:30 a.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To receive a briefing on best practices for keeping families safely together.

SD-G11

DECEMBER 19

2:30 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights

To hold hearings to examine a comparative look at competition law approaches to monopoly and abuse of dominance in the United States and European Union.

SD-226

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7455–S7530

Measures Introduced: Eight bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3741–3748. **Page S7509**

Measures Reported:

Report to accompany S. 2961, to reauthorize subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990. (S. Rept. No. 115–432) **Page S7509**

Measures Passed:

Returns by Exempt and Certain Non-Exempt Organizations: By 50 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 260), Senate agreed to S.J. Res. 64, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Treasury relating to “Returns by Exempt Organizations and Returns by Certain Non-Exempt Organizations”. **Pages S7458–74**

Removal and Transfer Procedures: Senate passed S. 3748, to amend the removal and transfer procedures for the Inspectors General of the Library of Congress, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and the Government Publishing Office. **Pages S7521–22**

Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act: Senate passed S. 1158, to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises, after withdrawing the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S7522–24**

Gardner (for Cardin) Amendment No. 4102, to make technical corrections. **Pages S7523–24**

Protecting Girls’ Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act: Senate passed S. 1580, to enhance the transparency, improve the coordination, and intensify the impact of assistance to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children and persons, including women and girls, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7524**

Congenital Heart Futures Reauthorization Act: Senate passed H.R. 1222, to amend the Public Health Service Act to coordinate Federal congenital heart disease research efforts and to improve public education and awareness of congenital heart disease, after withdrawing the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S7524–25**

Gardner (for Durbin/Young) Amendment No. 4103, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S7524–25**

Federal Personal Property Management Act: Senate passed S. 3031, to amend chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code, to improve the management of Federal personal property. **Pages S7525–26**

Building Our Largest Dementia Infrastructure for Alzheimer’s Act: Senate passed S. 2076, to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer’s disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer’s Disease and Healthy Aging Program, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S7526–27**

Gardner (for Collins) Amendment No. 4104, to clarify provisions relating to waivers. **Pages S7526–27**

Federal Election Campaign Act: Senate passed H.R. 7120, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to extend through 2023 the authority of the Federal Election Commission to impose civil money penalties on the basis of a schedule of penalties established and published by the Commission. **Page S7527**

American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Women in the United States: Committee on Indian Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 444, recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian women in the United States, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S7528**

29th Anniversary of the Tribal Canoe Journey of the Tribal Nations of the Pacific Northwest: Committee on Indian Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 596, recognizing the

29th anniversary of the Tribal Canoe Journey of the Tribal Nations of the Pacific Northwest and congratulating the Puyallup Tribe of Indians for hosting the 2018 Power Paddle to Puyallup, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S7528**

Sergeant Donald Burgett Post Office Building: Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 6020, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 325 South Michigan Avenue in Howell, Michigan, as the "Sergeant Donald Burgett Post Office Building", and the bill was then passed. **Page S7528**

Deputy Sheriff Zackari Spurlock Parrish, III, Post Office Building: Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5791, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9609 South University Boulevard in Highlands Ranch, Colorado, as the "Deputy Sheriff Zackari Spurlock Parrish, III, Post Office Building", and the bill was then passed. **Page S7528**

Detective Heath McDonald Gumm Post Office: Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5792, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 North 4th Avenue in Brighton, Colorado, as the "Detective Heath McDonald Gumm Post Office", and the bill was then passed. **Page S7528**

Napoleon 'Nap' Ford Post Office Building: Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 6591, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 501 South Kirkman Road in Orlando, Florida, as the "Napoleon 'Nap' Ford Post Office Building", and the bill was then passed. **Page S7528**

Major Andreas O'Keeffe Post Office Building: Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 6780, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7521 Paula Drive in Tampa, Florida, as the "Major Andreas O'Keeffe Post Office Building", and the bill was then passed. **Page S7528**

Judge James E. Horton, Jr. Post Office Building: Senate passed H.R. 6513, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1110 West Market Street in Athens, Alabama, as the "Judge James E. Horton, Jr. Post Office Building". **Page S7528**

Lance Corporal Juana Navarro Arellano Post Office Building: Senate passed H.R. 6405, to des-

ignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2801 Mitchell Road in Ceres, California, as the "Lance Corporal Juana Navarro Arellano Post Office Building". **Page S7528**

Janet Lucille Oilar Post Office: Senate passed H.R. 6655, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 44160 State Highway 299 East Suite 1 in McArthur, California, as the "Janet Lucille Oilar Post Office". **Page S7528**

Sergeant David Kinterknecht Post Office: Senate passed H.R. 6216, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3025 Woodgate Road in Montrose, Colorado, as the "Sergeant David Kinterknecht Post Office". **Pages S7528–29**

Deputy Sheriff Derek Geer Post Office Building: Senate passed H.R. 6217, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 241 N 4th Street in Grand Junction, Colorado, as the "Deputy Sheriff Derek Geer Post Office Building". **Page S7529**

Patrick E. Mahany, Jr., Post Office Building: Senate passed H.R. 6831, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 35 West Main Street in Frisco, Colorado, as the "Patrick E. Mahany, Jr., Post Office Building". **Page S7529**

Sgt. Josh Rodgers Post Office: Senate passed H.R. 4326, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 West North Street in Normal, Illinois, as the "Sgt. Josh Rodgers Post Office". **Page S7529**

Frank Leone Post Office Act: Senate passed H.R. 6428, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 332 Ramapo Valley Road in Oakland, New Jersey, as the "Frank Leone Post Office". **Page S7529**

Staff Sergeant Alexandria Gleason Morrow Post Office Building: Senate passed H.R. 5395, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 116 Main Street in Dansville, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Alexandria Gleason-Morrow Post Office Building". **Page S7529**

Army Specialist Jose L. Ruiz Post Office Building: Senate passed H.R. 5412, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 2nd Avenue in Brentwood, New York, as the "Army Specialist Jose L. Ruiz Post Office Building". **Page S7529**

Major Homer L. Pease Post Office: Senate passed H.R. 6621, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 530 East Main Street in Johnson City, Tennessee, as the "Major Homer L. Pease Post Office". **Page S7529**

Pleasanton Veterans Post Office: Senate passed H.R. 1210, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 122 W. Goodwin Street, Pleasanton, Texas, as the “Pleasanton Veterans Post Office”. **Page S7529**

Encinal Veterans Post Office: Senate passed H.R. 1211, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 400 N. Main Street, Encinal, Texas, as the “Encinal Veterans Post Office”. **Page S7529**

Captain Humayun Khan Post Office: Senate passed H.R. 3184, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 180 McCormick Road in Charlottesville, Virginia, as the “Captain Humayun Khan Post Office”. **Page S7529**

James Marshall ‘Jimi’ Hendrix Post Office Building: Senate passed H.R. 6628, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4301 Northeast 4th Street in Renton, Washington, as the “James Marshall ‘Jimi’ Hendrix Post Office Building”. **Page S7529**

Measures Considered:

Hostilities in the Republic of Yemen—Agreement: Senate began consideration of S.J. Res. 54, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress, taking action on the following amendment proposed thereto:

Pages S7482–S7503

Pending:

Young Amendment No. 4080, to clarify that this resolution prohibits United States Armed Forces from refueling non-United States aircraft conducting missions as part of the ongoing civil war in Yemen.

Pages S7488–S7503

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 60 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. 261), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution.

Page S7482

By 96 yeas to 3 nays (Vote No. 262), Senate determined that the point of order that amendments offered under 50 U.S.C. 1546a must be germane to the underlying joint resolution to which they are offered, was well-taken.

Page S7483

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing that at 1:45 p.m., on Thursday, December 13, 2018, all time be considered expired on the joint resolution, and Senate vote on or in relation to the following amendments in the order listed, with two minutes equally divided in the usual form prior to each vote, and no second-degree amendments in order: Young Amendment No. 4080 (listed above), Cornyn Amendment No. 4096, Cornyn Amendment

No. 4090, Cornyn Amendment No. 4095, Cotton Amendment No. 4097, Cotton Amendment No. 4098, and Sanders Amendment No. 4105; and that following disposition of the amendments, Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution, as amended, if amended, with no intervening action or debate.

Page S7529

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the joint resolution at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, December 13, 2018.

Page S7529

Appointments:

Syria Study Group: The Chair, pursuant to Public Law 115–254, on behalf of the Majority Leader of the Senate, appointed the following individual as a member of the Syria Study Group: Vance F. Serchuk, of New York.

Page S7521

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

60 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

11 Army nominations in the rank of general.

2 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy.

Pages S7503–05, S7529–30

Messages from the House:

Pages S7506–07

Measures Referred:

Page S7507

Measures Placed on the Calendar:

Page S7507

Measures Read the First Time:

Pages S7507, S7521

Enrolled Bills Presented:

Page S7507

Executive Communications:

Page S7507

Petitions and Memorials:

Pages S7507–09

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S7509–10

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Page S7510

Additional Statements:

Page S7506

Amendments Submitted:

Pages S7510–21

Notices of Intent:

Page S7521

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Page S7521

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S7521

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—262)

Pages S7474, S7482–83

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 9:22 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, December 13, 2018. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S7529.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

CHINA'S PRESENCE AND INVESTMENT IN AFRICA

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities concluded a hearing to examine implications of China's presence and investment in Africa, after receiving testimony from Yun Sun, The Stimson Center; Judd Devermont, Center for Strategic and International Studies; and Josh Meservey, Heritage Foundation Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy.

NAVY AND MARINE CORPS READINESS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower, with the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support concluded a hearing to examine Navy and Marine Corps readiness, after receiving testimony from Richard V. Spencer, Secretary of the Navy, General Robert B. Neller, USMC, Commandant of the Marine Corps, and Admiral William F. Moran, USN, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, all of the Department of Defense; and John H. Pendleton, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management, Government Accountability Office.

U.S. FORCE POSTURE IN THE INDO-PACIFIC REGION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support concluded a closed hearing to examine United States force posture in the Indo-Pacific region, after receiving testimony from James H. Anderson, Assistant Secretary for Strategy, Plans, and Capabilities, Lieutenant General Brian D. Beaudreault, USMC, Deputy Commandant of the Marine Corps for Plans, Policies, and Operations, and Brigadier General Tracy King, USMC, Deputy Director, J5 (Asia), Joint Chiefs of Staff, all of the Department of Defense.

NATIONAL PARKS LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine S. 2395, to amend title 54, United States Code, to authorize the provision of technical assistance under the Preserve America Program and to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into partnerships with communities adjacent to units of the National Park System to leverage local cultural heritage tourism assets, S. 2895 and H.R. 5613, bills to designate the Quindaro Townsite National Historic Landmark, S. 3291, to reauthorize the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Route, S. 3439 and H.R. 5532, bills to redesignate the Reconstruction Era National Monument as the Reconstruction Era

National Historical Park, S. 3468, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Nashua, Squannacook, and Nissitissit Rivers as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 3505, to provide for partnerships among State and local governments, regional entities, and the private sector to preserve, conserve, and enhance the visitor experience at nationally significant battlefields of the American Revolution, War of 1812, and Civil War, S. 3527 and H.R. 5585, bills to extend the authorization for the Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission, S. 3533, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain river segments within the Wood-Pawcatuck watershed as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, S. 3534, to redesignate the New River Gorge National River in the State of West Virginia as the "New River Gorge National Park", S. 3571 and H.R. 5420, bills to authorize the acquisition of land for addition to the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site in the State of New York, S. 3646, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept certain properties in the State of Missouri, S. 3609 and H.R. 801, bills to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Route 66 National Historic Trail, S. 3659, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to annually designate at least one city in the United States as an "American World War II Heritage City", H.R. 1220, to establish the Adams Memorial Commission to carry out the provisions of Public Law 107-62, H.R. 3607, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish fees for medical services provided in units of the National Park System, H.R. 3961, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Kissimmee River and its tributaries in the State of Florida for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, H.R. 5005, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing the birthplace of James Weldon Johnson in Jacksonville, Florida, as a unit of the National Park System, H.R. 5706, to establish the Pearl Harbor National Memorial in the State of Hawai'i and the Honouliuli National Historic Site in the State of Hawai'i, H.R. 6077, recognizing the National Comedy Center in Jamestown, New York, H.R. 6599, to modify the application of temporary limited appointment regulations to the National Park Service, and H.R. 6687, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to manage the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California consistently with Congress' long-standing intent to continue to authorize working dairies and ranches on agricultural property as part of the seashore's unique historic, cultural, scenic and natural values, after receiving

testimony from P. Daniel Smith, Deputy Director, Exercising the Authority of the Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

MISSING PERSONS AND MURDER VICTIMS IN INDIAN COUNTRY

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine missing persons and murder victims in Indian country, focusing on confronting the silent crisis, after receiving testimony from Charles Addington, Director, Office of Justice Services, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; Robert Johnson, Assistant Director, Criminal Investigative Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Gerald M. Laporte, Director, Office of Investigative and Forensic Sciences, National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, both of the Department of Justice; Amber Kanazbah Crotty, Navajo Nation Council, Window Rock, Arizona; Patricia Alexander, Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska Violence Against Women Task Force, Juneau; and Kimberly Loring Heavy Runner, Missoula, Montana.

CHINA'S NON-TRADITIONAL ESPIONAGE

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine China's non-traditional espionage against the United States, focusing on the threat and potential policy responses, after receiving testimony from John C. Demers, Assistant Attorney General, National Security Division, and E.W. Priestap, Assistant Director, Counterintelligence Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, both of the Department of Justice; Christopher Krebs, Director, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Department

of Homeland Security; Dean Cheng, The Heritage Foundation, and Peter E. Harrell, Center for a New American Security, both of Washington, D.C.; and James Mulvenon, SOS International, LLC, Vienna, Virginia.

TRANSNATIONAL CARTELS AND BORDER SECURITY

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Border Security and Immigration concluded a hearing to examine transnational cartels and border security, after receiving testimony from Kemp Chester, Associate Director, National Heroin Coordination Group, Office of National Drug Control Policy; Janice Ayala, Director, Joint Task Force for Investigations (JTF-I), Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and Carla L. Provost, Chief, Border Patrol, Customs and Border Protection, both of the Department of Homeland Security; Paul E. Knierim, Deputy Chief of Operations, Office of Global Enforcement, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice; Chris Magnus, Tucson Police Department, Tucson, Arizona; and Earl Anthony Wayne, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Roger F. Noriega, American Enterprise Institute, Celina B. Realuyo, The George Washington University Elliott School of International Affairs, and Andrew Selee, Migration Policy Institute, all of Washington, D.C.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 26 public bills, H.R. 7264–7289, were introduced.

Pages H10168–69

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H10170–71

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 6021, to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to exclude privately held, non-custody brokers and dealers that are in good standing from certain requirements under title I of that Act, and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 115–1075);

H.R. 6130, to provide for a 5 year extension of certain exemptions and reduced disclosure require-

ments for companies that were emerging growth companies and would continue to be emerging growth companies but for the 5-year restriction on emerging growth companies, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–1076);

H.R. 6745, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to revise the shareholder threshold for registration under such Act for issuers that receive support through certain Federal universal service support mechanisms, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–1077); and

H.R. 4758, to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require the Federal Open Market Committee to establish interest rates on balances maintained at a

Federal Reserve Bank by depository institutions (H. Rept. 115–1078). **Page H10168**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Yoder to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H10105**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:16 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H10113**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 169 nays with four answering "present", Roll No. 433. **Pages H10114, H10128–29**

Medal of Valor Review Board—Reappointment: Read a letter from Representative Pelosi, Minority Leader, in which she reappointed the following individual to the Medal of Valor Review Board: Mr. Brian Fengel of Bartonville, Illinois. **Page H10115**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Department of Homeland Security Data Framework Act: Concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2454, to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a data framework to provide access for appropriate personnel to law enforcement and other information of the Department; and

Pages H10129–30, H10152

Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018: S. 2736, amended, to develop a long-term strategic vision and a comprehensive, multifaceted, and principled United States policy for the Indo-Pacific region. **Pages H10130–38**

Condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Res. 274, condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights, as amended by Representative Ros-Lehtinen. **Pages H10138–40**

Georgia Support Act: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass H.R. 6219, to support the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Georgia. **Pages H10140–41**

Reaffirming the commitment of the United States to promote free, fair, transparent and credible elections in Bangladesh: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Res. 1169, reaffirming the commitment of the United States to promote free, fair, transparent and credible elections in Bangladesh. **Page H10142**

Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018: The House agreed to the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, by a yea-and-nay vote of 369 yeas to 47 nays, Roll No. 434. **Pages H10142–51, H10151–52**

H. Res. 1176, the rule providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 206 yeas to 203 noes, Roll No. 432, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 191 nays, Roll No. 431. **Pages H10115–28**

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives relating to automated external defibrillator (AED) training in the Nation's schools: The House agreed to discharge from committee and agree to H. Res. 35, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives relating to automated external defibrillator (AED) training in the Nation's schools, as amended by Representative Lewis (MN). **Page H10152**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: "Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives relating to automated external defibrillator (AED) education in the Nation's schools." **Page H10152**

Amending the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend honorary citizenship to otherwise qualified noncitizens who enlisted in the Philippines and died while serving on active duty with the United States Armed Forces during certain periods of hostilities: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass H.R. 887, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend honorary citizenship to otherwise qualified noncitizens who enlisted in the Philippines and died while serving on active duty with the United States Armed Forces during certain periods of hostilities. **Pages H10152–53**

CyberTipline Modernization Act of 2018: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass S. 3170, to amend title 18, United States Code, to make certain changes to the reporting requirement of certain service providers regarding child sexual exploitation visual depictions. **Pages H10153–55**

Posthumously awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to each of Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith in recognition of their contributions to the Nation: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass H.R. 2315, to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal to each of Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith in recognition of their contributions to the Nation, as amended by Representative Barr. **Pages H10155–56**

Chinese-American World War II Veteran Congressional Gold Medal Act: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass S. 1050, to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

Pages H10156–57

USS Indianapolis Congressional Gold Medal Act: The House agreed to discharge from committee and pass S. 2101, to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the crew of the USS *Indianapolis*, in recognition of their perseverance, bravery, and service to the United States.

Page H10157

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, December 13th.

Page H10157

Senate Referrals: S.J. Res. 64 was held at the desk. S. 1092 was held at the desk. S. 2961 was held at the desk.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H10163.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H10127, H10127–28, H10128–29, and H10151–52. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

Committee Meetings

SECURITY CLEARANCE PROCESSING STATUS REPORT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Security Clearance Processing Status Report”. Testimony was heard from Garry Reid, Director for Defense Intelligence, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence; Dan Payne, Director, Defense Security Service; and Charles Phalen, Director, National Background Investigations Bureau.

PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR FEDERAL ENERGY MANAGEMENT

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “Public Private Partnerships for Federal Energy Management”. Testimony was heard from Leslie Nicholls, Strategic Director, Federal Energy Management Program, Department of Energy; Jack Surash, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Energy and Sustainability, Department of the Army; Kevin Kampschroer, Chief Sustainability Officer and Director, Office of Federal

High-Performance Buildings, General Services Administration; and Ed Bradley, Executive Director, Office of Asset Enterprise Management, Department of Veterans Affairs.

EXAMINING THE AVAILABILITY OF SAFE KITS AT HOSPITALS IN THE UNITED STATES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Examining the Availability of SAFE Kits at Hospitals in the United States”. Testimony was heard from A. Nicole Clowers, Managing Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade held a hearing entitled “Evaluating the Effectiveness of the International Financial Institutions”. Testimony was heard from David Malpass, Under Secretary for International Affairs, Department of the Treasury.

DEVELOPMENT, DIPLOMACY, AND DEFENSE: PROMOTING U.S. INTERESTS IN AFRICA

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Development, Diplomacy, and Defense: Promoting U.S. Interests in Africa”. Testimony was heard from Tibor P. Nagy, Jr., Assistant Secretary, Bureau of African Affairs, Department of State; and Ramsey Day, Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Africa, U.S. Agency for International Development.

OVERSIGHT HEARING FOR THE ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES (FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION’S BUREAU OF COMPETITION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE’S ANTITRUST DIVISION)

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law held a hearing entitled “Oversight Hearing for the Antitrust Enforcement Agencies (Federal Trade Commission’s Bureau of Competition and the Department of Justice’s Antitrust Division)”. Testimony was heard from Makan Delrahim, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice; and Joseph J. Simons, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission.

FEDERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITION REFORM ACT (FITARA) SCORECARD 7.0

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Information Technology; and Subcommittee on Government Operations held a joint hearing entitled “Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act (FITARA) Scorecard 7.0”. Testimony was heard from Carol C. Harris, Director of IT Management Issues, Government Accountability Office; Ed Simcox, Chief Technology Officer and Acting Chief Information Officer, Department of Health and Human Services; and Sheila Conley, Deputy Chief Financial Officer, Department of Health and Human Services.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a markup on General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions. The General Services Administration Capital Investment and Leasing Program Resolutions were adopted, without amendment.

IS VA READY FOR FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF APPEALS REFORM?

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Is VA Ready for Full Implementation of Appeals Reform?”. Testimony was heard from James Byrne, Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs; and Elizabeth H. Curda, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Team, Government Accountability Office.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D1254)

H.R. 390, to provide relief for victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes who are members of religious and ethnic minority groups in Iraq and Syria, for accountability for perpetrators of these crimes. Signed on December 11, 2018. (Public Law 115–300)

H.R. 1074, to repeal the Act entitled “An Act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation”. Signed on December 11, 2018. (Public Law 115–301)

H.R. 2422, to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve essential oral health care for low-income and other underserved individuals by breaking

down barriers to care. Signed on December 11, 2018. (Public Law 115–302)

H.R. 4254, to amend the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 to strengthen the aerospace workforce pipeline by the promotion of Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program and National Aeronautics and Space Administration internship and fellowship opportunities to women. Signed on December 11, 2018. (Public Law 115–303)

H.R. 5317, to repeal section 2141 of the Revised Statutes to remove the prohibition on certain alcohol manufacturing on Indian lands. Signed on December 11, 2018. (Public Law 115–304)

H.R. 6651, to extend certain authorities relating to United States efforts to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria globally. Signed on December 11, 2018. (Public Law 115–305)

S. 440, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota. Signed on December 11, 2018. (Public Law 115–306)

S. 1768, to reauthorize and amend the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program. Signed on December 11, 2018. (Public Law 115–307)

S. 2074, to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Jamestown Reservoir in the State of North Dakota. Signed on December 11, 2018. (Public Law 115–308)

S. 3389, to redesignate a facility of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Signed on December 11, 2018. (Public Law 115–309)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 2018

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Finance: business meeting to consider the nomination of Courtney Dunbar Jones, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider the nominations of John Barsa, of Florida, to be an Assistant Administrator, and Bonnie Glick, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator, both of the United States Agency for International Development, and R. Clarke Cooper, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary (Political-Military Affairs), Christopher Paul Henzel, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Yemen, Michael S. Klecheski, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mongolia, Sarah-Ann Lynch, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Co-operative Republic of Guyana, Matthew John Matthews, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Brunei Darussalam, Carol Z. Perez, of Virginia, to be Director General of the Foreign Service, David Schenker, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary (Near Eastern Affairs), Lynne M. Tracy, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to

the Republic of Armenia, Earle D. Litzenberger, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Azerbaijan, Kyle McCarter, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kenya, and Arthur B. Culvahouse, Jr., of Tennessee, to be Ambassador to the Commonwealth of Australia, all of the Department of State, 10 a.m., S-116, Capitol.

House

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled “Nigeria at a Crossroads: The Upcoming Elections”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Healthcare, Benefits and Administrative

Rules; and Subcommittee on Government Operations, joint hearing entitled “Exploring Alternatives to Fetal Tissue Research”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Government Operations, hearing entitled “Oversight of Nonprofit Organizations: A Case Study on the Clinton Foundation”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, business meeting to consider Honoring the Memory of Damon P. Nelson; adopting the Committee’s Activity Reports; and transmitting an Unclassified Committee Report to the Intelligence Community for Review and Comment, 10 a.m., HVC-304. This hearing will be closed.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, December 13

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10:30 a.m., Thursday, December 13

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S.J. Res. 54, Hostilities in the Republic of Yemen, with a series of votes on or in relation to amendments, and on passage of the joint resolution, beginning at 1:45 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E1659
 Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E1651, E1658
 Carter, John R., Tex., E1649
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1656
 Conaway, K. Michael, Tex., E1650
 Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E1656

Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E1655, E1658
 Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E1653
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1649
 Kelly, Trent, Miss., E1651, E1657
 Lamborn, Doug, Colo., E1650
 Lewis, Jason, Minn., E1650
 Messer, Luke, Ind., E1649, E1652, E1653, E1655,
 E1656, E1656, E1658, E1658, E1659

Nolan, Richard M., Minn., E1654, E1659
 Poe, Ted, Tex., E1651, E1652, E1655, E1656
 Roby, Martha, Ala., E1649, E1649
 Royce, Edward R., Calif., E1653
 Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E1658
 Walker, Mark, N.C., E1650
 Wittman, Robert J., Va., E1657



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.