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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

January 15, 2019,

I hereby appoint the Honorable Peter WELCH to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

TRUMP SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, the Republican leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, went on “Face the Nation” and said the following: “It is unacceptable that 800,000 U.S. employees are not being paid.” He didn’t add, but he should have, that 40,000 of them are being made to work while they are not paid.

But I agree that it is unacceptable that 800,000 U.S. folks are shut out. It is unacceptable that Republicans and Donald Trump would shut down the government and deny paychecks to 800,000 Americans because they couldn’t get congressional approval for an expensive and ineffective border wall, even when they controlled all levers of government.

Let me repeat that. They didn’t get it done when they controlled all levers of government.

The Republican leader went on to say: “You know what we’re arguing over? One-tenth of 1 percent of the Federal budget.”

He is dead wrong on that. This isn’t about a wall, or healthcare, or the debt limit, or spending levels. It is about whether it is appropriate policy for a President to threaten shutdowns and take the country hostage to get what he wants.

It is malfeasant and malevolent to hold 800,000 Americans and, indeed, the millions they serve hostage to the demands of a President who, days before he shut down the government, told us that is exactly what he intended to do. That is why House Democrats, joined by several Republicans, passed six of the seven remaining appropriations bills for fiscal year 2019, all of which had bipartisan support in the Senate, and a continuing resolution to reopen the Department of Homeland Security on the first day of the new Congress.

It is also why, last week, House Democrats passed, on an individual basis, four of those same appropriations bills to reopen portions of government that the Senate approved by a vote of 92-6, over 90 percent, almost 95 percent of the Senators.

Our colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. COLÉ) was concerned that these were not products of the House. He is right. So vote to open up a government with a CR, which you will have an opportunity to do three times, my Republican colleagues. Let’s conclude the appropriations process by passing bills agreed upon by the House and the Senate.

What we have been saying all along is: Reopen the people’s government. Shuttering it down is an illegitimate, immoral act.

I disagree with the Republican leader’s characterization of Democrats’ position as taking a stand for a certain level of funding.

Just give us X amount of money for a wall. Republicans and the President say, and the shutdown will end.

This is not about a wall. It is about trying to gain an end by threat, rather than by democratic debate. One side cannot, must not, continue to threaten shutdowns to get its way in a democracy.

Our research does not show us another democracy in the world that shuts itself down. That is not how the system should work.

If Donald Trump is permitted to bully the American people and their representatives into giving him whatever he wants, does anyone think, for a second, we won’t be right back here in a few weeks, or a few months, with yet another shutdown over the next item on the President’s wish list?

Give me more tax cuts for the wealthy, or I will shut down the government, he will say. Cut Medicare and Social Security, or I will default on the debt.

This is about more than money to build a wall on our border. It is about whether to firm up the wall around our democracy.

We need to end this shutdown now, reopen the government first, and discuss rationally, how best to secure our borders, an objective many of us have voted to do over the years, with substantial increases in our investment in security at all of our borders.

The only beneficiaries, very frankly, of this shutdown are Russia, China, Iran, and our other enemies and those who would like to see us fail. If this
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shutdown continues, it will further weaken us on trade, on national security, on protecting our interests around the world, and in serving our people here at home. And it will continue harming our economy, which has already lost nearly as much in GDP as the President wants for his wall," and President Trump to end it by taking up the bills the House has already passed to do so.

Mr. President, open our government for the people.

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

OPIOID EPIDEMIC IS PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, I had the privilege of being in Kane, Pennsylvania, McKean County, Pennsylvania’s 15th Congressional District, for a film screening and a panel discussion about opioid addiction.

The 11-minute film is called “Eye of the Needle,” and it chronicles opioid addiction in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. It was produced in 2017 for the Light of Life Rescue Mission’s annual gala.

Light of Life is a homeless shelter in Pittsburgh whose clients are homeless, primarily due to addiction and mental health issues. Light of Life provides a home for the homeless; food for the hungry; and care for the poor, the addicted, the abused, and the elderly.

Like so many shelters in America, the opioid epidemic has greatly impacted them. They have been using this film as an educational tool. It has been screened at Carnegie Mellon University, Duquesne University, Point Park University, and Robert Morris University.

On Sunday, it was the first time the film was shown in a community setting. About 100 people gathered in the Kane Borough Community Center for the viewing, which also featured a panel discussion.

I proudly participated on the panel, which featured several speakers from the community, including representatives from law enforcement and alcohol and drug abuse services.

Mr. Speaker, I know there isn’t a ZIP Code in the country that isn’t impacted by the opioid epidemic. We have seen the crippling effects of this epidemic, and we need to act with unified urgency to help those who are suffering.

It is considered by many to be the worst public health crisis of this generation. Overcoming it will not only take a community-wide effort, but a nationwide effort.

Through treatment and recovery, prevention, by protecting our communities, and by fighting fentanyl and other ever-changing synthetic or foreign illicit drugs, we will overcome this epidemic.

Heroin and pill addiction does not discriminate on age, race, gender, or socioeconomic status. Your neighbor could be using heroin, and so could the person who lives next door to you.

Unfortunately, the people of Pennsylvania have seen some of the worst. In 2017, the crisis surged when the Commonwealth experienced a 44 percent increase in opioid overdoses.

Addressing this unprecedented rate of opioid-related deaths means that we must focus on nearly 2.2 million Americans who currently struggle with opioid addiction.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, we were on the front line. Through community conversations, like the one that took place in Kane this Sunday, we can continue the conversation on how to end this epidemic.

Congress has engaged many agencies, including the Department of Justice, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, and Customs and Border Protection, just to name a few, to help combat opioid abuse.

This crisis has taken lives, torn apart families, weakened our workforce, and overextended our healthcare system.

Mr. Speaker, this is a modern-day plague and the public health crisis of our lifetime. We need to talk about it. We need to act. And we need to find solutions.

LET’S HAVE SMART BORDER SECURITY

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

Mr. DeFazio. Mr. Speaker, the President has really made his wall argument on the basis of stopping illegal drugs from coming into the country.

Last week, I talked about the Maginot Line in France, an impenetrable defense. The Germans went around it.

If drugs were being smuggled across the desert section of wall isn’t going to stop them. They will go around it. But that is not the way drugs are coming into the United States of America. They are coming through our legal border crossings. I talked about that last week.

We need more personnel. We need more technology there to inspect a larger number of the vehicles, all the vehicles coming across, with high technology, to find the human smuggling, the drug smuggling, and the weapons smuggling, if it is coming in that way.

But there is another way that drugs are pouring into the United States of America, and here is, last year, just one of the incidents that the Coast Guard intercepted. They intercepted $5.6 billion of illegal drugs being smuggled in through maritime pathways.

The recently retired commandant said that is only about 20 percent of the shipments. We could intercept more if we had more resources. If we had more fast-pursuit boats, we could stop a much larger percentage.

But today is a really special day. These brave men and women of the United States Cabinet who are not being paid. If we had more fast-pursuit boats, we could stop a much larger percentage.

41,000 Active Duty coasties won’t be paid. And guess what? The first of next month, 50,000 retired coasties won’t be paid. In addition to that, there are 8,000 Coast Guard critical civilian employees who are not being paid.

So if the President really wants to talk about intercepting drugs, and he wants to talk about real border security, he should be talking about giving more resources to the United States Coast Guard, not stifling them on their paychecks and not making them fly ancient helicopters and 50-year-old cutters.

But he wants to waste $5 billion on a wall across part of the desert that you can go around, if that is the way they were smuggling in drugs. But as I said earlier, they aren’t.

Let’s have smart border security. Let’s use our precious tax dollars in an intelligent, 21st century way, not a vanity wall.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF PFC GARFIELD M. LANGHORN

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the service and sacrifice of hometown hero and Medal of Honor recipient PFC Garfield M. Langhorn from Riverhead, New York, who, 50 years ago today, saved the lives of his platoon members, at just 20 years old, by throwing himself on a live grenade in Pleiku province in Vietnam on January 15, 1969.

PFC Langhorn served as a radio operator with Troop C, 7th Squadron, 17th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Aviation Brigade, when his unit attempted to rescue the crew of a downed American helicopter. Finding no surviving crew, PFC Langhorn and his unit were returning the fallen aviators when they came under heavy fire from North Vietnamese forces.

Under the cover of darkness, the North Vietnamese began to advance, throwing a hand grenade in front of PFC Langhorn, who threw himself on the grenade. The grenade was just a few feet from a few of his injured comrades.
It was in that moment, PFC Langhorn was so selfless, he chose a courageous act that President Lincoln once referred to as "the last full measure of devotion." It was an act for his brothers, his fellow soldiers, and his country. In that moment, he "unhesitatingly threw himself on the grenade, scooped it beneath his body and absorbed the blast," according to the Medal of Honor Citation and the firsthand accounts of his fellow soldiers he saved.

His extraordinary act of bravery. PFC Langhorn received a series of awards, including the highest, most prestigious personal military declaration, the Medal of Honor. Most recently, the Riverhead Post Office was renamed in his honor. There is no doubt PFC Langhorn has earned these commendations, but they mean little if we forget to look beyond the declarations and forever remember and honor the actions of the 20-year-old man who earned them.

In his act, his fellow soldiers, PFC Langhorn's life was extinguished too soon, but as President Lincoln continued, "we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

Today, we must challenge ourselves as Americans to pick up that torch, to embody the bravery, selflessness, and commitment to our great country. There is no memorial, no medal, and no post office that can bring back PFC Langhorn, but he can live eternally in all of us, in our actions and in our hearts.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McGOVERN). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to read part of a letter from Charles from Vermont:

I am a Marine Corps veteran and have spent my career guarding the national borders as a CBP officer. The government shutdown is unacceptable. January in Vermont is pretty cold. As a furloughed government worker, I have to choose whether to pay for fuel oil to heat my home or to make child support payments to support my ex-wife and my children. And without work and without pay, I am unable to do that.

He is one of 1,300 Vermont employees of the Federal Government who is working without pay. These include 900 employees at the Department of Homeland Security, 300 employees at the Department of Agriculture, and 100 employees at the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, I went to the shift change at the Burlington International Airport and met with our TSA personnel. They asked me a question. They had missed a paycheck. They had been showing up for work every single day. They had been doing, in their professional and cheerful way, processing all of us through security, keeping us safe, and they are very proud of their work. But they asked me a question that I couldn’t answer: Do you know of any other situation where an employer can require a person to work even when the employer has told that employee you are not getting paid?

That is what is happening. That happens nowhere. Where in your experience can an employer, whatever kind, tell the worker to show up, but we are not going to pay you? That is what is going on, and it is having a rippling effect throughout our economy. It is the Federal workers, but it is also every citizen who depend on routine functioning of government in order to meet their needs.

Let me read a letter from Karlie, a small business owner from the Northeast Kingdom. He talks about how this government shutdown has affected his business:

As the owner of Kingdom Construction, we employ nearly 30 full-time, year-round construction workers.

They were recently awarded a $2 million construction contract, but they can’t get permits signed because the permit signers are on furlough. Those folks are not going to work. That is real and unacceptable and inevitable when we have this government shutdown.

Now, every one of us has these stories, whether it is somebody who has a microbrewery and can’t get the FDA inspection, it is that construction company where they can’t get the sign-off on the permit, or it is a closing that can’t occur because the work won’t be signed. This is going on, costing our economy about a billion dollars a week, and it is all because we are having this dispute that is quite resolvable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the issue of border security is incredibly important and we all know that, but at the eleventh hour, because we have a dispute about one element of it, is that a reason to shut down government, what not only does it do collateral damage to lots of innocent people, but it makes it more difficult for us to resolve the underlying issue about border security?

Mr. Speaker, my suggestion is it is time for us to have a cooling-off period. Turn the lights back on in government. We can have a temporary, short-term extension of the Homeland Security bill, get people paid, and then convene all of the relevant parties to have a negotiation about border security and all about all of our immigration policies, including the Dreamers, including undocumented workers, and including the challenge we have about legal immigration and having people who can come here vetted to our country and contribute to our economy.

There is a price that is paid by individual workers not getting a paycheck; there is a price that is paid by individuals who are not getting the functioning of government; but there is also a price that we are paying in the trust that is required to sustain a democracy.

We have to make off-limits the tactic of shutting down government in order to get your way. Our democracy depends on mutual trust; it depends on accepting certain norms that, as vigorous as we will be in advocating our point of view, we will not cause collateral damage to others to get our way.

RECOGNIZING CORPORAL KEVIN MCCLOSKEY

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, I was proud to stand with our community and join Homes For Our Troops as a new house for an American hero was unveiled. On Saturday morning, Kevin McCloskey and his wife, Bridget, received the keys to their new home in Upper South Hampton in Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

On June 8, 2008, Corporal McCloskey was severely injured in Afghanistan when this vehicle struck an IED. He suffered critical injuries to both his legs and vision in his right eye, and he suffered severe burns and traumatic brain injury.

While Kevin has made significant progress in his recovery, everyday activities can still be challenging. The McCloskeys’ new home is retrofitted to make these tasks easier and more accessible for Kevin and Bridget.

Mr. Speaker, Kevin is a true patriot and an American hero. We thank him for his service, and we wish him and Bridget all the best in their new home. We are so proud to have them join our Bucks County family.

I would also like to thank Homes For Our Troops and their entire board for honoring those who sacrifice for our freedom.

RECOGNIZING PINEVILLE TAVERN

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a small business in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that has gone out of their way to help Federal employees who are not being paid due to this prolonged government shutdown.

For the duration of the government shutdown, Pineville Tavern has offered furloughed workers and their immediate family their popular pickle-brined chicken at no cost. At this time of so much unneeded uncertainty for our Federal workers, the charity of Pineville Tavern is deeply appreciated by our community.

Pineville Tavern chef Drew Abruzzese says about the move, "I believe that at a time of so much unneeded uncertainty for our Federal workers, the charity of Pineville Tavern is deeply appreciated by our community."

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to put aside our differences, fund our government, and get our Federal employees back to work.

I am grateful for Drew’s generosity and leadership, along with his father and the owner of Pineville Tavern, Andrew Abruzzese. Their dedication to our community is deeply appreciated.
Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of a Bucks County icon who passed away on January 10 at the age of 87. Ed Burns embodied public service throughout his entire life and his story of public service will continue.

In 1972, Ed entered State government, serving as a State representative for the 18th District for nearly 20 years. Notably, Ed later became the first mayor of Bensalem, serving honorably from 1990 to 1994.

We would like to extend our heartfelt condolences to Ed’s wife, Joan; his son, Joseph F. Burns; and his two beautiful grandchildren.

Ed’s legacy of public service to Bensalem and to Bucks County has left an indelible mark on our community, one that will last for generations.

ANTI-SEMITISM

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

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I want to applaud my colleagues, especially Mr. Engel and Mr. McCaul, for sending a strong message with a vote on H.R. 221, the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism Act.

Anti-Semitic acts and rhetoric are being normalized. We cannot sit idly by while they are targeted for how they dress, how they look, or how they choose to worship.

In the context of rising intolerance, hatred, and xenophobia in our country, we are witnessing emboldened normalization of anti-Semitic language and behavior. This includes anti-Semitic propaganda targeting many of us new Members of Congress. The tragic shooting at Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh was the deadliest attack on Jews in our Nation’s history.

Bigotry is not unique to the Jewish community. What is, however, is that we don’t have anyone monitoring and responding to the uptick in anti-Semitic rhetoric and acts both in the U.S. and Europe.
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The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

HONORING JOSEPH FARINA

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

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, at a time of dysfunction and rancor, it is useful to remember a time when America led the world because of the heroism of everyday Americans. I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Sergeant Joseph Farina of New Windsor, New York.

Joe was a regular guy who ran a bowling alley in Newburgh, New York. He was a 20-year-old and a member of the National Guard when America was attacked at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. Joe was 17 that night. Joseph volunteered for service.

During war, he was deployed to the Philippines and New Guinea, where his service earned him four battle stars, numerous other medals, and two Presidential citations.

Joseph passed away at his home last month at the age of 97. Next to him was his wife of 76 years, Elizabeth, whom he had married in Brisbane, Australia, at the height of the war in 1942. Joseph would actually work in Australia for many years and pioneer the sport of bowling there.

But his legacy is far broader than that, not only to his country during his service in World War II, but also to the veterans community in the Hudson Valley and across America.

He was active in many veterans organizations, the Catholic War Veterans, and helped to found the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor in New Windsor, New York. The Hall of Honor is dedicated to collecting and sharing the stories of Purple Heart recipients. No comprehensive list of Purple Heart recipients exists, and the hall acts as an important archive and monument to their service.

Joseph, like so many in his generation, knew what it meant to serve others. Like so many in his generation, he worked in his community and was a person dedicated to something bigger than himself. What a powerful lesson for all of us today. He was a model American citizen, and he will be missed.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR LARRY LANGFORD

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and legacy of late Mayor Larry Paul Langford. Mayor Langford was a beloved mayor of Birmingham and Fairfield, as well as serving Jefferson County as its first African American president of the Jefferson County Commission. He devoted much of his time to big ideas for the people whom he loved in the communities that he served.

Mayor Langford will be remembered as a larger-than-life personality who broke barriers as the first Black reporter for the region at WBRC; the first Black mayor of Fairfield, Alabama; the first Black president of the Jefferson County Commission; and as mayor of Birmingham, a Vietnam vet. Mayor Langford served in public office in multiple capacities for nearly 23 years, and he will be greatly missed by our community.

On March 17, 1946, Larry Langford was born to John Langford and Lilian Nance Langford as the oldest of six children. He was a proud graduate of Parkers High School in Birmingham, Alabama. After high school, he enlisted in the United States Air Force, serving for five years during World War II.

Langford returned home with a renewed sense of community and a renewed sense of service. He quickly completed his college degree at the University of Alabama at Birmingham, and he became the first African American male to become a news reporter for WBRC News in its region.

The importance of this role was never lost on Langford. He knew that, after the tumultuous decade before, to have an African American man reporting the news in this area was an important sign of progress in the city of Birmingham. Langford did well as a reporter, using his charisma and outgoing personality. He was able to speak with the people of Birmingham and tell their stories.

Langford decided to run for his first political office. He was elected to the Birmingham City Council in 1977, where he quickly became known as the liveliest and most outspoken of city council members, as well as the most media savvy.

During his time on the Birmingham City Council, he also worked as a radio news director and contributed to the Birmingham Times. After an unsuccessful run for mayor of the city of Birmingham against fellow Councilman Richard Arrington, Jr., in 1979, Langford temporarily retreated from public life. By 1982, Langford had moved to Funa, a suburb of Birmingham, and married the love of his life, Miss Melva Ferguson. A few years later, he decided to return to public life and ran for mayor of Fairfield, handily defeating a crowded field of candidates.

Langford became the first African American mayor of the city of Fairfield in 1988, another first. After his election, he led an aggressive campaign to revitalize the city. Langford was granted newspaper authority and helped to save the Fairfield City Schools from bankruptcy, and he pushed for regional cooperation in economic development that led to an agreement between 11 Jefferson County municipalities which joined forces in 1998 to finance and construct a $90 million project called Visionland, an amusement park that he brought to the city of Birmingham. It was actually in Bessemer, and it was part of a regional cooperation.

During his four terms as Fairfield mayor, Langford set his eyes on the Jefferson County Commission, where he hoped to continue to develop more regional cooperation in economic development. Langford was elected to the Jefferson County Commission in 2002, defeating the incumbent.

After becoming elected to the commission, he was quickly elected by his peers to be its president, another first. During his tenure as president of the Jefferson County Commission, he proposed a 1 percent sales tax that helped build 30 new schools and generated over $1 billion in revenue.

In 2006, Mayor Langford ran again for the mayor of Birmingham for a second run. This time, he was successful and won in a very crowded field without a runoff.

Mayor Langford was sworn into office on November 13, 2007, as mayor of Birmingham. He went on to strike an agreement with a foundation that provided computers to schoolchildren throughout the city of Birmingham. Nearly 17,000 elementary and middle school children received laptops that year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore's 23-year political career resulted in many successful public projects, his service was not without controversy. Mayor Langford's tenure as mayor of Birmingham was cut short when a jury found him guilty of public corruption on October 28, 2009, and he was sentenced to 15 years. After serving 8½ years, on December 28, 2018, due to his failing health, Mayor Langford's sentence was commuted by a Federal judge, giving him compassionate release. The next day, Mayor Langford was transferred from a Federal prison to Birmingham Hospital, where he remained until his death.

I want you to know, on a personal note, Mayor Langford was an outstanding mayor and his service will always be remembered and beloved by the community that loved him so much. I was honored to be a part of his funeral and to help him get his compassionate release. It is important that we remember the totality of his career.

I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering Mayor Larry Langford.

SENIORS HAVE EYES, EARS, AND TEETH ACT

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, as we begin this new Congress, I am proud to introduce the Seniors Have Eyes, Ears, and Teeth Act, with 78 of my colleagues. My bill would
Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about what is now the longest government shutdown in American history, its impact on the hardworking men and women of Massachusetts, and the opportunity cost of the current impasse.

Over the last several weeks, I have heard heartbreaking stories from Federal workers and their families from across north central Massachusetts. During a meeting I had last week in Auburn, one Federal employee ees, I heard about veterans struggling to afford their prescriptions and parents worrying about putting food on the table.

One woman had just recently lost her husband and others were still recovering from last September’s gas explosions in the Merrimack Valley. A few days earlier, I spoke with an air traffic controller at Logan Airport who, after hearing President Trump’s assurances from the Oval Office that the budget standoff would not lead to a shutdown last month, felt comfortable splurging on Christmas presents for his wife and four children. Now, with the bills coming due and his pay stub reading zero, he and his family are faced with anxiety and financial hardship.

Each of the over 800,000 Federal workers impacted by this shutdown, close to 7,500 in Massachusetts alone, has a story to share. I am the daughter of a union iron worker and the country’s biggest union, the AFL-CIO, has a saying: A fair day’s wage for a fair day’s work. We gain nothing from punishing the dedicated Federal workforce, nor do we position ourselves to recruit the best and the brightest if we can’t even keep the lights on.

Today, the majority in this Chamber continues to vote for legislation that restores critical services, and makes Federal employees financially whole again. As we continue to wait on the President and his party’s leadership in the Senate to do the right thing by approving House-passed legislation to end this shutdown, critical pieces of legislation languish as the American people wait anxiously for Congress to act on real issues and crises, not the manufactured one on the border.

Healthcare costs continue to rise. Our climate is rapidly changing as coastal communities suffer from more intense storms and more frequent flooding, while California has faced down some of the deadliest fires in the history of the State.

Gun violence continues to rip apart families and communities, and more Americans died of an opioid overdose than died during the Vietnam war. There is so much more we should be focused on.

Madam Speaker, we cannot allow shutting down the government over a policy debate to become the new normal. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Seniors Have Eyes, Ears, and Teeth Act, and ensure a healthier future for all our seniors.
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PUT THE PEOPLE FIRST AND END GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

We were all elected to this body to debate issues that matter to the American people. It is what our constituents expect us to do. It is time to open the government and debate border security on the floor of the people’s House for all Americans.

Ensuring the safety and the security of the United States is among our most solemn responsibilities. I take it very seriously, but the only crisis right now is the one the President is making.

Each day that this administration keeps the government closed, it threatens the financial security of Federal workers, the people who process our taxes, inspect our food, and ensure air travel security as well as all of the people who depend upon them.

Each day of the shutdown is a day lost supporting education, improving roads and bridges, and providing affordable healthcare.

We have sent bill after bill to the upper Chamber to provide border security and reopen the government. This week, we will do it again. If the President wants to improve border security, he should work with Democrats on real solutions.

Madam Speaker, I oppose a $5 billion wall. Experts say the wall won’t stop the flow of drugs or prevent visa overstays. The people who live at the border don’t want it. But whenever you stand on funding a border wall, holding Federal employees and their families hostage is unacceptable.

Madam Speaker, it is time to put people first, end this government shutdown, and get back to work.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF GDANSK MAYOR PAWEL ADAMOWICZ

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Caucus on Poland, it is with a truly heavy heart that I rise this morning to express deepest sympathy to our NATO ally, Poland, and its countrymen and women on the brutal slaying of visionary Gdansk Mayor Pawel Adamowicz.

Mayor Adamowicz had served his city since 1998 as it championed the values of liberty, equality, and democracy. I hold profound respect for his enduring dedication, perseverance, and honorable service to his community and nation. He loved Gdansk as a beacon for a free Poland and gave his life to it.

What a deep tragedy this is for his grieving family, his wife, his children, his associates, for the Polish nation, and for freedom-loving people everywhere.

Far too much blood has been shed on Polish soil for the world to ignore such a heinous crime that took his life.

I visited Gdansk in both 2009 and 2013, and through these visits, I gained an even deeper respect for its noble history and its place on Earth, including the location where Nazi shelling at Westerplatte began the catastrophic invasion of Poland starting World War II.

I visited Gdansk in both 2009 and 2013, and through these visits, I gained an even deeper respect for its noble history and its place on Earth, including the location where Nazi shelling at Westerplatte began the catastrophic invasion of Poland starting World War II.
This year, we will commemorate the 80th anniversary of that moment.

Then more recently, Gdansk’s remeditive transformative role in world history with the courageous Solidarnosc worker strikes that tripped across the tyranny across Central Europe, imposed by the Soviet Union, ushering in the possibility of freedom for the millions who suffered under dehumanizing repression for over half a century.

In our modern era, Gdansk became that symbol of liberty. It formally partnered with the city of Cleveland, Ohio, which I am privileged to represent, along with Congresswoman Marcia Fudge, in a sister-cities relationship. As part of my own congressional district, I am deeply honored and proud of this relationship.

In Mayor Adamowicz’s memory, I and this Congress must stand ready to strengthen this alliance of liberty, certainly at this moment in history. In his memory, our Poland Caucus must pursue an annual liberty exchange in his name to nurture aspiring young Polish leaders who follow in his footsteps in pursuit of liberty and security for Poland.

Let his death serve as a constant reminder of how precious freedom remains. I am certain Polish law enforcement officials will examine the circumstances surrounding the perpetrator’s actions with a diligent eye. They must also ask whether there are any linkages that exist with outside influence or propaganda that might have catalyzed this heinous crime.

I know I speak on behalf of all Americans and of millions of Polish Americans across our country, including in Ohio, to remind all freedom-loving people that the United States stands with Poland now at this hour of mourning.

During these uncertain times, we must work to strengthen our transatlantic and NATO alliances through increased diplomatic, cultural, and military exchanges.

May the soul of Mayor Pawel Adamowicz rest in peace, and may the worth of his noble life inspire the young leaders of Poland to pursue his visionary leadership.

OPEN THE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today reflects two interesting commemorations. First, it is the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who lost his life in a fight for justice for public employees. I wonder what he would say on this day while we are in the longest shutdown that is really against the Nation’s proud and needed Federal employees across the Nation.

I think it is important for my colleagues to reflect that 80 percent of those impacted who work for the Federal Government are outside of the Capital of the United States.

The second commemoration is a founder’s day for Alpha Kappa Alpha. That is the group of young women who organized a segregation America at Howard University to stand for service to the Nation. They were African American young women. As I have said, in a segregated Nation, in the midst of Jim Crow-ism, these women stood up to be servants of change and good government. And it was their impact by the lack of service, such as a disabled woman who may not get her payments from HUD and may be evicted from housing that she desperately needs.

So why are we here? It is interesting that for the 2 years that the President has served after convincing every voter in America that any wall will be paid for by the country of Mexico, our neighbor and our friend, he never found a path to pay for that wall. If it happened, it was a fantasy, untrue, and it would never happen.

But in the 2 years that he had the Presidency, the Republican Party, the House and the Senate, he never made an issue of this wall. But when the Nation wanted a change and elected Democrats to the House of Representatives in the majority, all of a sudden in the close of the Mueller investigation and a number of other investigations going forward, indictments of various collaborators and close associates of the White House, all of a sudden the wall becomes a major national issue, rather than the crisis of dealing with the needs of the American people from gun violence, to jobs, to dealing with our disasters, it is that.

But, yet, we have worked as Democrats in the House to get the government open and to stop the Trump shutdown. When we first were sworn in, we voted on every bipartisan bill that the Senate had voted on to open the government. That was the week of January 3. We then, in the last week, voted for every Republican appropriations bill in order to send to the Senate for the government to open.

Then there were ideas of extending the homeland security funding for a short period of time to February 8, 3 weeks. We supported that. We were even eager to hear from the Senator from South Carolina to open the government and then begin the negotiations.

None of these suggestions were taken. In fact, the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina, a Republican, was rejected out of hand on this past Monday.

The President has not been able to provide his own solutions. He has not understood smart border security means we can sit down and devise ways to ensure more personnel, to be able to make sure there are TSO officers, Border Patrol officers, Customs and Border Protection, laptops, technology, drones, and scanners.

That is what the American people believe in. That is what the American people believe in. The American people are smart. They know that we can find a solution, and they also know the solution comes in many forms, an infrastructure of some sort.

Those of us on the border States have been to the border. It is our home. We have seen the 700 miles of border infrastructure. We have seen construction going on.

I just came back from the border again. I am from Texas. I was there in the space where Felipe, the little boy who died, came across. He came across with family members. They turned themselves in seeking asylum. More courts and more judges we need to ensure—

So there is a solution. In the name of Dr. Martin Luther King, I would simply say: let us be a peace finder, and let us be a warrior for justice and find the peace and solve the problem. Open the government to this White House.

THE PLIGHT OF AMERICAN WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE. Madam Speaker, I rise to praise what must be two corporate CEO superstars based on just how much they have made in compensation.

The first is Irene Rosenfeld who was CEO of Mondelez/Nabisco. Over the last 5 years she was paid over $100 million, and her successor—who makes Ms. Rosenfeld look poor by comparison—Mr. Dirk Van de Put in 41 days was paid $42 million.

Now, $32 million for 41 days of work, $165 million for the last 5 years’ worth of work, you must think: What superstars these two are. What great achievements or great invention did these two CEOs come up with?

Here is what they have done leading Nabisco.

They closed the factory in Philadelphia in my district that employed hundreds of people for over 60 years. They closed a similar plant in Chicago that employed over 600 people. By the way, when I say employed, I am not talking about minimum wage jobs. I am talking about good, family-sustaining jobs.

Now, where did these jobs go?

To what other part of the United States did they go?

Salinas, Mexico, where workers, instead of getting family-sustaining wages, are getting paid approximately $1.50 an hour. That is wrong. When you wonder why there is such angst in our
economy today, despite the historically low unemployment rate, this is why.

In case you think that Philadelphia and Chicago might be exceptions to this Nabisco business model, they have also done it in Pittsburgh, Houston, Niles, St. Elmo, Buena Park, and as I have mentioned, of course, Philadelphia and Chicago.

This is greed on steroids.

So the next time you crave an Oreo or crave Chips Ahoy!—both Nabisco brands—Madam Speaker, I urge you to take a look at the back of the package and see whether or not it was still made in the United States or if it is one of the products that is now made in Mexico.

Madam Speaker. I also urge you to do this: contact your Member of Congress and say that you are not going to accept trade deals and tax policies that allow this sort of disgraceful behavior to happen—the hollowing out of American middle class jobs.

It is wrong, and we the elected officials of this country have to stand up for the American worker.

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 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.
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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:

God of the universe, thank You for giving us another day.

It is Your nature to hold us in Your loving presence always. It is our nature to think of You or of others only momentarily or in passing.

Be with each of us, that we may be our very best and prove ourselves worthy of Your love and Your grace.

Bless the Members of this people’s House in their work and deliberations today, that they might merit the trust of the American people and manifest the strength of our republican democracy to the nations of the world.

Without You, O Lord, we can do nothing. With You and in You, we can establish a community of peace, goodness, and justice now and forever.

May all that 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 her approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. SCANLON 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.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Joe Shuker, a Federal worker in my district.

I met with Joe on Friday after he reached out, looking for help for his colleagues, TSA agents who have been working for 3 weeks without pay. Their jobs are stressful, and many of them live paycheck to paycheck. Now they have the added stress of struggling to pay mortgages, rent, childcare, or even to put food on the table. Many can’t afford to get gas to get to their jobs.

Joe has gone door to door to get people to donate food and diapers to meet the most basic needs of his coworkers and their families. He told me about a family with a 3-month-old baby. They can’t afford baby formula—baby formula.

This is unacceptable. Holding Federal workers hostage and shutting down our government is a failed tactic. The House has sent legislation to reopen the government to the Senate three times. We have done our job. The Senate needs to do its.

CONGRATULATING NATIONAL CHAMPIONS CENTRAL METHODIST UNIVERSITY EAGLES MEN’S SOCCER TEAM

(Mrs. Hartzler asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

MRS. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Central Methodist University Eagles men’s soccer team of Fayette, Missouri, in Missouri’s Fourth Congressional District, winner of the NAIA men’s national soccer championship.

Head coach Alex Nichols and the Eagles capped off a superb 22-2-2 season with a penalty shootout victory over Missouri Valley in the championship finale in Irvine, California.

This national soccer championship is the first ever for any team sport for Central Methodist University. It is the culmination of steady progress that saw the Eagles move from a top 30 ranking three seasons ago, to a top 20 ranking two seasons ago, to a top 12 ranking last season, and finally, to the number one spot this past season.

I congratulate the Central Methodist University Eagles on winning the national championship. Your hard work, dedication, and determination paid off and left an example future teams will strive to follow.

Well done.

REOPEN OUR GOVERNMENT

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

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, I rise in solidarity with the thousands of Federal employees in my district and across this Nation who, because of the shutdown, haven’t received a paycheck.

I want to share the story of Robert Guevara, a Federal aviation safety inspector in my district who did not receive a paycheck this past Friday. He is tasked with overseeing the airline’s mechanics and repairing facilities so operations run smoothly and safely at Miami International Airport. He has one goal: aviation safety. He prides himself on keeping our travelers safe and ensuring that all inspections are as thorough and accurate as possible.

After 21 years of service in the Air Force, he told me he could barely recognize our country anymore. How can the greatest country on Earth tell its employees to work without a paycheck? How can we hold our patriots hostage?

Madam Speaker, no one wins in a shutdown. We must demand that this administration and the Senate leadership reopen our government.

AMERICA’S PARTNERSHIP WITH FINLAND

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, America is grateful for our alliance with Finland, a loyal NATO partner, to promote regional security.

Finnish Defense Minister Jussi Niinisto wrote an article in Defense News reviewing our partnership:

“Today, the Finnish Defense Forces are more capable and more interoperable than they have ever been. That makes [Finland] effective in looking after our own security and a solid partner for other EU member states and NATO countries.

“During my time as the minister of defense of Finland, we have taken other steps to strengthen the trans-Atlantic link. A prime example is our bilateral defense relationship with the
United States. In October 2016, we signed our bilateral statement of intent on defense cooperation. This was later followed by a trilateral statement of intent between Finland, Sweden, and the United States in May 2018.

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

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

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to put on notice every State mooching New Jersey’s tax dollars.

Last week, a new Rockefeller report revealed what we have known for too long: Some States, like New Jersey, are paying their own weight and paying their own way. Other States are not. They are mooching off the rest of us.

My district has historically received 33 cents for every dollar it sends to Washington, D.C., while other States, like Mississippi and Alabama, receive 7 to 12 times that amount, depending upon the study.

According to one study, the National Priorities Project report, as you see here, moocher States like Mississippi receive $4.38 for every dollar they send to Washington.

This news is only compounded by the fact that, come tax season, the tax hike bill, which gutted the State and local tax deductions, kicks in and will really start to hurt my district. That was a giveaway to the moocher States and was largely paid for by States like mine.

New Jersey is one of the top tax-paying States in the Nation, which is why we must cut taxes there for residents and businesses of all sizes and work with mayors to continue to do like I have done to claw back more dollars to the State. We are already up 16 percent.

Madam Speaker, as this new Congress begins, I am making it one of my core missions to reinstate the SALT deduction, stop double taxation, and fight back against the moocher States who continue to rob us blind. It is time to fight to get more dollars back to States like ours.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, this month, we celebrate Human Trafficking and National Slavery Prevention Month, and I rise today to draw attention to the importance of combating this epidemic.

Human trafficking takes many forms, including sex, forced labor, and domestic servitude. Educating individuals about human trafficking is essential to thwarting this modern day form of slavery.

This need for increased awareness is why I have partnered with the Center for Prevention of Abuse in Peoria, Illinois, and also the V.S. Department of Homeland Security to host two human trafficking awareness prevention roundtables in my district, bringing together State, local, and Federal officials. We held valuable dialogues with those on the front lines of this crisis about ways to end human trafficking for good.

This week, I am proud to be joining my colleague, Congresswoman Val Demings from Florida, to introduce a resolution to formally recognize January as National Trafficking and Modern Day Slavery Prevention Month in Congress.

As I have learned firsthand, combating human trafficking will take a multifaceted approach, but if we continue to educate and make resources available at all levels, important strides can be made and we can end this crisis.

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

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, it has been 25 days, 25 days since over 800,000 Federal employees have either been going to work without pay or have been furloughed, all of them wondering: How am I going to pay my rent or my mortgage? How am I going to afford the bills that I need to pay to take care of my family?

I heard recently from Jay from the island of Maui, in my district of Hawaii, who is a TSA employee who has been working this entire time without pay, wondering how he is going to pay his mortgage, car, credit card payments, and medical care that he needs to provide for his daughter.

Jay is not alone. Our national parks are filling with trash. Our Coast Guard members are working without pay, being told to hold garage sales or start babysitting to help pay the bills while the government is shut down.

Food stamps for tens of millions of Americans are at risk, while low-income housing subsidies aren’t being renewed, impacting over 340,000 elderly and disabled veterans who depend on that rental assistance. The safety and security of our country is at risk.

We cannot turn our backs on our brothers and sisters. These are real people, real families, real lives, and real futures.

Senator McConnell and President Trump must pass the bipartisan legislation we have already passed and reopen the government now.

CELEBRATING SESQUICENTENNIAL OF JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE
(Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate and pay tribute to my hometown of Johnson City, Tennessee, for its sesquicentennial.

In 1856, entrepreneur Henry Johnson opened a railroad station and a commercial business, the Depot. Just 13 years later, in 1869, Johnson City was founded, holding its first election on January 3, 1870, when voters elected Mr. Johnson as the city’s first mayor.

Today, Johnson City boasts a diverse economy, attracting national and regional companies while also supporting countless small business owners. The city is home to three major hospitals; to the James H. Quillen VA Medical Center, which serves more than 170,000 veterans; and to East Tennessee State University, recognized for the highly regarded Quillen College of Medicine and Gatton College of Pharmacy.

The city has become a thriving community of more than 66,000 residents, and I look forward to what is in store for Johnson City over the next 150 years. I doubt that I will be there.

Madam Speaker, I will include in the RECORD a more complete statement of Johnson City’s history.

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize Tommy May and his inspirational example of leadership throughout his life and courage in battling ALS.

May served in Vietnam in the United States Marine Corps before returning home to the University of Arkansas and the Walton College to earn his degree in business. He would go on to establish a remarkable banking career, eventually becoming president and CEO of Simmons First National Bank in 1987.

In 2005, May was diagnosed with ALS, also known as Lou Gehrig’s disease, becoming one of about 20,000 people living with that disease in the United States. Although statistics show that the average survival time is only 3 years, May has survived far longer, continuing his leadership for more than a decade at Simmons First National Bank and at the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences.

Since his diagnosis, he has helped spearhead a new effort at UAMS to speed up research on the disease. He has been recognized for those efforts by the university. My friend’s example of perseverance and courage in continuing to live his life on his own terms is one that all Americans and Arkansans can admire.
ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, by direction of the House Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 42
Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Ms. Kapitulnik, Mr. Visclosky, Mr. Serrano, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Ms. Lee of California, Ms. McCollum, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Ruppersberger, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. Cuellar, Ms. Pingree, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Cartwright, Ms. Meng, Mr. Pocan, Ms. Clark of Massachusetts, Mr. Aguilar, Ms. Frankel, Mrs. Bustos, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Mrs. Lawrence, Mrs. Torres of California, Mr. Crist, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, and Mr. Case.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Gar�ner, Mr. Gabbard of Hawaii, Mr. Corcoran, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Moulton, Mr. Carbajal, Mr. Brown of Maryland, Mr. Khanna, Mr. Kean, Mr. Veia, Mr. Kim, Ms. Kenedi of Oklahoma, Mr. Gianaras, Ms. Houlahan, Mr. Crow, Ms. Torres Small of New Mexico, Ms. Slotkin, Ms. Sherrill, Mr. Hill of California, Ms. Escobar, Ms. Haaland, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Delgado, and Mr. Larrabee.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR: Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Courtney, Ms. Pudge, Mr. Sablan, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Takano, Ms. Adams, Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. Corcoran, Mr. Krishnamoorthi, Mr. Espaillat, Ms. Jayapal, Mr. Moore, Mr. Wild, Mr. Harder of California, Mrs. McBath, Ms. Schrier, Ms. Lowey, Mr. Lewis of Nebraska, Ms. Escobar, Mr. Thompson of Ohio, Mr. Thompson of Georgia, Mrs. Trahan, and Mrs. Luria.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCES: Mr. Rush, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Engel, Ms. DeGette, Mr. Michael P. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Butterfield, Ms. Matsui, Ms. Castor of Florida, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. McNerney, Mr. Welch, Mr. Luján, Mr. Tonko, Ms. Clarke of New York, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Schrader, Mr. Kennedy, Ms. Cárdenas, Mr. Ruiz, Mr. Peters, Ms. Dingell, Mr. Veasey, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Ms. Barragan, Mr. McEachin, Ms. Blunt Rochester, Mr. Soto, and Mr. O’Halleran.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Larsen of Connecticut, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Kind, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Ms. Sánchez, Mr. Higgins of New York, Ms. Sewell of Alabama, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Judy Chu of California, Ms. Moore, Mr. Kidde, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Evans, Mr. Schneider, Mr. Soto, Ms. Panetta, Mrs. McNerney, Mr. Hinojosa, and Mr. Hinojosa.

Mr. JEFFRIES (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. Watso}$n CO}$LEAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, DC, January 15, 2019.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 15, 2019, at 9:33 a.m.:

Appointments:
National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,
KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a motion to reconsider 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.

FURTHER ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 27) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes. The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 27
Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (division G of Public Law 115–245) is further amended by striking the date specified in section 105(3) and inserting “February 1, 2019”.

This joint resolution may be cited as the “FURTHER Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentleman from New York (Ms. GRANGER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 27, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, we are now in the 25th day of the Trump shutdown, the longest Federal Government shutdown in United States history.

This past Friday, hundreds of thousands of dedicated Federal employees went without a paycheck. It is shameful that the stubborn whims of this President have harmed the security of America’s public servants. That includes Federal law enforcement officials at the FBI, the very Secret Service agents who protect the President, and those who work tirelessly to protect our air travel, our national parks, our environment, and public health.

The bill before us is the seventh—let me repeat, the seventh—piece of legislation Democrats have put on the House floor to end the Trump shutdown and get the government back to work for the American people. It will reopen government through February 1, providing time for Congress to come to an agreement on a full-year appropriation without further jeopardizing vital services or the pay of Federal workers.

It is long past time that Senate Republicans join us to reopen the government, pay our Federal employees, and negotiate on border security and immigration policy. Madam Speaker, I hope that my colleagues across the Capitol come to their senses and end this shutdown.

I urge support for this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 27, a continuing resolution providing funding through February 1.

I support the goal of reopening the government. There are many critical programs that are on pause which are important to my constituents and all of us. Programs like TSA, Border Patrol, Coast Guard, and air traffic controllers.

Unfortunately, the bill we are considering today will not restart those programs or help our districts. That is because it is not a comprehensive solution to resolve the government shutdown and fully address the security and humanitarian crisis we face on our southern border.

Criminals, terrorists, and drugs are flowing across our southern border. It may be difficult to believe, but there are thousands of children, many of them without their parents, make the dangerous trip to the United States every year. I have been to the border and to Central America, and I have heard the heartbreaking stories. This situation is unacceptable and it must be addressed. We can and we must do better.

Madam Speaker, again, I share the concern that parts of the government
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remains closed and employees are not yet being paid, but moving this bill across the floor will not fix the problem. To put it simply, there is not a bipartisan consensus on this plan.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), my good friend, an outstanding legislator, chair-designate of the Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman Lowe for the recognition and the opportunity to speak.

Madam Speaker, this vote is a tribute to the thousands of Federal patriots who have shown up to work for the past 25 days, working with no pay. This must end today. I call on my colleagues in this body to vote to support our hardworking public servants.

This bill is a clean continuing resolution. It comprises short-term funding through February 1 for all the agencies and departments currently shuttered for no good reason. Those include the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, the State Department, the Interior Department, the Agriculture Department, the Department of Commerce, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Transportation, and many more agencies.

The President is not serving this Nation; he is not serving it well as he uses his authority to harm our Republic. Civil servants, who are the bonds that hold our country together.

The Commander in Chief is hurting our Nation and holds our entire government hostage to his harebrained notion that you can stop drug trafficking and migration with a wall. The drug traffickers must be laughed out of a storm. They already ship it here hidden in legal cargo. They dig tunnels under the 650 miles of border that already exists. Those tunnels are flown contraband material over our border. They boat illegal contraband in here from our coastal ports, and they ship it from China through even the Postal Service, and we do not have a mechanism to detect fentanyl in the mails.

To secure our Nation and our border, our Nation first needs to open all our government agencies for the American people who are paying the bills, open those that are safe and pay those that are not. And women who dedicate their lives to protecting our borders and protecting us. Once the government is open, we can spend the next weeks discussing how best to fund mechanisms that will truly improve our security. This could include thorough inspection of all cargo.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. This could include enhanced electronic surveillance between ports of entry. This could include additional personnel at all ports of entry to increase checks. And, frankly, in communities like I represent, it should involve increasing DEA agents to take care of the gangs that are trafficking in these illegal materials.

But most importantly, we need a President who understands you do not stop the drug trade or undocumented migration of individuals by shuttering the entire Department of Homeland Security or making them go to work with no pay. This would not stop the drug trade, it would simply move it from the border agents or making them go to work with no pay. Has he got the wrong answer for what America needs to address in border security?

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

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), my good friend, who is the chair-designate of the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to reopen the Federal Government and end this destructive Trump shutdown. For 25 days now, the Trump shutdown has inflicted financial pain and anxiety on families, businesses, and entire communities across the United States.

I awoke this morning with a full room of these victims. Aviation safety experts detailed for me how the Trump shutdown has ushered in an air travel system that, for now, is safe, but they are growing worried and concerned.

I heard from Federal workers who told me that the changes to tax laws ushered in during the Republican tax scam have left citizens scrambling for answers, yet workers are not there who can shepherd them through those changes.

A local leader who represents domestic violence shelters warned me, if the Trump shutdown drags on, as many as a third of the Florida facilities that women count on for refuge when they are victims of domestic violence could find themselves cutting services.

Reports in the Washington Post have done our job. We have passed half a dozen bills to reopen the government, yet Senate Republicans have decided to hide behind President Trump and his border boondoggle refusing to take “yes” for an answer that could end this irresponsible shutdown.

While they are busy bowing to the President, Senate Republicans recklessly ignore that public safety is at stake. They downplay, and even dismiss, that 800,000 families are now living without a paycheck today.

Businesses, farmers, veterans, restaurant workers, domestic violence victims, and many more are all feeling real pain from this unnecessary shutdown. We need to do our jobs. We need to work together and actually be the equal branch of government that the Constitution describes.

So today, House Democrats will do just that and give the American people another option to get us out of this latest Trump trap and offer this bill that would reopen all closed Federal agencies through February 1. This bill would allow time for us to negotiate border security and immigration reform, but without inflicting further economic harm on our families and our businesses. It is the smart, reasonable, and compassionate thing to do.

I ask my colleagues to pass this bill in full without delay. It would allow time for us to negotiate border security and immigration reform, but without inflicting further economic harm on our families and our businesses. It is the smart, reasonable, and compassionate thing to do.

I ask my colleagues to pass this bill in full without delay. It would allow time for us to negotiate border security and immigration reform, but without inflicting further economic harm on our families and our businesses. It is the smart, reasonable, and compassionate thing to do.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, it is once again disappointing to witness partisan, noncontroversial legislation—to bipartisan, noncontroversial legislation—to
play politics with this government shutdown.

Let me be clear: This legislation will not reopen the government. This has, once again, as we have seen for 3 weeks in a row now, House Democrats using valuable time on the floor of the House of Representatives to play politics rather than to do our job to find a real solution to reopen shuttered agencies.

It is being reported that President Trump has invited several House Democrats to the White House today to discuss the government shutdown and potentially find solutions for compromise. Unfortunately, it is also being reported that several of my fellow House Members have rejected that invitation. If that is true, it demonstrates a serious neglect of our duties as representatives of the people.

As my friend from California, Jackie Speier, rightly said just this morning on cable news: "I think when the President's staff went out to respect the office and to attend the meeting. And if they have been asked, I would suggest that they go."

Madam Speaker, I could not agree more. Every single Member of this body should be working on behalf of the American people to reopen this government.

The President is demonstrating his willingness to compromise. I sincerely hope my Democratic colleagues will heed the invitation and come to the table with a real offer. Any rejection of this invitation is a shameful disregard of the seriousness of the situation before us.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FLEISCHMANN).

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Madam Speaker, In opposition to H.J. Res. 27, I thank Ranking Member GRANGER for allowing me to speak on this very important issue, and I thank my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Mrs. LOWEY is a friend from New York. We have served together.

Madam Speaker, this situation is frustrating. We have come to a place right now where I received a phone call last night from the Commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral Schultz. We talked about the wonderful men and women who are serving so well and so hard and who are not going to get a paycheck because of this situation.

We all want border security; I believe that. But I also believe that President Trump is right, that we need a wall, a barrier.

I happen to represent the people of the Third District of Tennessee—wonderful people, east Tennessee—and they tell me time and time again: Build a wall; have a border; keep us safe; but we also want the government open.

And when I look at the polling data, when I look at the phone calls, it is high time that we get back to work, open the government, but keep us safe.

In our districts, we all represent Republicans and Democrats and Independents. Hopefully, most of the people vote. But even people who pay their taxes will decide not to vote, they counted on the American Representatives, our House, to work, and they count on the Senate.

With all due respect, H.J. Res. 27 is dead on arrival in the United States Senate. We all know that. The American people know that. The President knows that. We need a compromise on this wall issue right now that will satisfy security, that will keep the American people safe, and, yes, that will open the government.

Compromise is not a dirty word in this scenario. It is what we need to do, and we need good faith. I am not alleging bad faith on anyone in this body. I am saying it is time to call a timeout and get back to work and do the people's business.

They sent us here to govern. We need to govern. We need a wall. We need border security, and we need the government open. It is high time that we get there.

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. Another week has gone by and we find ourselves with another exercise in futility.

As I said last week, these CRs are a waste of everyone's time and a waste of countless hours of hard work by members of staff on both sides of the aisle.

While we waste floor time and the American citizens' time, there are 800,000 families—and more—that are feeling the negative effects of the gamesmanship on the other side of the aisle. These effects are not limited to government employees. Contractors, small businesses and small businesses at large have been suffering for weeks.

Just the other day, in Jacksonville, I spoke with the father of a government subcontractor who explained to me how much this shutdown has hurt his son's livelihood.

Now, this idea that once the government is opened back up and government employees are going to receive their backpay, as I am sure most eventually will, there are many across this country who will not. His son is one of them.

And just to prove how ridiculous this entire thing is, due to the recalcitrance of Democrats, experts say that this shutdown has already cost our economy more than the President's request for the wall.

My colleagues on the other side of aisle want to score political points by denying our duly-elected President a campaign promise, a simple promise to protect the American citizen.

Ratify, we are focusing energy on reaching a compromise with the Senate and the President to reopen the government and get Federal workers their paychecks, we are spending time on our bills, bringing bills to the floor that have absolutely no chance of becoming law.

Here is my message to the House majority: Stop using working-class Americans as leverage and come to the table to find a compromise on behalf of the American people.

I have said it before, and I will say it again: If the Speaker is serious about opening the government and getting people back to work, bring a bill to the floor that the Senate will pass and the President will sign.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I urge a 'yes' vote on this continuing resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, it is time to end the Trump shutdown. Let's vote "yes."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 27.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, on this, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered taken.

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

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ANTIDISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 135) to amend the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 to strengthen Federal antidiscrimination laws enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and expand accountability within the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 135

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

Section 102 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), to read as follows:

“(4) accountability in the enforcement of Federal employee rights is furthered when Federal agencies take appropriate disciplinary action against Federal employees who have been found to have committed discriminatory or retaliatory acts;”;

and
section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) NOTIFICATION OF FINAL AGENCY ACTION.—

“(1) Not later than 30 days after a Federal agency takes final action or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission issues an appellate decision involving a finding of discrimination or retaliation, the agency shall provide notice for at least 1 year on the agency’s internet website in a clear and prominent location linked directly from the agency’s internet home page stating that a finding of discrimination or retaliation has been made.

“(2) The notification shall identify the date the finding was made, the date or dates on which any disciplinary action or acts occurred, and the law or laws violated by the discriminatory or retaliatory act or acts. The notification shall also advise Federal employees of the rights available under the respective provisions of law covered by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 201(a).”

SEC. 4. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) ELECTRONIC FORMAT REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(a) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended by—

(A) inserting “Homeland Security and” before “Governmental Affairs”;

(B) inserting “Oversight and” before “Government Reform”; and

(C) by inserting “(in an electronic format prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management)” after “annual report”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1)(C) shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the effective date in paragraph (2).

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—Section 203 of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) DISCIPLINARY ACTION REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a Federal agency takes final action or a Federal agency receives an appellate decision issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission involving a finding of discrimination or retaliation in violation of a provision of law covered by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 201(a), as applicable, the employing Federal agency shall submit to the Commission a report stating whether disciplinary action has been initiated against a Federal employee as a result of the violation.”

SEC. 5. DATA TO BE POSTED BY EMPLOYING FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Section 301(b) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)(A)—

(A) by striking “nor is accountability” and inserting “but accountability is not”; and

(B) by inserting “for what law the agency is responsible” after “under this Act”;

(2) in paragraph (5)(B)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” and adding “the following:”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period that follows the last semicolon in such subparagraph and the provisions that follow such semicolon, and replacing such provision with ‘the Commission shall refer the matter to Federal Labor Relations Authority pursuant to the authority granted to the Authority by the Federal Service Labor Relations Act of 1978.’”;

(3) T RANSITION PERIOD.—Notwithstanding the requirements of section 203(b) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note), the report required under such section may be submitted in an electronic format, as prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the effective date in paragraph (2).

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—Section 203 of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) DISCIPLINARY ACTION REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a Federal agency takes final action or a Federal agency receives an appellate decision issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission involving a finding of discrimination or retaliation in violation of a provision of law covered by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 201(a), as applicable, the employing Federal agency shall submit to the Commission a report stating whether disciplinary action has been initiated against a Federal employee as a result of the violation.”

SEC. 6. DATA TO BE POSTED BY THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION.

Section 302(b) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended by striking “(10)” and inserting “(11)”.

SEC. 7. NOTIFICATION AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ANTI-DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—The Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 2301 note) is amended by adding after section 206 the following:

“SEC. 207. COMPLAINT TRACKING.

‘‘Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act of 2019, each Federal agency shall establish a system to track each complaint of discrimination arising under section 203(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, and adjudicated through the Equal Employment Opportunity process involving a resolution of the complaint, including whether a decision has been made regarding necessary disciplinary action as the result of a finding of discrimination.’’

“SEC. 208. NOTATION IN PERSONNEL RECORD.

‘‘If a Federal agency takes an adverse action covered under section 7512 of title 5, United States Code, against a Federal employee for an act of discrimination or retaliation prohibited by a provision of law covered by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 201(a), the agency shall enter into the employee’s personnel record such notation of the adverse action and the reason for the action, including whether the employee has appealed or requested a review of the adverse action.’’

“SEC. 209. CATEGORIZATION OF COMPLAINTS.

‘‘Each Federal agency is responsible for the fair, impartial processing and resolution of complaints of employment discrimination and retaliation arising in the Federal administrative process and shall establish a model Equal Employment Opportunity Program that—

“(1) is not under the control, either structurally or practically, of a Human Capital or General Counsel office;

“(2) is devoid of internal conflicts of interest and ensures fairness and inclusiveness within the organization; and

“(3) ensures the efficient and fair resolution of complaints alleging discrimination or retaliation.”

“SEC. 402. NO LIMITATION ON HUMAN CAPITAL OR GENERAL COUNSEL ADVICE.

‘‘Nothing in this title shall prevent a Federal agency’s Human Capital or General Counsel office from providing advice or counsel to Federal agency personnel on the processing and resolution of a complaint, including advising providing legal representation to a Federal agency in any proceeding.”

“SEC. 403. HEAD OF PROGRAM REPORTS TO HEAD OF AGENCY.

‘‘The head of each Federal agency’s Equal Employment Opportunity Program shall report directly to the head of the agency.”

“SEC. 404. REFERRALS OF FINDINGS OF DISCRIMINATION.

‘‘(a) EEOC FINDINGS OF DISCRIMINATION.—Not later than 30 days after the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission issues an appellate decision involving a finding of discrimination or retaliation within a Federal agency, the Commission shall refer the matter to the Office of Special Counsel.

‘‘(b) REFERRALS TO SPECIAL COUNSEL.—The Office of Special Counsel shall accept and review a referral from the Commission under subsection (a) for possible disciplinary action under its authority against a Federal employee who commits an act of discrimination or retaliation.

‘‘(c) NOTIFICATION.—The Office of Special Counsel shall notify the Commission in a case in which the Office of Special Counsel issues a disciplinary decision involving a finding of discrimination or retaliation within a Federal agency.”

“SEC. 405. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION.—Section 202 of such Act is amended by striking “(f)” and inserting “(f)”.

“(b) HEAD OF PROGRAM REPORTS TO HEAD OF AGENCY.—Section 203(b) of such Act is amended by striking “(c)” and inserting “(c)”. The head of each Federal agency’s Equal Employment Opportunity Program shall report directly to the head of the agency.”

“SEC. 406. NOTIFICATION AND RESOLUTION OF COMPLAINTS.

‘‘Each Federal agency is responsible for the fair, impartial processing and resolution of complaints of employment discrimination and retaliation arising in the Federal administrative process and shall establish a model Equal Employment Opportunity Program that—

“(1) is not under the control, either structurally or practically, of a Human Capital or General Counsel office;

“(2) is devoid of internal conflicts of interest and ensures fairness and inclusiveness within the organization; and

“(3) ensures the efficient and fair resolution of complaints alleging discrimination or retaliation.”

“SEC. 407. NONDISCLOSURE AGREEMENT LIMITATION.

‘‘Section 202(b) of such Act is amended by—

“(1) striking “and” and inserting “or”;

“(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking “or” and inserting “and”;

“(3) by adding a period at the end of such subparagraph; and

“(4) by striking “and” and inserting “or”.”
During our committee’s bipartisan investigations of several different agencies—including the Forest Service, the Park Service, and the Transportation Security Administration—we have seen firsthand the consequences that employers face when agencies fail to operate model EEO programs or when they do not handle complaints of harassment and discrimination in a fair, timely, consistent, and thorough manner.

We have also seen how employees who file complaints with their agencies’ EEO programs can be victimized again if appropriate steps are not taken to prevent the disclosure of complainants’ identities and personal information.

H.R. 135 would strengthen the management of Federal EEO programs by requiring that they operate independently of agencies’ human resources and general counsel offices. H.R. 135 would require that each agency’s EEO program report directly to the head of the agency. This policy is critical to ensuring that agencies prioritize their EEO programs at the highest levels and that their sole purpose is to ensure equal opportunity for all employees.

H.R. 135 would strengthen the accountability mechanisms that are central to effectiveness of the EEO process. The bill would also prohibit any forms, policies, or agreements that seek to prevent an employee from disclosing waste, fraud, or abuse to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel, or an Inspector General.

Madam Speaker, the provisions in this bill are very simple, and the entire House has repeatedly supported them on a bipartisan basis. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 135, and I urge the Senate to pass this bill as quickly as possible.

Let me be clear that while the measure before us is important to improving our Federal workplaces, many of those workplaces are shut down today, and they have been for longer than at any time in our great Nation’s history. As the legislation before us proves, we can come together in a bipartisan manner to enact measures that will help the millions of Americans who work for the Federal Government.

As I have often said, our Federal employees do not want us, the government, to hurt them; they want us to help them. We ought to be able to come together on a bipartisan basis and take the simple step of reopening our government and ensuring that the programs and services on which our Nation depends are functioning and that the people who work for us are paid or they can take care of their families and take care of their bills, for they give their blood, their sweat, and their tears to keep our country together.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 135, the Federal Employee Antidiscrimination Act. H.R. 135 amends the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002, commonly referred to as the No-FEAR Act, to better protect employees from being victimized after they report waste, fraud, and abuse.

Specifically, H.R. 135 requires Federal agencies to establish a system to track Equal Employment Opportunity complaints from beginning to end. This system must also track any disciplinary action that resulted from a finding of a disciplinary act. If a disciplinary action is taken by an agency against an employee, both the disciplinary action and the reason for the action must be included in the employee’s personnel record.

H.R. 135 implements notification and reporting requirements for instances of discrimination within Federal agencies. Agencies must post a notice on their website if the agency or Equal Employment Opportunity Commission finds that a discriminatory or retaliatory act has occurred.

The bill also requires agencies to submit a report to the EEOC if a discriminatory or retaliatory act is found to have occurred. The report must include any disciplinary action initiated against an employee for discrimination or retaliation against another employee.

Lastly, the bill bars agencies from using nondisclosure agreements or policies to restrict Federal employees from reporting waste, fraud, and abuse to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel, and Inspectors General.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. CUMMINGS for his good work on this piece of legislation, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding, and I particularly thank him for his remarks concerning this bill.

I am particularly pleased to rise in support of this bill as a former chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. This bill strengthens the protections Federal employees enjoy under the antidiscrimination laws of our country.

It reinforces the importance of this antidiscrimination provisions by requiring that the head of that program report directly to the agency head. It expands notification of findings of discrimination and any action that has been taken pursuant to those findings. Surely, we understand the importance of this section at a time when we have just recently passed the sexual harassment provisions, and of course, we can see the deterrent effect of assuring any disciplinary action that has been taken is known to the public.
Finally, the bill bars agreements that would keep employees from disclosing any kind of Federal violation, as well as fraud, waste, and abuse. The latter provision is normally called a whistleblower provision.

Madam Speaker, I particularly appreciate that the chairman has brought this bill to the floor—I am sure it is noncontroversial—but he has brought it at a time when Federal employees are experiencing the longest shutdown in U.S. history. This bill cannot and does not purport to make up in any way for the effects of the shutdown. But this bill sends a message to Federal employees that they are particularly valued and, so far as I can tell, it sends it in a unanimous fashion, just as the shutdown should have a unanimous resolution.

It happens that around 62,000 Federal employees live in my own district, because this is the District of Columbia—the 62,000. I should add, who are furloughed or working with no pay. But I want to remind Members that each and every Member of this body has Federal employees who are at home today, who are working, and are furloughed as I speak. Though I represent a large number, some Members from the far West States should know that they are among those who represent the largest number of Federal employees. That is how dependent they are far away from Washington on Federal employees.

Madam Speaker, the President seems to have moved a step away from claiming executive powers to commandeer Federal funds to open the government. That is probably because somebody drew to his attention the extraordinary spectrum of constitutional, legal, political, and financial issues that would be raised were he to use the crisis of Trump’s making to carefully rethink the President’s emergency powers, leaving him ample room to make acquiescence and to get the ball in our camp, we are who control this House. I ask that the Democrats appoint a subcommittee and that the administration sit down and hammer out an acceptable compromise. For more than two centuries now, we have operated under a separation-of-powers government to make tyrannical rule nearly impossible. Even Trump is hesitating to declare an emergency to get his border wall. That throws the ball in our camp, we are Democrats who control this House. I ask that we accept it, use it, run with it, and settle the matter now.

Madam Speaker, I think the gentleman for yielding.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I would like to make the gentleman from Maryland aware that I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 8 minutes remaining.

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

Madam Speaker, I just want to associate myself with the words of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia. So often what we see is our Federal employees often being criticized when it came to trying to find money when we have budgetary problems. It seems that there is an effort to constrictively treat our Federal employees and make them pay. And they do all kinds of jobs. I agree with the gentlewoman. This bill does not solve the problem with the shutdown.

At least I hope that we are sending a message to them that we care about them and that we understand and we feel their pain. I agree with the gentlewoman. In some kind of way, we ought to be able to move from where we are getting folks back to work, an independent group looking at, perhaps, the issues that confront the compromisers—that is, looking at this wall—and deal with that at some other time. But we need to get people back to work.

People are in pain. They are feeling it. Not only are the employees feeling it, but all the people who are coming into the various parks or whatever, who are flocking back this weekend, they are feeling it. They are feeling it in a way that they think—what I think—is probably being prepared, just in case. But it does not purport to make up in any way for the effects of the shutdown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has yielded the balance of his time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield the balance of my time.

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

I thank my colleagues who worked through the weekend on this bill. Congresswoman MEADOWS, Congresswoman NORTON, Congresswoman SENSENBRUNNER, and Congresswoman JACKSON LEE. All of them worked in a strong, bipartisan way to make this happen. H.R. 135 is a simple, straightforward measure that would make a handful of changes to require the Federal agencies’ equal employment opportunity programs conform to the model standards set forth by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and to strengthen accountability.

This bill has had overwhelming bipartisan support from the entire House of Representatives for years, and I urge the Senate to pass this measure as soon as possible.

As I close, I do not want to address extraneous issues that have previously arisen regarding this measure in the Senate Homeland and Government Affairs Committee. I want to be crystal clear that I believe that the supervisors who engage in discriminatory or retaliatory actions must be held accountable. However, this can be accomplished without curtailing any existing due process rights for Federal employees, and I will continue to oppose efforts to roll back due process rights.

Madam Speaker, I urge the House to vote in favor of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 135 the “Federal Employee Anti-Discrimination Act of 2019,” which will strengthen the policies governing federal agencies’ management of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) programs by amending the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002.

Equal Employment Opportunity programs ensure Federal employees or applicants who believe they have been the victims of discrimination to file a complaint about the alleged discrimination.
I support this legislation because it works to expand accountability within the federal government as federal agencies take appropriate disciplinary action against federal employees who have been found to have committed discriminatory or retaliatory acts.

In 2012, federal employees and applicants for employment filed nearly 16,000 EEO complaints; most of which were handled accordingly, but some federal agencies still have not met the standards of a model EEO program set forth by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).

This legislation would require each federal agency to ensure its EEO program is not under the control of the agency's human resources or general counsel offices and that the head of the program reports directly to the agency head.

Madam Speaker, this bill would also expand the notifications that agencies are required to provide when discrimination is found to have occurred, and it would require agencies to track and report whether necessary disciplinary action has been taken.

Additionally, H.R. 135 would prohibit policies, forms, or agreements that prohibit or restrict an employee from disclosing to Congress, the Office of Special Counsel, or any Inspector General any information that relates to any violation of any law, rule, or regulation or any criminal, fraud, or abuse.

Fighting discrimination is a commitment the federal government needs to make, beginning with their own employees at home and abroad.

Men, women, of every race and religion deserve equal treatment and protection under the United States government, and in order to fulfill the requirements of their job to the best of their ability, their right to not be discriminated against needs to be upheld.

In 2013, Texas employees received almost 10 percent of the nation's federal employment discrimination, harassment, and retaliation allegations, at about 9,000 total charges.

I support this legislation because I support the rights of federal employees to feel safe and represented in their working environments, and obtain the correct protection they desire.

For these reasons, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 135 to strengthen the policies surrounding workplace discrimination in the federal government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 135.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to consume, without debate, the time necessary to the presentation of the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to consume, without debate, the time necessary to the presentation of the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

The bill before us, the Federal Intern Protection Act, would close a loophole in Federal employment law that currently leaves unpaid interns open to discrimination and sexual harassment without any legal recourse.

The Committee on Oversight and Reform has held multiple hearings about sexual harassment and retaliation occurring in various Federal agencies, including the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Park Service, and the Forest Service.

During these hearings, both my Republican colleagues and I expressed our disgust at the exploitation of female employees and interns, and we demanded action to prevent future abuse.

Unfortunately, the act of harassing unpaid interns on the basis of race, religion, age, or sex is not currently prohibited by Federal law. Under existing law, victims rely on the discretion and integrity of managers to prevent this behavior.

One witness who testified before our committee told us that managers do not always address the problem as they should and may actually be, in fact, a part of the problem.

The witness stated: "Even after finding out about the numerous harassment victims, the direct reporting manager continued to feed the harasser a steady diet of young women.

We saw at our hearings that allowing this kind of behavior to go unchecked can have serious consequences on the lives and careers of those who are interested in government service. Our bill will give Federal interns the same protections already provided to Federal employees.

This measure passed the House in previous Congresses, and I urge my colleagues to join me in ensuring that this legislation passes our Chamber once again today.

I want to speak to the Congressional Intern Protection Act, related legislation I introduced, which gives protections to congressional interns and was passed at the end of the last Congress as a part of a package of reforms to the Congressional Accountability Act.

This is a great start, but more must be done. Along with the Federal Intern Protection Act, I introduced the Unpaid Intern Protection Act, which would provide these protections to interns in the private sector.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 136, the Federal Intern Protection Act. The Federal Government is well served by interns who provide invaluable assistance to agencies. Many of the staff here in Congress itself began as interns, and I know my office, over the years, has been extremely well served by interns who have gone on to become a real credit where they have found themselves employed.

Interns work alongside career Federal employees, helping to conduct agency business on behalf of American people. Federal internship programs help agencies identify and develop the next generation of Federal employees. In exchange, interns gain valuable work experience.

Unfortunately, there are students who benefit from the opportunity to develop experience in a field they might hope to enter upon graduation. Some students even receive credit they can apply at their institution of learning.

Fortunately, there are no existing provisions in Federal law that protect interns working at Federal agencies from harassment or discrimination.
In O’Connor v. Davis, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit upheld the district court decision, finding an intern could not bring sexual harassment claims under Federal law. The court reasoned that the intern was not an employee and she was, therefore, not covered by existing law.

The court concluded that: “It is for Congress, if it should choose to do so, . . . to provide a remedy.”

H.R. 136 provides the remedy. The Federal Intern Protection Act ensures interns working for the Federal Government receive the same protections as employees. The bill prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability for interns working at Federal agencies.

Discrimination disadvantages eager-to-work interns, but discrimination also disadvantages Federal agencies by interfering with the selection of the best candidates for this work.

I thank my colleague from Maryland, Mr. CUMMINGS, for his sponsorship of this bill and for his leadership and commitment to protecting interns who work for the Federal Government, and I urge all Members to support the bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 136 is a commonsense measure that would close a loophole in the Federal employment law that currently leaves the youngest, most vulnerable group of our constituents open to harassment and discrimination without legal recourse to protect them.

This bipartisan bill passed our Chamber in the last Congress, reflecting bipartisan agreement that we need to solidify protections for Federal interns and ensure they have the same protections already provided to Federal employees.

As I close, I want to be clear that this bill responds to very real instances of interns being victimized within the Federal Government. Without this bill, victims will be forced to continue to work in workplaces and employees safer and more productive.

I respectfully submit that we should do the same in this body. To be sure, it may be difficult for us to obligate anyone in our offices to be fully bound by our policies. But surely we can provide a safer workplace not only for our paid and unpaid employees but also for contractors and suppliers who required access to our facilities also agree to be bound by those policies. We did not do this out of legal obligation, but because it made our workplaces and employees safer and more productive.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 136.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSPECTOR GENERAL ACCESS ACT OF 2019

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 202) to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General.

The Clerk then read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 202
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 "Inspector General Access Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. INVESTIGATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE PERSONNEL.
(1) in subsection (b)—
(A) in paragraph (2), by striking "and paragraph (3)";
(B) by striking paragraph (3);
(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and
(D) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by striking "paragraph (4)" and inserting "paragraph (3)"; and
(2) in subsection (d), by striking "except with respect to allegations described in subsection (b)(3)";

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.
Madam Speaker. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 202, the Inspector General Access Act of 2019. Inspectors general perform a critical oversight function with regard to misconduct at their respective agencies. This committee, the Oversight and Reform Committee, has a long history of advocating for IGs to have timely and complete access to all the information they need to fulfill their oversight and investigative functions.

In continuation of that mission, H.R. 202 removes an unnecessary and outdated statutory hurdle that prevents the inspector general from investigating certain misconduct at the Department of Justice, DOJ.

Current law requires the DOJ IG to refer all allegations of misconduct against department attorneys to the Office of Professional Responsibility, or OPR, rather than initiate an investigation himself. The OPR existed prior to the statutory creation of the DOJ IG in 1986. At the time DOJ IG was created, OPR was specifically given authority to investigate allegations against DOJ attorneys for their actions as law enforcement agents, from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or FBI, and for their actions as attorneys; this role is restricted only to the attorney general, answers to the attorney general, and ranking member here, it is a power that this office stands for and I urge my colleagues to support it. With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Florida (Ms. Wasserman Schultz).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker. I rise today to urge Congress to pass the Inspector General Access Act of 2019. This act, I am pleased to underscore, enjoys broad bipartisan support from this body now and has in the past, and its approval is more urgent now.

The actions, for example, of former U.S. Attorney Alex Acosta have drawn intense scrutiny since new revelations surrounding a plea deal he offered to a serial pedophile came to light. In June, the U.S. Marshals Service, has issued reports and a group of brave women who came forward to share their stories, it appears that Acosta gave a sweetheart deal to a wealthy and well-connected sex offender and hid it from his victims, some of whom were still in the midst of coming forward. Acosta is now the U.S. Secretary of Labor, a position that handles workplace harassment and sex trafficking policies, yet he has refused to discuss the new allegations.

This Access Act would explicitly allow the Department of Justice Office of Inspector General to investigate allegations of such alleged misconduct. It is a power that the IG office—this act has been pointed out by both the chair and ranking member here, it is a power that the IG office already has when it comes to investigating allegations made against any of the DOJ’s many law enforcement agents, from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the U.S. Marshals Service.

This act has received broad bipartisan support, both in successive Congresses and from the Government Accountability Office, but because of an arcane carve-out, the DOJ’s inspector general is believed to be, as the ranking member said, the only Federal agency that has no explicit power to review the conduct of its own attorneys.

If professional misconduct was involved in Acosta’s handling of Jeffrey Epstein’s plea deal, potentially dozens of victims of this connected multi-millionaire have a right to know. Acosta’s seemingly unethical decision to drastically reduce the criminal penalties against this vile sexual predator and to shield his other coconspirators is simply unacceptable.

The American people and the victims of these horrific crimes deserve to know why justice was not served in this disturbing case, and the lack of transparency still cloaking it is deeply disturbing.

Giving the DOJ’s inspector general more explicit and independent power to pull back the cloak of secrecy on Acosta’s sweetheart deal goes to the heart of transparency and accountability that this office stands for and that this bill would insist upon.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, again, I urge the adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

On November 29, 2018, DOJ Inspector General Michael Horowitz sent a letter to the Oversight and Reform Committee in support of the Inspector General Access Act, and this is what he wrote: “Providing the OIG with authority to exercise jurisdiction in attorney professional misconduct cases would enhance the public’s confidence in the outcomes of these investigations and provide the OIG with the same authority as every other inspector general.”

I include Mr. Horowitz’s letter in the Record.
same reasons, in 1994, the then-General Accounting Office, now the Government Accountability Office (GAO), issued a report that found that preventing the OIG from investigating misconduct within the Department and the OPR would enhance the independence and accountability that Congress envisioned under the IG Act.

The OIG has long questioned this carve-out because OPR lacks statutory independence and does not regularly release its reports and conclusions to the public. Moreover, to our knowledge, the DOJ Inspector General is the only Inspector General in the entire federal government that does not have the authority to independently investigate and misconduct by attorneys who work in the agency or oversee them. Providing the OIG with authority to perform oversight in an independent manner that is entirely without merit. The decision by Congress to extend OIG jurisdiction in 2002 to encompass misconduct by FBI and DEA agents is particularly concerning given the FBI and DEA's cultural history of providing the OIG with oversight of alleged misconduct by FBI and DEA agents contended that those cases required specialized expertise—and that argument was roundly rejected and has proven to be unfounded. The Congress to extend OIG jurisdiction in 2002 to encompass misconduct by FBI and DEA agents as well as, on occasion, ethics issues involving DOJ lawyers. In addition to our recent investigation of the FBI's actions involving investigatory and federal oversight roles, which involved evaluating the professional conduct by FBI agents, FBI lawyers, and FBI senior executives, OPR cautioned against allowing the OIG to handle and investigate the allegations made against the former-agents involving its former agent Robert Hansen.

The OIG has consistently demonstrated our ability to handle complex legal and factual matters related to our misconduct reviews, including those involving FBI and DEA agents as well as, on occasion, ethics issues involving DOJ lawyers. In addition to our recent investigation of the FBI's actions involving investigatory and federal oversight roles, which involved evaluating the professional conduct by FBI agents, FBI lawyers, and FBI senior executives, OPR cautioned against allowing the OIG to handle and investigate the allegations made against the former-agent Robert Hansen.

The OIG has consistently demonstrated our ability to handle complex legal and factual matters related to our misconduct reviews, including those involving FBI and DEA agents as well as, on occasion, ethics issues involving DOJ lawyers. In addition to our recent investigation of the FBI's actions involving investigatory and federal oversight roles, which involved evaluating the professional conduct by FBI agents, FBI lawyers, and FBI senior executives, OPR cautioned against allowing the OIG to handle and investigate the allegations made against the former-agent Robert Hansen.

The OIG has consistently demonstrated our ability to handle complex legal and factual matters related to our misconduct reviews, including those involving FBI and DEA agents as well as, on occasion, ethics issues involving DOJ lawyers. In addition to our recent investigation of the FBI's actions involving investigatory and federal oversight roles, which involved evaluating the professional conduct by FBI agents, FBI lawyers, and FBI senior executives, OPR cautioned against allowing the OIG to handle and investigate the allegations made against the former-agent Robert Hansen.

The OIG has consistently demonstrated our ability to handle complex legal and factual matters related to our misconduct reviews, including those involving FBI and DEA agents as well as, on occasion, ethics issues involving DOJ lawyers. In addition to our recent investigation of the FBI's actions involving investigatory and federal oversight roles, which involved evaluating the professional conduct by FBI agents, FBI lawyers, and FBI senior executives, OPR cautioned against allowing the OIG to handle and investigate the allegations made against the former-agent Robert Hansen.

The OIG has consistently demonstrated our ability to handle complex legal and factual matters related to our misconduct reviews, including those involving FBI and DEA agents as well as, on occasion, ethics issues involving DOJ lawyers. In addition to our recent investigation of the FBI's actions involving investigatory and federal oversight roles, which involved evaluating the professional conduct by FBI agents, FBI lawyers, and FBI senior executives, OPR cautioned against allowing the OIG to handle and investigate the allegations made against the former-agent Robert Hansen.

The OIG has consistently demonstrated our ability to handle complex legal and factual matters related to our misconduct reviews, including those involving FBI and DEA agents as well as, on occasion, ethics issues involving DOJ lawyers. In addition to our recent investigation of the FBI's actions involving investigatory and federal oversight roles, which involved evaluating the professional conduct by FBI agents, FBI lawyers, and FBI senior executives, OPR cautioned against allowing the OIG to handle and investigate the allegations made against the former-agent Robert Hansen.

The OIG has consistently demonstrated our ability to handle complex legal and factual matters related to our misconduct reviews, including those involving FBI and DEA agents as well as, on occasion, ethics issues involving DOJ lawyers. In addition to our recent investigation of the FBI's actions involving investigatory and federal oversight roles, which involved evaluating the professional conduct by FBI agents, FBI lawyers, and FBI senior executives, OPR cautioned against allowing the OIG to handle and investigate the allegations made against the former-agent Robert Hansen.

The OIG has consistently demonstrated our ability to handle complex legal and factual matters related to our misconduct reviews, including those involving FBI and DEA agents as well as, on occasion, ethics issues involving DOJ lawyers. In addition to our recent investigation of the FBI's actions involving investigatory and federal oversight roles, which involved evaluating the professional conduct by FBI agents, FBI lawyers, and FBI senior executives, OPR cautioned against allowing the OIG to handle and investigate the allegations made against the former-agent Robert Hansen.

The OIG has consistently demonstrated our ability to handle complex legal and factual matters related to our misconduct reviews, including those involving FBI and DEA agents as well as, on occasion, ethics issues involving DOJ lawyers. In addition to our recent investigation of the FBI's actions involving investigatory and federal oversight roles, which involved evaluating the professional conduct by FBI agents, FBI lawyers, and FBI senior executives, OPR cautioned against allowing the OIG to handle and investigate the allegations made against the former-agent Robert Hansen.
the component so that it can adjudicate the OIG’s findings and take disciplinary action, as appropriate. The Access Act creates a similar practice, by maintaining the Department’s OPR to handle misconduct allegations that do not require independent outside review as determined by the OIG, much as the internal affairs offices at the FBI, DEA, ATF, and USMS remain in place today.

We are unaware of any claims by Department leaders that this approach has resulted in “decisive investigative standards,” “decrease[d] efficiency,” or “inconsistent application” of legal standards. There is no evidence that it has impacted the components “ability to defend against any significant discipline decision before the Merit Systems Protection Board.” Yet this parade of horribles is precisely what the OLA letter claims is different if attorneys are treated in the same manner as Special Agents and non-attorneys at the Department, rather than continuing to receive the special oversight treatment granted to them under the current carve-out provision under the IG Act.

This argument is meritless. Indeed, the disciplinary processes at the FBI and the DEA have substantially improved since the OIG obtained statutory oversight authority over those components in 2002, in significant part due to the greater transparency and accountability that has resulted from the OIG’s oversight.

I very much appreciate your strong support for my Office and for Inspectors General throughout the Government. If you have further questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Michael E. Horowitz
Inspector General

Mr. CUMMINGS. On December 25, 2018, the New York Times editorial board wrote: “It makes sense to give Mr. Horowitz’s office oversight authority over the activities of Justice Department lawyers—as other inspectors general have over lawyers in their departments. Doing so would aid the cause of justice and strengthen the public’s trust in an institution charged with upholding it.”

On December 30, 2018, the Miami Herald also published an editorial in support of the Inspector General Access Act. I hope the Senate will follow the House and pass the bill, H.R. 202.

On December 30, 2018, the Miami Herald also published an editorial in support of the Inspector General Access Act. I hope the Senate will follow the House and pass the bill, H.R. 202.

For these reasons, and for the victims of the Danziger Bridge shootings and their families, I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 202.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALL-AMERICAN FLAG ACT
Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 113) to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 113
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. The Act may be cited as the “All-American Flag Act”.

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT FOR AGENCIES TO BUY DOMESTICALLY MADE UNITED STATES FLAGS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR AGENCIES TO BUY DOMESTICALLY MADE UNITED STATES FLAGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 63 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

(“§ 6310. Requirement for agencies to buy domestically made United States flags.”)

(b) REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in subsections (b) through (d), funds appropriated or otherwise available to an agency may not be used for the procurement of any flag of the United States, unless such flag has been 100 percent manufactured in the United States from articles, materials, or supplies that have been grown or 100 percent processed or manufactured in the United States.

(c) AVAILABILITY EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the extent that the procurement of a privately grown or produced flag is necessary to comply with any trade agreement to which the United States is a party.

(d) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN PROCUREMENTS.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the following:

(1) Procurements by vessels in foreign waters.

(2) Procurements for resale purposes in any military, commercial, military exchange, or nonappropriated fund instrumentality operated by an agency.

(3) Procurements for amounts less than the simplified acquisition threshold.

(4) PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER.

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive the requirement in subsection (a) if the President determines that compliance with such requirement would result in a hardship on the Government.

(2) NOTICE OF WAIVER.—Not later than 30 days after granting a waiver under paragraph (1), the President shall publish a notice of the waiver in the Federal Register.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ‘agency’ has the meaning given the term ‘executive agency’ in section 162 of title 40.

(2) SIMPLIFIED ACQUISITION THRESHOLD.—The term ‘simplified acquisition threshold’ has the meaning given that term in section 134.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“§ 6310. Requirement for agencies to buy domestically made United States flags.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Section 6310 of title 41, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to any contract entered into on or after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 20 minutes.
The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the Record at any time.

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

There was no objection.

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

The All-American Flag Act is a commonsense bill that all Members can support. It would require that all Federal agencies purchase American flags that are manufactured right here in the United States using materials grown or produced in the United States.

Under current law, the requirement applies only to the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs. It should be extended to all Federal agencies.

As under current law, the bill would provide limited exceptions and allow agencies to purchase American flags made elsewhere if they are not available in sufficient quantity or quality from American manufacturers.

I urge support of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 113 is a bipartisan bill to ensure government agencies buy United States flags made only from 100 percent American-made materials.

Most Americans may think American flags purchased with taxpayer money for the government are made here at home by Americans using only U.S. materials. Surprisingly, this is not a uniform requirement in current Federal acquisition laws and regulations.

Requirements in current law are inconsistent when it comes to the content of American flags purchased by executive agencies. The Department of Defense and the military departments generally are required to buy American flags made entirely of U.S. materials, but civilian agencies are currently permitted to buy flags that are manufactured in the U.S., consisting of only 51 percent American-made material, or sometimes even less than that.

This bill brings all executive agencies under a single rule about the content of American flags bought by the Federal Government. The bill harmonizes and integrates this single rule with existing laws that require domestic content of U.S. flags purchased by the government.

Rather than impose new rules and exceptions for DOD and civilian agencies, the bill is self-enforcing. The All-American Flag Act recognizes and essentially adopts current DOD requirements and exceptions. The bill makes those flag purchasing standards permanent law and applies the rules to civilian agencies that buy U.S. flags.

H.R. 113 contains limited exceptions that recognize practical realities such as domestic nonavailability. These exceptions reflect those contained in current Federal law and the purchase of textiles, including U.S. flags.

I thank Representative Bustos and the many cosponsors who are leading this effort to honor America's greatest symbol of freedom, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge adoption of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I think this is a very important bill. The American flag is so near and dear to so many people, and, quite often, folks think that it is being manufactured here in the United States and being manufactured with materials grown here; but the fact is, quite often, that is not the case. So I think it is only fitting that, when we wave that flag and when we salute that flag, we know that it has been produced here in our country.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SEWELL of Alabama). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 113.

The question was taken, and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CIO AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 247) to amend chapter 36 of title 44, United States Code, to make certain changes relating to electronic Government services, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows: H.R. 247

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 CIO Authorization Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. CHANGES RELATING TO ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT SERVICES.

(a) CHANGE OF CERTAIN NAMES IN CHAPTER 36 OF TITLE 44.

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3601 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (1);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (8) as paragraphs (1) through (7), respectively; and

(C) in paragraph (4), as so redesignated, by striking “E-Government Fund” and inserting “Federal IT Fund”.

(2) OFFICE OF ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT.—Section 3602 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “OFFICE OF ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT” and inserting “OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER”;

(B) in subsection (a), by striking “Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(C) in subsection (b),

(i) by striking “the Administrator” and inserting “a Federal Chief Information Officer”; and

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “who shall report directly to the Director”;

(D) in subsection (c), by striking “The Administrator” and inserting “The Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(E) in subsection (d), by striking “The Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(F) in subsection (g),

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “the Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking “E-Government Fund” and inserting “Federal IT Fund”;

(iii) in paragraph (16), by striking “the Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “the Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(18) Overseer the Federal Chief Information Security Officer.”

and

(H) in subsection (g), by striking “the Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “the Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(3) CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS COUNCIL.—Section 3603 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “The Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “The Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

and

(C) in subsection (i),

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking “the Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

(ii) in paragraph (5), by striking “the Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

and

(D) in the heading, by striking “E-GOVERNMENT FUND” and inserting “FEDERAL IT FUND”;

(4) E-GOVERNMENT FUND.—Section 3604 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “E-GOVERNMENT FUND” and inserting “FEDERAL IT FUND”;

and

(B) in subsection (a),

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “E-Government Fund” and inserting “Federal IT Fund”;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

and

(C) in subsection (b), by striking “Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

and

(D) in subsection (c), by striking “the Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

and

(E) in subsection (d), by striking “the Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

and

(F) in subsection (e), by striking “the Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;

and

(G) in subsection (f),

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “the Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”; and

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “who shall report directly to the Director”;

(5) PROGRAM TO ENCOURAGE INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS TO ENHANCE ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT
SERVICES AND PROCESSES.—Section 3605 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—
(A) in subsection (a), by striking “The Administrator” and inserting “The Federal Chief Information Officer”;
(B) in subsection (b), by striking “E–Government” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;
(C) in subsection (c), by striking “(I)” and inserting “(A)”;
(D) in paragraph (1)—
(i) by striking “The Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer”;
(ii) by striking “E–Government” and inserting “Annual”;
(E) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “the Federal Chief Information Officer,”;
(F) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “(I)” and inserting “(A)”;
and
(G) in paragraph (4)—
(i) by striking “(I)” and inserting “(A)”;
(ii) by striking “(E)” and inserting “(G)”;
and
(H) in paragraph (5) (as so amended), by striking “E–Government” and inserting “Annual.”

OFFICE OF ELECTRONIC GOVERNMENT.—Section 3607 of title 44, United States Code, is further amended by striking “The Administrator” and inserting “the Federal Chief Information Officer.”

E–GOVERNMENT REPORT.—Section 3606 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—
(A) in subsection (b), by striking “E–Government” and inserting “Annual”;
(B) in subsection (a), by striking “an E–Government status report to the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives” and inserting “a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives”;
(C) in paragraph (2), by striking “administering” and inserting “The Federal Chief Information Officer commencing as of that date, without further appointment under such section”;
(D) in paragraph (4), by adding at the end the following new item:
“(4) by striking ‘Executive Order’ and inserting ‘the Federal Chief Information Officer’;”; and
(E) in paragraph (6), by striking “(I) by striking ‘Office of Electronic Government’ and inserting ‘The Federal Chief Information Officer’;”.

E–GOVERNMENT ACT OF 2002.—Section 1702 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “E–Government” and inserting “Federal Chief Information Officer.”

SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland? Mr. CUMMINGS.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure before us today.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Federal CIO Authorization Act would make several commonsense changes to existing law:

First, it would update the name of the Administrator for E-Government Services and Processes to the Federal Chief Information Officer. Second, it would require the Federal Chief Information Officer to submit a report to Congress on the status of the implementation of the E-Government Act of 2002.

Third, it would establish a process for consolidating information technology across the Federal Government, especially among Federal agencies not covered by section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code, and increasing the use of shared services, including any recommendations for legislative changes that may be necessary to effect the proposed changes.
to the Federal Chief Information Officer, and it would require direct reporting of that individual to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. It is very, very important.

Second, it would establish the position of the Federal Chief Information Security Officer. The bill would report to the Federal CIO and assist OMB in the cybersecurity efforts.

Finally, this very important bill would require the Federal CIO to submit a proposal on consolidating IT across Federal, state, and local agencies, especially smaller agencies, through the use of shared services.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to vote in favor of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for yielding time to me on this important piece of legislation.

It should come as no surprise to anyone in this Chamber that technology is integrated into every facet of our daily lives. We have come a long way since the bill that established the role of the Federal Chief Information Officer, the E-Government Act, was originally passed.

Less than 50 percent of the U.S. population had home access to the internet in 2001 when this was first passed. Now, nearly every American has access to the internet.

Just 62 percent of Americans had cell phones when the original bill was passed. Now, 95 percent of Americans own cell phones, and 77 percent of those are smartphones.

Mobile apps were nonexistent in 2002. Today, over 2.2 million apps are available to consumers.

This bill recognizes how far technology has come. It codifies the position of the Federal Chief Information Officer and elevates the office to report directly to the head of the Office of Management and Budget.

The bill also establishes the role of the Federal Chief Information Security Officer, FCISO, who reports directly to the Federal CIO and will lead OMB cybersecurity efforts.

Empowering CIOs at the Federal agencies is consistent with the principles of one of the signature pieces of legislation on IT reform, the Federal IT Acquisition and Reform Act. The Federal CIO should be treated no differently. The Federal CIO must have the statutory and organizational authority to succeed, and this bill achieves just that.

The bill does more than just rename the office. It makes a clear statement that the Federal CIO is in charge of coordinating IT policy across the government.

This bill passed the House last Congress by a vote of 391–0, and I want to thank my friends—Representatives ROBIN KELLY, MARK MEADOWS, and GERRY CONNOLLY—for their continued support for this important initiative. And I would like to thank Chairman CUMMINGS and Ranking Member JORDAN for making sure this important piece of legislation comes to the floor.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I think this piece of legislation is in the spirit of what Congress needs to be doing in terms of updating where we are in dealing with technology and the need for adequate oversight. This bill acknowledges that Federal technology policy has not kept up with the pace of technology integration by our Federal agencies.

This bill codifies the position of Federal CIO, emphasizing the importance of the position of a governmentwide technology policy; and this bill promotes organized, cost-efficient, and secure technology used throughout the Federal Government.

I would like to again thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) for introducing this bill, along with the many bipartisan supporters of it.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, vote for it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to join my colleague, Congresswoman FOXX, in thanking Mr. HURD, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Congresswoman KELLY for all the hard work that they put into this legislation.

So often in our Congress, we are blessed to have someone like Mr. HURD, who is very, very familiar with these very complex issues, and he brings just a reasonable approach to coming up with bipartisan solutions to the problems that are facing our country and, just as significant, bringing solutions that will prevent problems from happening. So I want to thank him for working so hard on this, along with our colleagues, Mr. CONNOLLY and Ms. KELLY.

Again, Madam Speaker, I urge all of our Members to vote in favor of this bill. It is a significant piece of legislation.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 247, the Federal CIO Authorization Act of 2019, introduced by my colleague, Congressman Will Hurd. I am happy to co-sponsor this bill, which the House of Representatives passed last year under suspension of the rules.

This bill rebrands the Office of Electronic Government, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and helps bring it into the 21st century by renaming it the Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer. This new name more appropriately characterizes the important role the Office plays across the federal government in coordinating federal information technology (IT) policy and providing guidance to agencies. Currently, the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government is informally called the Federal Chief Information Officer (CIO), so it is long overdue for Congress to make this change in statute, as this bill will do. H.R. 247 will also rename the E-Government Fund, the "Federal IT Fund" which better describes the purpose of the account.

More importantly, this bill establishes the Federal Chief Information Security Officer (CISO) within the office of the Federal CIO. The Federal CISO (pronounced SISSO) will be appointed by the president and be responsible for carrying out the cybersecurity duties of the OMB Director, including the responsibilities under the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA). This position was created by President Obama to address the increasing risk of cyberattacks and the need to better protect our government's data and information across the federal government. However, it was not until a year and half into the Trump Administration that the President named Grant Schneider the permanent Federal CISO. My hope is that this position will foster effective coordination of cybersecurity policy across the federal government, providing agencies with guidance to secure their IT systems and better defend against cyber-attacks.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 247.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANT REPORTING EFFICIENCY AND AGREEMENTS TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2019

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 150) to modernize Federal grant reporting, and for other purposes.

The motion to suspend the rules was agreed to by the Yeas being 260 and the Nays being 120.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. HURD now moves that the Members present be counted.

The Yeas and Nays on the motion to suspend the rules are recorded on the printed record.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 150

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 "Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act of 2019" or the "GREAT Act".

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) modernize reporting by recipients of Federal grants and cooperative agreements by creating and imposing data standards for the information that grants and cooperative agreement recipients must report to the Federal Government;

(2) implement the recommendation by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, under section 5(b)(6) of the Federal Accountable, Transparent, Competitive (FACT) Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note), which includes the development of a “comprehensive...
taxonomy of standard definitions for core data elements required for managing Federal financial assistance awards; (3) reduce burden and compliance costs of recipients of Federal grants and cooperative agreements by enabling technology solutions, existing or yet to be developed, by both the public and private sectors, to better manage data recipients already provide to the Federal Government; and (4) to strengthen oversight and management of Federal grants and cooperative agreements by agencies through consolidated collection and display of and access to open data that has been standardized, and where appropriate, transparent to the public.

SEC. 3. DATA STANDARDS FOR GRANT REPORTING.

(a) Amendment.—Subtitle V of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 63 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 64—DATA STANDARDS FOR GRANT REPORTING"

SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.

"In this chapter—

(1) AGENCY.—The term ‘agency’ has the meaning given that term in section 552(f) of title 5.

(2) CORE DATA ELEMENTS.—The term ‘core data elements’ means data elements that are not program-specific in nature and are required by agencies for all or the vast majority of Federal grants and cooperative assistance recipients for purposes of reporting.

(3) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(4) FEDERAL AWARD.—The term ‘Federal award’ means the transfer of anything of value for a public purpose of support or stimulation authorized by a law of the United States, including financial assistance and Governmental facilities, services, and property.

(5) (B) INCLUDES grants, subgrants, awards, and cooperative agreements; and

(C) does not include—

(i) conventional public information services or procurement of property or services for the direct benefit or use of the Government;

(ii) an agreement that provides only—

(I) direct Government cash assistance to an individual; or

(II) military pay;

(III) a loan; or

(IV) a loan guarantee; or

(V) insurance.

(6) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the head of the standard-setting agency.

(7) STANDARD-SETTING AGENCY.—The term ‘standard-setting agency’ means the Executive department designated under section 6402(a)(1).

(8) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means each State, the District of Columbia, each commonwealth, territory or possession of the United States, and each federally recognized Indian Tribe.

SEC. 402. DATA STANDARDS FOR GRANT REPORTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DESIGNATION OF STANDARD-SETTING AGENCY.—The Director shall designate the Executive department (as defined in section 101 of title 5) that issues the most Federal awards in a calendar year as the standard-setting agency.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDARDS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this chapter, the Secretary and the Director shall establish Government-wide data standards for information reported by recipients of Federal awards.

(b) DATA ELEMENTS.—The data standards established under paragraph (2) shall include, at a minimum—

(A) standard definitions for data elements required by Federal grants and cooperative agreements; and

(B) unique identifiers for Federal awards and entities receiving Federal awards that can be consistently applied Governmentwide.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Director shall establish or establish under subsection (a) shall include core data elements and may cover any information required to be reported to any agency by recipients of Federal awards, including audit-related information reported under chapter 75 of this title.

(d) REQUIREMENTS.—The data standards established under subsection (a) shall, to the extent reasonable and practicable—

(1) render information reported by recipients of Federal grant and cooperative agreement awards fully searchable and machine-readable;

(2) be nonproprietary;

(3) incorporate standards developed and maintained by voluntary consensus standards bodies;

(4) be consistent with and implement applicable accounting and reporting principles; and


(e) CONSULTATION.—In establishing the data standards under subsection (a), the Secretary and the Director shall consult with, as appropriate—

(1) the Secretary of the Treasury, to ensure that the data standards incorporate the data standards established under this act’s Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note);

(2) the head of each agency that issues Federal awards;

(3) recipients of Federal awards and organizations representing recipients of Federal awards;

(4) private sector experts;

(5) members of the public, including privacy experts, privacy advocates, and industry stakeholders; and

(6) State and local governments.

SEC. 403. GUIDANCE APPLYING DATA STANDARDS FOR GRANT REPORTING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this chapter—

(1) the Secretary and the Director shall issue guidance to all agencies directing the agency to use the data standards established under section 6402 to all applicable reporting by recipients of Federal grant and cooperative agreement awards; and

(2) the Director shall prescribe guidance applying the data standards to audit-related information reported under chapter 75.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The guidance issued under this section shall—

(1) to the extent reasonable and practicable—

(A) minimize the disruption to existing reporting practices for agencies and for recipients of Federal grant and cooperative agreement awards; and

(B) explore opportunities to implement modern technologies within Federal award reporting;

(2) allow the Director to permit exceptions for categories of grants if the Director determines, after considering exceptions, including exceptions for Indian Tribes and Tribal organizations, that the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act; and

(3) take into consideration the consultation required under section 6402(d).

SEC. 404. AGENCY REQUIREMENTS.

"(a) AMENDMENTS.—"(Section 552(h) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting before ‘to a Federal clearinghouse’ the following ‘in an electronic form consistent with the data standards established under chapter 64.’.

(b) SEC. 6401''.

SEC. 405. CONSOLIDATION OF ASSISTANCE-RELATED INFORMATION; PUBLICATION OF PUBLIC INFORMATION AS OPEN DATA.

(a) COLLECTION OF INFORMATION.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Director shall establish the capability for the public to search, display, and maintain of Federal award information as a Government-wide data set, using the data standards established under chapter 64 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 3, subject to reasonable restrictions established by the Director to ensure protection of personally identifiable and otherwise sensitive information.

(b) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary and the Director shall require the publication of recipient-reported data collected from all agencies on a single public portal. Information may be published on an existing Government-wide website as determined appropriate by the Director.

(c) Nothing in this section shall require the disclosure to the public of information that would be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Freedom of Information Act’).

SEC. 5. EVALUATION OF NONPROPRIETARY IDENTIFIERS.

(a) DETERMINATION REQUIRED.—The Director and the Secretary shall determine whether to use nonproprietary identifiers under section 6402(a)(3)(B) of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 3.

(b) FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.—In making the determination required pursuant to subsection (a), the Director and the Secretary shall consider factors such as accessibility and cost to recipients of Federal awards, agencies that issue Federal awards.
private-sector experts, and members of the public, including privacy experts and privacy advocates.

(c) PUBLICATION AND REPORT ON DETERMINATION. Not later than the earlier of 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act or the date on which the Secretary and Director establish data standards pursuant to section 31. United States Code, as added by section 3(a), the Secretary and the Director shall publish and submit to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report explaining the reasoning for the determination made pursuant to subsection (a).

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the terms “agency”, “Director”, “Federal award”, and “Secretary” have the meaning given those terms in section 6001 of title 31. United States Code, as added by section 3(a).

SEC. 8. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed to require the collection of data that is not otherwise required pursuant to any Federal law, rule, or regulation.

SEC. 9. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 150, currently under consideration.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Madam Speaker, the Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act, or GREAT Act, represents bipartisan legislation introduced by Representatives VIRGINIA FOXX and JIMMY GOMEZ, would standardize reporting for recipients of Federal grants and cooperative agreements.

Grant recipients often have to report the same information in different ways because Federal agencies do not use the same forms or even the same terms to describe this duplicative information.

Madam Speaker, I have often said that the most important thing that we must do in our lives is to operate in an effective and efficient manner, and that also includes this Congress.

Unless the reporting requirements for Federal grants, which are to be fully comprehended in the project’s terms and conditions, are simplified, the Federal Government does business by simplifying grant reporting information into a searchable, more manageable system. It does so that the grant reporting process more transparent, efficient, and accountable in the Federal Government. Those are values that should not be assigned to anything but they are important for our country. They are important for what we do.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), who has been waiting patiently to speak on this bill.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 150, the Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act. Madam Speaker, in 1788, Patrick Henry spoke at the Virginia Constitutional Convention, where he said: “The liberties of a people never were, nor ever will be, secure when the transactions of their rulers may be concealed from them.”

Transparency in government is an important principle for the preservation of our Republic, and it has been a priority for me during my tenure in the Virginia House of Delegates, where I was the minority leader to put the entire State budget in a searchable online database.

In a similar vein, H.R. 150 would require that data on more than $600 billion in Federal grants be standardized and published on a single online portal. This is bipartisan legislation that would modernize the way the Federal Government does business by simplifying grant reporting information into a searchable, more manageable system. Nonprofit, State and local governments, and small businesses will no longer be forced to spend meaningful work hours on filling out duplicative paperwork.

In return, this will not only make the grant reporting process more transparent but will make it more efficient and accessible to everyday Americans, thus saving taxpayer dollars and helping to fulfill the vision of another Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, who in his first inaugural said: “A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injurings one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the fruits of their own toil. This is the sum of good government.”

Madam Speaker, I support this bill and urge its passage.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia sharing his remarks with us, and I would like to continue my remarks by thanking Representative JIMMY GOMEZ for helping author this piece of legislation, the Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act, or GREAT Act.

Representative GOMEZ has been an outstanding partner on this bipartisan bill to create more transparency, efficiency, and accountability in the Federal grant reporting process, and I thank him for his hard work on this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, in 2017, the Federal Government awarded $662.7 billion in grants funding to State agencies, local and Tribal governments, agencies, non-profits, universities, and organizations. This is a lot of hardworking tax dollars, even in terms of Washington-speak.

Within our Federal Government, there are 26 agencies awarding Federal grants, and all of them continue to rely on outdated, burdensome, document-based forms to collect and track grant dollars. Society has moved into a new age of information and technology, and it is time that our government follows suit.

The GREAT Act represents bipartisan legislation to modernize the Federal grant reporting process. It does so by mandating a standardized data structure for information that recipients report to Federal agencies. It streamlines the reporting requirements for Federal grants are searchable, the auditing process will continue to yield waste and inefficiency at best, and potentially fraud and abuse at worst.

Adopting a governmentwide open data structure for all the information that grantee form is an wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injurings one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improve-
from the taxpayers to ensure it goes back into communities, supporting local businesses, organizations, and education.

Lastly, the GREAT Act has received broad support from an array of good government groups. The Coalition for the GREAT Act includes the Bipartisan Policy Center, American Association of Law Libraries, American Library Association, Association of Government Accountants, Association of Research Libraries, Data Coalition, Government Accountability Project, Government Information Watch, Grant Professionals Association, National Grants Management Association, National Taxpayers Union, Native American Finance Officers Association, the Project on Government Oversight, R Street Institute, Senior Executives Association, and the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition.

In order to fix the way Federal grants are reported, we must move from a document-centric reporting system to a data superhighway. I urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to support the GREAT Act and bring grant reporting into the 21st century.

Madam Speaker, again, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, this bill is intended to reduce the burden on applicants for Federal grants by enabling a more streamlined electronic process for completing grant applications. It would require HHS and OMB to develop uniform data standards for common application elements, such as the name and address of the organization and the name of the grant.

This will, hopefully, lead to the development of a uniform grant application that could be used across all Federal agencies. This would improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the grant application process immensely.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support this measure, and I hope that the Senate will quickly pass it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues again, along with Mr. CUMMINGS, to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I again thank Ms. FOXX for this very important legislation and all of the bipartisanship that made it happen.

This bill and the others that we have dealt with today, where there was such great bipartisanship to get it done, I hope will set a model as a model of what this Congress can do.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 150.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Speaker, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 41

Whereas, on January 10, 2019, Representative Steve King was quoted as asking, “White nationalist, white supremacist, Western civilization—how did that language become offensive?”; Whereas a 2006 Federal Bureau of Intelligence (FBI) assessment defined a White supremacist as follows: “White supremacists believe that the white race is superior to all other races and was created to rule them. They view non-whites as subhuman and usually refer to them in derogatory terms”; Whereas the same 2006 FBI intelligence assessment defined a White nationalist as follows: “To be a white nationalist is to be pro-white. The domestic white nationalist movement seeks to promote, honor, and defend the white race. They believe the white race is under attack from Jewish interests that dominate the government (referred to as the Zionist Occupied Government, or ZOG), the media, banking, and entertainment industries and act to the detriment of the white race. White nationalists view multiculturalism, diversity, and illegal immigration as direct assaults on the white race and advocate for a ‘white genocide.’ They hope to appeal to mainstream whites, believing that the majority of white people do not understand the imminent or long-term threat to their race. Many contend that a race war, often referred to as RAHOWA, or Racial Holy War, is a certainty”; Whereas White supremacy and White nationalism are contrary to the ideals of the United States of America, which was established according to the principle stated in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal, a principle that was updated in 1848 in Seneca Falls, New York, to include all people; whereas while our country has often fallen short of these ideals, patriotic Americans have sought to form a more perfect Union by rejecting White nationalism and White supremacy in the name of patriotism, and welcoming immigrants from across the globe who have continuously enriched our Nation;

Whereas Abraham Lincoln in an 1858 speech said of the Founders, “Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants, and so they established these great self-evident truths, that in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but white men were entitled to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and exclaim ‘the battles which our fathers began—so that truth, and justice, and mercy, and all the humane and Christian virtues might not be extinguished from the earth’ and the man who would hereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the great principles on which the American liberty was based, I hope, would be eternally disgraced by his countrymen.”

Whereas Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., while recognizing that “no other nation can mean to us what our nation means”, condemned nationalism perversion of the American and isolationism” as “preached by... the advocates of white supremacy” and asked, “Will we continue to serve the false god of racial prejudice or will we serve the God who made of one blood all men to dwell upon the face of the earth?”;

Whereas President Reagan observed in a 1988 speech, “Anyone, anywhere on the Earth, can come to live in America and become an American... This, I believe, is one of the most important sources of America’s greatness. We lead the world in showing among nations, we draw our people—our strength—from every country and every corner of the world. And by doing so we continuously renew and enrich our nation. While other countries cling to the stale past, here in America we breathe life into dreams. We create the future, and the world follows us into tomorrow. Thank God for all the new arrivals to this land of opportunity, we’re a nation forever young, forever bursting with energy and new ideas, and always on the cut-edge, always on the move to the next frontier. This quality is vital to our future as a nation. If we ever closed the door to new Americans, our leadership in the world would soon be lost”; Whereas according to FBI statistics, hate crimes nationwide increased in 2015, 2016, and 2017, the three most recent years for which data is available;

Whereas the perpetrator of the shooting that killed 9 African-American worshippers at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, on June 17, 2015, was motivated by White supremacy and White nationalism to carry out this act of terrorism, and stated that he wanted to “be rescued by the white nationalists after they took over the government”; Whereas the perpetrator of the shooting that killed 11 Jewish worshippers at Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on October 27, 2018, accused Jews of “waging a propaganda war against Western civilization” and “committing genocide” against Whites by promoting immigration and refugee resettlement, and accused the President of being “a globalist, not a nationalist” because of the “infestation” of Jews; and whereas Public Law 114-88, a joint resolution signed into law on September 14, 2017, rejects “white nationalism, white supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups”; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives once again rejects White nationalism and White supremacy as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values that define the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. NADLER). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 20 minutes.
The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, this resolution stands for one very simple proposition: White nationalism and white supremacy are hateful expressions of intolerance that have no place in the United States of America.

Unfortunately, what should be an obvious statement in 2019 has been challenged in recent days, and not for the first time, by one of our own colleagues. As those elected to represent all of America, Members of Congress should repudiate hatred, and stand against white nationalism and white supremacy, which are the source of so much violence, so much hatred, and so much divisiveness throughout our Nation’s history. These hateful ideologies are diametrically opposed to what America is supposed to stand for.

But, as the New York Times reported last week, Mr. King of Iowa was quoted as saying:

“White nationalism, white supremacy, Western civilization—how did that language become offensive?”

Well, I will tell him, and anyone else who may be confused.

This language has always been offensive. We fought a civil war to establish that. But this language and the philosophy it represents persisted. It motivated the Ku Klux Klan to terrorize African Americans; it sparked Jim Crow laws that oppressed African Americans through institutionalized racism; it inspired the murder of nine Black congregants at a Charleston, South Carolina, church; and the murder of 11 Jewish worshippers in a Pittsburgh synagogue; and it inspired racists, anti-Semites, and other assorted bigots at the Unite the Right rally in Charlottesville, Virginia, that spread fear, hatred, and, ultimately, violence in celebration of white supremacy.

These hateful ideologies are dangerous, not because they too often lead to violence. These noxious views can also infect the policies that govern our Nation, sowing more division, and leading to more injustice in our society. When we establish Muslim bans; when we try to build walls to keep out those who do not look like us; and when we reverse a half century of progress on voting rights and civil rights, we are putting these hateful views into action.

I thank the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Clyburn), for bringing this resolution forward. He knows from his experience—both as a leader in the civil rights movement, and as a Member of Congress whose own constituents were recently targeted in a vicious attack motivated by white supremacy—that when we see bigotry and hatred expressed in any form, we must condemn it, loudly and forcefully.

We can pretend that these sentiments do not exist in our country, in this Congress or in the White House. We can try to sweep them under the rug, and to convince ourselves that we have moved past our shameful history on race. But we ignore white supremacy at our peril. If we do not speak out now, collectively as a Congress, clearly and without reservation, we will send the message that these views are acceptable, and they will continue to foster in communities across the country, generating more hatred, more repression, and more violence, in their wake.

Madam Speaker, I call upon all of my colleagues—Republican and Democrat alike—to reject the hateful ideology of white nationalism and white supremacy, the policies that flow from such doctrine, and the gripes of anyone who would espouse those views. Vote “yes” on this important resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this resolution resolves that “the House of Representatives once again rejects white nationalism and white supremacy as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values that define the people of the United States,” and with that I agree.

As the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, I would like to use my time to consider with my colleagues how firmly America has stood, and continues to stand, against white supremacy. It is a basic human flaw that our eyes open slowly and close on wickedness too quickly. Today, we have the opportunity to renew our gaze at the truth about our fellow men and women, and that each of them is created with untold dignity and worth.

As a result, we recognize that white supremacy and white nationalism peddle lies about our brothers and sisters in dignity. We reject these lies, and we stand with the Americans who have gone before us in rejecting white supremacy and racism.

As Martin Luther King, Jr., observed, “When the architects of our Republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men would be guaranteed the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

Dr. King’s words are historical fact rooted in universal truth. America’s Founders gave us an incredible inheritance in the Declaration of Independence, in which they said “all men are created equal.” This declaration helped the Founders and all Americans who have lived after them identify the many ways that we discriminate against the citizens of the United States from all further participation in those violations of human rights which have been so long continued on the unoffending inhabitants of Africa.

George Washington said, “There is not a man living who wishes more sincerely than I do to see a plan adopted for the abolition of slavery.”

John Adams wrote that “Every measure of prudence, therefore, ought to be taken for the immediate total abolition of slavery from the United States. . . .” and “I have, through my whole life, held the practice of slavery in . . . abhorrence.”

Benjamin Franklin believed “Slavery is an atrocious debasement of human nature.”

Alexander Hamilton cited racial prejudice as something that “makes us fancy many things that are founded neither in reason nor experience.”

And James Madison wrote that “We have seen the mere distinction of color made in the most enlightened period of time, a ground of the most oppressive dominion ever exercised by man over man.”

The words of our Founders indict anyone who would believe that white supremacy or actions born out of that world view is in anyway defensible.

It does all Americans good to revisit our path out of darkness that feeds racism, since we need to ensure that we never find ourselves slipping back, but rather move forward knowing that we are all created equal and all are created in God’s image.

At the beginning of the American Revolution, slavery existed in all the 13 original States, and the slave trade with Africa was carried on unconstrained. Official actions to abolish slavery began in 1774, before independence was even declared, and this moral mission gained substantial ground over the next 35 years.

Delegates to the First Continental Congress in 1774 pledged to stop the importation of slaves into America, and by 1786 every State had outlawed slave importation. During the founding era, eight States proceeded to abolish slavery, either gradually or immediately. Were these good steps? Yes. Were they enough? Certainly not.

Congress passed the Northwest Ordinance in 1787, forbidding slavery in the territories where the future States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin would be established. This law proved to be decisive in ending
slavery in America. In the 1850s, Abraham Lincoln cited the Northern Ordinance to show that the Founders opposed the expansion of slavery. And, in the 1860s, these States, along with a number of their fellow States, fought for a confederation that elected Lincoln President, won the Civil War, and abolished slavery nationwide.

The principle that all men are created equal and have a fundamental right to liberty gave the emancipation movement its foundation. As James Madison wrote in the Federalist Papers, defending the ratification of the Constitution, the Constitution was grounded on "the fundamental principles of the revolution, namely, "the transcendental laws of nature and of nature's God" and "the rights of humanity announced in the Declaration of Independence."

Our first Republican President, Lincoln, was a young man, he said the Founders established "political institutions, conducting more essentially to the ends of civil and religious liberty, than any of which the history of former ages tells us." In the Gettysburg Address, President Lincoln explained that America was "conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." As Lincoln argued to his opponent, Stephen Douglas, this equality applies to all human beings, regardless of race.

When President Lincoln spoke of America’s earlier days, he said, "I will remind you, Mr. Douglas, and this audience, that while Mr. Jefferson was the owner of slaves, as undoubtedly he was, in speaking upon this very subject, he used the strong language that he trembled for his Nation when he remembered that God was just." Mr. Speaker, from my faith background, I will tell you, God is just, and I do tremble when I consider his justice. I tremble when any person, in any way, pretends that white supremacy has any affinity with the Christian faith or its heritage, and, frankly, am very offended when that is brought up. The Bible is clear on the equality of all people. White people are entitled to no special privilege on this Earth, and they will have no unique standing in heaven. In fact, my Bible tells me we will all give account for what we do. Heaven is a place where every person there is united in bowing before the God who made us equal.

Knowing this, we understand that we should use this life to honor our brothers and sisters without exception. As James tells us, "If you really fulfill the royal law according to the Scripture, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself,' you are doing well. But if you show partiality, you are committing sin." Partiality is unacceptable in God’s economy, and racial prejudice finds no shelter among American values. Favoritism rooted in racism is evil in all its forms, including white supremacy and white nationalism.

Today, Madam Speaker, is a day like many others. Today, like every day, the world is watching America to see if we still believe in equality, if we still elevate human dignity at every turn, and if we will reject hypocrisy whenever it tries to take root among us. As the Founders knew, it is the responsibility of every American to be vigilant in seeing that their leaders live out the American principles alongside them.

Today, I stand here with colleagues to reaffirm these values and reject white supremacy as both dangerous and, for America and the world, as America’s democracy is remarkable.

Today, Madam Speaker, our message is, as it ever was, that every person is created equal in value, and that the hill of equality is one Americans will stand tall to defend, and, yes, even die to defend.

We are all, Madam Speaker, created in God’s wonderful image. He made us and he breathed life into us. We are the very essence of his beloved creation. There is no reason you will find today, Madam Speaker, no one—I challenge you from the depths of any prison, to the sidewalks of any major city, anywhere in this country, white, Black, any color imaginable, any race imaginable, that they come from, male or female—there is not one person you will find today that, when you look into their eyes, they are not deeply beloved by their God who created them, and how can we choose any different? As President Lincoln said in face-to-face confrontation with God’s creation is an abomination, and that is exactly what this ideology is.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished majority whip.

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

Madam Speaker, I want to say to my colleague, Mr. COLLINS, that I wish to associate myself with the sentiments that he expressed here today. However, I also rise today to speak of how the tale of two Kings has brought us to this moment in history.

If he had been allowed to live, today would have been the 90th birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr. Today, this August body stands ready to vote to shanghai and deport to the skies. Syrgey Kryk’s recent comments and condemn the evil concepts of white nationalism and white supremacy.

White supremacy and white nationalism are evils, they are insidious, and are clear and present dangers to our great Republic. Reported hate crimes rose 17 percent last year, which was the third consecutive year that we have seen an increase in this insidiousness. This is appalling and unacceptable.

When elected representatives give cover and comfort to those who spread racial divisiveness, we embolden those on the fringes of our society, and we have seen some of the results: the massacre of nine parishioners in historic Charleston’s Emanuel AME Church at the hands of a young man who believed he would be, in his words, “rescued by white nationalists after they took over the government;” the murder of 11 Jewish worshippers at the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh; the shouting of those who believed the Jews were, in his words, “waging a propaganda war against Western civilization.”

The other term used by Mr. King in his comments to the New York Times; attacks in Charlottesville, Virginia, at the white nationalists’ Unite the Right rally, where they chanted the Nazi phrase, “blood and soil.”
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Some have questioned the timing of this resolution. Why now? They ask.

My guidance, Madam Speaker, comes from Dr. King, who wrote in his letter from the Birmingham jail: “Time itself is neutral; it can be used either destructively or constructively. More and more I feel,” continued Dr. King, “that the people of ill will have used time much more effectively than have the people of good will.” He closed his thought with these words: “We must use time creatively, in the knowledge that the time is always ripe to do right.”

Now is the time to do right. We have reached a tipping point. Racial divisiveness is a fault line that is ripping our Nation apart. This body must speak out against this evil. The time has come to condemn those of ill will and say that no part in our great Nation can be had by them.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, when the French historian Alexis de Tocqueville came to this country, he observed its greatness and set out to find the genius that made it so. He wrote in his book “Democracy in America” that: “The greatness of America lies not in being more enlightened than any other Nation, but rather in her ability to repair her faults.”

White supremacy and white nationalism are faults that cannot be repaired but must be removed.

White supremacy and white nationalism are faults that cannot be repaired but must be removed.

White supremacy and white nationalism are faults that cannot be repaired but must be removed.

White supremacy and white nationalism are faults that cannot be repaired but must be removed.

White supremacy and white nationalism are faults that cannot be repaired but must be removed.
me well. But I began to read this resolution, Madam Speaker, and I started with the first “whereas,” and I am going to read it as it is here: “Whereas, on January 10, 2019, Representative STEVE KING was quoted as asking, ‘While mainstream, white supremacist, Western civilization, if he hadn’t been killed in that conflict."

This means something to me, the abolitionism that goes clear back into my family, and they paid a price with their lives to make sure that all men, and now all women, are created equal, and we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. Those rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

I understand how you interpreted my words when you read them this way. There is no tape for this interview that I did to interviews long. There are some notes on the other end, but there is no tape. There is no way to back and listen. But I can tell you this: That ideology never shows up in my head. I don’t know how it could possibly come out of my mouth.

So I am going to tell you that the words are likely what I said, but I want to read it to you the way I believe I said it. And that is this: “White nationalist, white supremacist, Western civilization, if he hadn’t been killed in that conflict."

It is 13 words, ironically, that has caused this firestorm. And, again, I regret that we are in this place. I read all of the rest of the resolutions that are here.

Number two, I reject the ideology. The statement is true, Mr. CLYBURN.

Number three, same story. I reject the ideology that is noted in here. Your statement is true.

And when I look down at the “resolved”—that is usually the meat of these—it says: “Resolved, That the House of Representatives once again rejects white nationalism and white supremacy as hateful ideologies that support evil ideologies, and those that support this evil and bigoted ideology that saw in its ultimate expression the systematic murder of 6 million innocent Jewish lives."

That is where I stand. That is what I believe.

So I want to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina for bringing this resolution. I have carefully studied every word in this resolution, and even though I would add some more that are stronger language. I agree with the language in it.

I want to ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let’s vote for this resolution. I am putting up a “yes” on the board here because what we are doing up, Mr. COHEN, is true, and it is just, and so is what I have stated here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I beg to differ and I want to thank the Republican leadership, Mr. COLLINS, and company, who have condemned white supremacist and white nationalist language.

It is important that we come together and condemn this language because, unfortunately, in Charlottesville, Virginia, we had Ku Klux Klan people and neo-Nazis marching and saying: “Jews will not replace us in blood and soil.” Our President said there were fine people on both sides.

We must condemn bigotry, racial supremacy, anti-Semitism, racism, or bigotry of any kind in Congress.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. NADLER for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mr. CLYBURN for bringing this resolution, and I want to thank the Republican leadership, Mr. COLLINS, and company, who have condemned white supremacy, anti-Semitism, racism, or bigotry of any kind in Congress.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak out against white supremacy. As a Christian, I live my life by the guidance and teachings of Jesus Christ and by the many great lessons in the Bible. John 7:12 tells us: “So whatever you wish that others would do to you, do also to them.” This is the golden rule, that we treat every person as we wish to be treated. This is why I stand here today to say there is no place for white supremacy, anti-Semitism, racism, or bigotry of any kind in Congress.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEWART), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. STEWART. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. I rise
in support of this resolution, which, again, rejects white nationalism and white supremacy as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to our values that define the people of the United States.

I call on my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to denounce racial and religious bigotry of all stripes.

Like many, I do have some personal insight into this problem. It doesn’t come as a surprise to many that, being from Utah, I am a Mormon. And my church, as many know, was founded in New York in the early 1800s. We were driven further and further west as members of my church were targeted, harassed, and killed for their sincerely held religious beliefs, culminating in the murder of my founder and subsequent decision to relocate to Utah.

My own ancestors were targeted in this bigotry. They lost their possessions. They lost their lands. They lost their freedom. And in some cases, they lost their lives. Fortunately, such hatred still exists today.

Three years ago, we witnessed the tragedy in Charleston, where a deranged individual motivated by white supremacy shot and killed nine Black worshippers and injured many others.

We remember the riots in Charlottesville, where a white nationalist struck and killed a White woman who was protesting, once again, white supremacy.

But the problem is more widespread than just these individuals who advocate for white supremacy. We also need to condemn anti-Semitism, anti-Zionism, and Islamophobia.

Last October, a perpetrator shot and killed 11 Jewish worshippers at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, which we all remember.

All of these should be condemned by all of us here in this body: Black, White, Muslim, Christian, or Jewish. We are all, I believe, children of the same God.

I hope that the majority is sincere in ushering in this resolution to the floor not as just an opportunity to shame one party as irredeemably racist, but as a united statement against bigotry.

When bigotry goes unchallenged, it festers and rears its ugly head in ways that test our Nation’s greatest triumphs in shedding these shameful practices of slavery and other types of racial and religious intolerance. This is something that must unite this body. I hope that it does, and I believe that it will.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of Mr. CLYBURN’s resolution condemning white supremacy and white nationalism.

Congressman King’s recent comments asserting that terms like “white supremacist” should be acceptable and have rightly drawn strong condemnation from both sides of the aisle in this Chamber. Sadly, these comments are part of a well-documented history of embracing the far right and making racist and anti-immigrant remarks for more than a decade.

As Congressmen and women of color take a stand today to publicly voice bigotry and evil views like these. We have seen it in discussions around Charlottesville, the current debate on immigration, and in criticism of those who are silently and peacefully protesting police brutality.

These views are contrary to our country’s founding values of fairness and equality. America was found on the simple but powerful idea that all are created equal and are worthy of dignity and respect.

White nationalism and white supremacy are a vile assault on that magnificent idea. These views belong on the ash heap of history. That is exactly where this resolution will put them.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), who is a freshman.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 41, a resolution rejecting white nationalism and white supremacy.

As a lifelong resident of southwestern Pennsylvania, I was devastated by the shooting that killed 11 Jewish worshippers and wounded six others at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on October 27, 2018. This despicable act of domestic terrorism reminded us that evil is alive in this world and must be confronted in a spirit of courage.

The day after this cowardly act of violence, I stood in solidarity with Americans of all religions, all races, and all ethnicities at a vigil honoring the victims of this heinous crime. There is no place for this kind of thinking in our country.

When the rights of any community are under attack, all of our rights are under attack. We must come together as a nation to stand up against hatred, white nationalism, and bigotry in our country.

I commend the leadership of my party for their strong response to any comments that divide our country, and I thank my colleague from South Carolina for introducing this important resolution.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).

Mrs. DEMINGS. Madam Speaker, it is surely a shame that it is necessary in the year 2019 for the U.S. Congress to denounce white nationalism in Congress.

As a police officer, I worked white supremacist rallies. The words alone hurt enough, but as a police officer, I also saw vicious acts of violence by those inspired by those hateful words. Words do have consequences, and if you promote hateful, ignorant beliefs, then you will be held accountable. Certainly, Congress should lead the way.

This week, the ignorance of white nationalism was defended by one of my colleagues. Today, as we recognize Dr. King’s birthday, I am reminded that Dr. King called on all Americans to enlist in a crusade finally to end the race question and make it an ugly relic of a dark past. But still we know hate crimes are on the rise. We understand why.

Madam Speaker, if we are who we say we are, a great nation, one nation with liberty and justice for all, then we all must exercise our power and take a stand so strong that even the white supremacists cannot ignore it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, it has been an open secret for too long that Representative STEVE KING of Iowa has made his trade in saying and pushing fundamentally racist and unacceptably ideas. While I am glad that my colleagues on the other side are speaking out and have taken this important act of stripping Mr. King of his committees, let us be very clear that those of us who have served with Mr. King on the Judiciary Committee, those of us who are African American, Latino, immigrant, those of us who are Caucasian and steeped in our country’s history of slavery and racism, we all know that the record of these kinds of comments is long.

In 2013, Mr. King said that, for every Dreamer who is a valedictorian, there are another 100 undocumented immigrants who have calves the size of cantaloupes because we have served with Mr. King on the Judiciary Committee, those of us who are African American, Latino, immigrant, those of us who are Caucasian and steeped in our country’s history of slavery and racism, we all know that the record of these kinds of comments is long.

In 2017, he said that we couldn’t restore civilization with “somebody else’s babies.” Madam Speaker, how dare he. I was born in India. I am somebody else’s baby, and I am a proud American.

Just last year, Mr. King met with a Nazi-linked party in Austria. He is a Member of Congress who continuously makes these comments that cause the deepest of harm to real people, physical harm in the form of hate crimes, and psychological harm.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Washington an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, all of us, whether African American, people of color, immigrants, we are not other categories of people. We are not somebody else. We are America, all of us.

The terrible truth is that racism and xenophobia escalates when racism and white supremacy are permitted here in
Congress and all the way up to the White House to be issues with both sides. There are no both sides when it comes to white supremacy.

So, Madam Speaker, I hope that this is just the start of a definitive party-wide turn away from racism for all of us.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, I rise to reject white nationalism, to reject white supremacy, and to reject anyone who supports these immoral ideas.

I reject STEVE KING. So does America.

Do you know what? So do the people of Iowa’s Fourth Congressional District.

How do I know that? Because I was born there to a police officer as a father and a mom who raised four boys. The way that they raised us is the way that every family in cities like Ames, Algona, and Sac City raised their kids: to love God, to love God, to love God, to love God, to work together, and to believe that, in a community, we come together and that love always conquers. They reject the bigotry that they hear day after day from their Representative.

I want to make sure that every person in the United States knows that what was expressed by our colleague is an exception and does not define the hardworking people of western Iowa.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining for my colleague?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I yield to my colleagues in both parties to vote today, on what would have been Dr. King’s 90th birthday, to condemn white nationalism and white supremacy.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on this resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I rise to reject white nationalism and white supremacy. These philosophies divide us, teach fear, and lead to violence. They are to blame for the worst of American history, from slavery and Jim Crow to the fatal shooting of Sikhs at an Oak Creek gurdwara and Jews at the Tree of Life synagogue.

White nationalism led to the passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act, forcing Chinese immigrants like my grandfather to be condemned to life as a second-class citizen. But today, his granddaughter stands here as the first Chinese American woman in Congress. I am not alone. This is the most diverse and representative Congress in our history.

The message is clear: diversity has a place in Congress, prejudice does not. But white nationalism is finding a home in politics once again through racist rhetoric and xenophobic misinformation aimed at immigrants and others. Any attempt by politicians at any level to encourage fear of those who look different must be rejected.

Madam Speaker, I urge support for this resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 41 rejecting white nationalism and white supremacy.

Today, on what would have been Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.’s 90th birthday, I am honored to join Majority Whip CLYBURN in denouncing the racist remarks of Representative STEVE KING and condemning white supremacy and white nationalism in all forms. Hatred and bigotry have no home in America, and certainly not one in the Halls of Congress.

Dr. King was one of the finest citizens this country has produced: a champion for justice and a fearless crusader for equality. Today and every day, we must honor the life and legacy of Dr. King, while also acknowledging the work which remains. We must strongly condemn hateful expressions of intolerance wherever and whenever we see them.

America is strongest when we stand together. From the Lowcountry to the heartland, I believe that today is a promising start.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, but I also believe that the House of Representatives should go one step further, and I believe we should institute a censure for Mr. King to signal to this country and to our children that this behavior is unacceptable.

The underlying premise is that we have had leaders at the highest levels down the street from here condone and continue to perpetuate race-baiting and white supremacist language that is not good for this country. We need to come together. We are a weaker country today because we are so divided.

What this is all about is whether the United States is going to move forward saying that we are a united country, that we respect diversity—and not only recognize, but recognize that our diversity in this country is our greatest strength. It is our greatest cultural strength, and it is our greatest economic strength. This House needs to take this resolution one step further.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ALLRED) for an unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. ALLRED. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the resolution against white nationalism and against white supremacy.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, may I inquire of the time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining.
Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, we have heard from many here today, and I think we have all come to a common theme, and the common theme goes back to the simple rule that most of us would have learned growing up—and we have heard it referenced here today, but it may be as simple as in kindergarten—you hold hands; you look after each other; you treat people with respect no matter where they come from, what they look like, what the color of their skin is, what their gender may be, or what religion they may practice.

What is true on the floor today and what should be true in the hearts of every American—and, frankly, not just every American, but those around the world—is that we realize that we have been given a gift by God, that we have been given the strength by God, and we have been given the hope by God to treat each other with dignity, respect, and love. When we understand that, then it takes away.

But we also, Madam Speaker, today have realized that, when we as Members speak, people pay attention and people hold us accountable. We have talked about that in many ways, and that cannot continue in the way that we have seen it.

White supremacy is wrong. White nationalism is wrong. Anti-Semitism is wrong.

When we divide ourselves and we classify ourselves against each other, we bring ourselves down, not those whom we go after.

As long as we ever have anyone in this country who believes that they can climb to the top on the backs of others because they make fun of their race, their gender, their ethnicity, or any other thing, then we devalue the very breath that God gives us.

Madam Speaker, as I said earlier when I opened this up, there is not anyone we face today, anyone we come in contact with today who is not inherently and deeply loved by God. And it is pretty simple; He breathed life into them. I believe it with all that I am here.

And if I can believe that God created each and every person I see and everything we see around us, how can I not value that creation? How can I stand against anyone who would fear that down, especially if there was ever a thought in this country from anywhere, anywhere, to take and say this is a Christian value? Then I challenge them and say there will be a judgment. It is already written down that no man stands that way.

So today it is pretty simple. Place a “yes” vote on the floor. We support this resolution because it is not an American value; it is not what we stand for.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNA MOORTHY) to close the debate on our side.

Mr. KRISHNA MOORTHY. Madam Speaker, I rise on Martin Luther King Jr.’s birthday to urge passage of H. Res. 41 and to reject white nationalism and supremacy in all its forms.

I applaud both sides for taking up this resolution in support of rejecting white nationalism.

But today, Madam Speaker, I ask one question: Where does President Trump stand on this resolution? Will President Trump do as we are doing and reject white supremacy in all its forms? So far, we have heard nothing but silence. I ask him to act and do the same: reject white supremacy and white nationalism, today.

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

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, while I strongly consider White’s statement of race and white nationalism, my position remains unchanged. Anything short of censure is shallow. STEVE KING has made a career of making racist statements. That is the only thing he is known for and this pattern of racists must be confronted head on by the House of Representatives. This resolution just restates the obvious. It does not address STEVE KING’s violent, vitriolic, and racist. This Democratic resolution is an insult to the legacy of Martin Luther King Jr. As we recognize his birthday. We must proceed with a vote to censure him with the same zeal that the House used when censuring Charlie Rangel. Yesterday, the notice I provided of my privileged resolution to formally censure the Member from Iowa, started the clock for a floor vote to punish him for his bigotry and racism. We need to be clear to the American people that we use condemnation to express our disapproval of those not in the House. We use censure for those in the House, STEVE KING is a sitting member.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the gentleman from South Carolina’s resolution condemning the recent remarks of our colleague STEVEN KING. As we celebrate the 90th birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., he indicated that “there comes a time when one must take a position that is neither safe, nor politic, nor popular, but he must take it because conscience tells him that it is right.”

Unfortunately, the recent rhetoric of Mr. King not only highlights the wrongs of our nation’s dark past, but it promotes a spirit of division, bitterness and fear.

At a time when our nation is looking to its leaders to bring confidence and security, we must take the steps toward unity and seek out understanding and denounce thoughts that are divisive.

There is no room for such rhetoric in the most diverse Congress ever and I stand with my colleagues to censure Congressman STEVEN KING.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 27) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 187, not voting 9, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEA</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>NOT VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Cisneros</td>
<td>Deutsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguilar</td>
<td>Clark (MA)</td>
<td>Dingell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almed</td>
<td>Clarke (NY)</td>
<td>Doyle (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anez</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>Clyburn</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatty</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beier</td>
<td>Connolly</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (GA)</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Correa</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryson (MD)</td>
<td>Costa</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicilline</td>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castor (FL)</td>
<td>Cox (CA)</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, Brendan</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (CA)</td>
<td>Crist</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownley (CA)</td>
<td>Crist</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterfield</td>
<td>Cuellar</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardenas</td>
<td>Doggett</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cárdenas (IN)</td>
<td>Doggett</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castetter</td>
<td>DeLauro</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castor (FL)</td>
<td>DeLisi</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter (TX)</td>
<td>DelBene</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chel, Judy</td>
<td>Delgado</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicilline</td>
<td>DeSaulnier</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, removing electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.
REJECTING WHITE NATIONALISM AND WHITE SUPREMACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 41) rejecting White nationalism and White supremacy, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 41) rejecting White nationalism and White supremacy, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

Ms. MOORE changed her vote from "nay" to "yea." (So-two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REJECTING WHITE NATIONALISM AND WHITE SUPREMACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 41) rejecting White nationalism and White supremacy, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 41) rejecting White nationalism and White supremacy, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

Ms. ZELDIN, DAVIDSON of Ohio, BILIRAKIS, and BROOKS of Alabama changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."
So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ANTIDISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 135) to amend the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 to strengthen Federal antidiscrimination laws enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and expand accountability within the Federal Government, 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 the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—424

NAYS—1

Rush

NOT VOTING—9

DesJarlais
Huizenga
Jones

For other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 135) to amend the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 to strengthen Federal antidiscrimination laws enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and expand accountability within the Federal Government, 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 the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]
COMMUNICATION FROM DISTRICT DIRECTOR. THE HONORABLE JACKIE SPEIER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Brian Perkins, District Director, the Honorable Jackie Speier, Member of Congress:


Hon. Nancy Pelosi,
Speaker of the House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San Mateo, in a criminal proceeding involving an alleged threat of violence against our office personnel. After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

Brian Perkins
District Director.

JODI READINGER, A TAX PREPAREER

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

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise for Jodi Readinger, a tax preparer in Pennsylvania’s Sixth District. She and her organization, the Berks Community Action Program, provide a range of services to over 2,500 low-income individuals and families in my community. For example, her team works for free to help people navigate the complicated process of filing their taxes. During a weekend town hall in Berks County this weekend, Jodi shared with me that she has been unable to reach the IRS to access tax preparation software due to the shutdown. Her work is responsible for bringing $1 million worth of tax refunds back to my community and for saving $80,000 for her customers.

I am a third generation veteran. Border protection is imperative and a real issue. I am certain that there are measures to protect our borders that we can come to an agreement on in this brand new Congress, but a shutdown is not the answer.

Madam Speaker, I rise for the people like Jodi, because shutting down the government is failed policy.

HONORING PCN FOR 25 YEARS OF FARM SHOW COVERAGE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor PCN for 25 years of outstanding coverage of the Pennsylvania Farm Show. Pennsylvania Cable Network, now called PCN, was organized August 29, 1979, as a nonprofit corporation by Pennsylvania cable companies. PCN marked the first use of cable television for distance education, and it was the first educational cable television network in the Nation. PCN was on the air before CNN, ESPN, FOX News, MSNBC, and nearly all other nationally distributed cable networks.

In November 1993, PCN began providing public affairs programming in prime time to provide viewers coverage of the Pennsylvania General Assembly. In 1994, it expanded beyond government and covered every aspect of the annual Pennsylvania Farm Show. This year, PCN exclusively delivered the Pennsylvania high school championships rodeo, the sale of champions, the mini-horse pull, square dancing competitions, and much more.

Madam Speaker, I commend PCN on 25 years of exclusively delivering the Farm Show to viewers in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I congratulate PCN on this outstanding achievement.

IMPACT OF THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring my people’s voice into this Chamber. They are going through day 25 of an unnecessary government shutdown. They are begging their landlords not to evict them because HUD funding is suspended. Our neighbors at home who live among the biggest corporate polluters are wondering, without EPA inspectors on duty, if they are breathing in more toxins than permitted under the law. Madam Speaker, when did it become okay to use people as pawns, to jeopardize the well-being and way of life of our residents back home?

I urge the leadership in the Senate to put people first. Majority Leader McConnell works for the American people, not the President. We don’t need the President’s support.

So, please, Senators, pass the bills you supported before, and let’s get our government up and running again for our families.

CONGRATULATING MEMBERS OF ARIZONA LEGISLATURE

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

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to congratulate all the Members of the Arizona Legislature who took their oaths of office to begin a new term this week.

The start of each legislative session is exciting: an opportunity to keep promises made to constituents and make Arizona a better place to work and raise a family.

As ever, legislators will face challenges that will impact Arizonans. I look forward to working with my former colleagues, especially those in the east valley, for the benefit of our constituents.

I recognize and give special congratulations to和 my former colleagues, especially those in the east valley, for the benefit of our constituents.

OPEN THE GOVERNMENT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I can’t even account for this historic and devastating Trump shutdown.

When I say I can’t account, I can’t believe that the government is now in the mix of a shutdown that has such far-reaching proportions of impact, negative impact: not only my constituents who work for so many Federal agencies, from TSA to Border Patrol, to air traffic controllers, to HUD, and Department of Housing and Urban Development, to those around the Nation—the two Federal employee families that is now going into their son’s scholarship fund, the young mother who now needs food assistance, those who are on the SNAP program, those who live in public housing, those who are disabled.

Is there any empathy or sympathy in the White House to begin intelligent and informed negotiations, allowing us to negotiate border security after the fact but open the government now so that people can be paid?

Madam Speaker, people are asking me whether their healthcare coverage is going to lapse because they are not being paid. People are asking about whether or not the credit scores that are impacted by not being able to pay your bills, how they are going to make ends meet for that; about the mortgages or the rent to landlords who are being insensitive.

Madam Speaker, the bottom line: Open the government, Mr. Trump, for the American people.

BORDER WALL FUNDING

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

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of President Trump’s request for border wall funding.
Yes, we are a nation of immigrants. I know firsthand. My grandparents emigrated from Sweden to the Upper Peninsula to start a new life in the 1890s, but Congress has a constitutional duty to provide for the safety and security of our citizens. Right now, our immigration system is broken, making entry into the U.S. a common occurrence rather than a random act.

President Trump is right to call this a crisis. It is a crisis of our own making, and it is time for Congress to do our job.

We are on day 25 of the longest and most avoidable government shutdown in U.S. history. Those most vital to protecting our borders, coasts, and ports have now missed at least one paycheck, with little to no progress being made in Washington.

It is time to end this shutdown, secure our borders, and get our government open and working for the people.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting efforts to build a wall.

A SHUTDOWN IS NOT THE ANSWER

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Madam Speaker, President Trump is forcing more than 37,000 Californians, including many veterans, to go without pay. From Coast Guard members at Naval Base Ventura County and Channel Islands Harbor to local air traffic controllers, Ventura County residents and their families are trying to make ends meet without their paychecks.

On the first day of this Congress, I joined my Democratic colleagues to pass legislation to reopen the government and provide for sensible border security.

The President should not use people’s lives and our economy as hostages to build a campaign slogan. The President closed the government. A shutdown is not the answer.

Mr. President, reopen our government now.

OKLAHOMA INAUGURATION DAY

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

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise in celebration of the inauguration of Oklahoma’s Governor Kevin Stitt, Lieutenant Governor Matt Pinnell, Insurance Commissioner Glen Mulready, and State Superintendent Joy Hofmeister. These leaders come from Oklahoma’s First Congressional District and will represent Tulsa well in our capital.

Governor Stitt, like our President and myself, is an entrepreneur and a businessman. He has a vision for Oklahoma to be a top ten State, shaking up the status quo in Oklahoma City and turning the State around.

Lieutenant Governor Pinnell is, likewise, a business owner and has been an advocate of the Republican Party and conservative agenda in our State for many years.

Commissioner Mulready is a long-term insurance professional and business manager, most recently serving in the Oklahoma House of Representatives as the majority floor leader.

State Superintendent Joy Hofmeister, another business owner, is beginning her second term in the role and will continue to work hard for Oklahoma’s students.

A new day is dawning in Oklahoma with the leadership of Governor Stitt, Lieutenant Governor Pinnell, Commissioner Mulready, and Superintendent Hofmeister. I congratulate them on this accomplishment and wish celebration and joy this week.

KEYSTONE TAILORED MANUFACTURING PLAN CLOSURE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight yet another grim economic headline: another broken promise on jobs and trade from President Trump to the people of northern Ohio, and more pink slips by another factory shuttered.

Keystone Tailored Manufacturing will close by March. Approximately 150 employees will lose their jobs.

Keystone has made men’s suits at the site since 2015. Before that, it was a Hugo Boss men’s suit plant. Since 2010, workers fought to keep the facility from closing twice. There won’t be a third time.

As Mark Milko, the area director for the Workers United union put it: “It doesn’t look like there is anything to fight to save.”

Madam Speaker, this company plans to shift these jobs to Canada. There they can save $15 a suit on imported buttons, zippers, shoulder supports, and tariffs—because Canada isn’t involved in a trade war with China that the President has started. Under NAFTA, they can then turn those suits right back around to sell here in America for nothing.

This President’s trade strategy is a disaster. American workers suffer the ultimate sacrifice. Our Nation must put someone in charge who knows what they are doing.

CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Madam Speaker, the North Dakota State University football team brought home their record seventh FCS championship trophy in 8 years.

On January 5, the Bison defeated the Eastern Washington Eagles, 38-24. The Eagles are a good team and attempted several comebacks, but the Bison held strong for the win.

Quarterback Easton Stick led the Bison with a spectacular performance. He had five touchdowns—two passing and three rushing—for a combined 319 yards.

The Bison players were cheered on by 17,000 dedicated NIAC fans who traveled over 1,000 miles south to Frisco, Texas, for what has become an annual journey.

Victory also sealed Coach Klieman’s place in college football history. In his five seasons, he has coached the team to four national championships and just four conference losses.

Madam Speaker, this incredible achievement is the result of months of hard work and preparation. Congratulations to all Bison players, coaches, and fans. They earned it.

AN IMPORTANT VICTORY FOR DEMOCRACY

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, today, we had an important victory for democracy. A Federal judge in New York ordered the Trump administration to remove a planned citizenship question from the 2020 Census in response to a lawsuit filed by the State of New York, which was joined by 17 other States in support.

I am proud to have led an amicus brief of 126 Members of Congress, also in support of this lawsuit.

The court affirmed what we already knew: adding a citizenship question is a deliberate effort to scare away noncitizens and their families in order to undercount this community.

Fortunately, the court agreed, but there will likely be an appeal. That is why I will be introducing legislation to remove the citizenship question. We must act quickly.

Our democracy depends on a full and accurate count of our Nation, and we cannot allow the Trump administration to compromise that.

END THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to object to the administration’s threat to issue a national emergency declaration and reprogram money that has been allocated for Hurricane Harvey.

I join a bipartisan group of Texas legislators in opposition to this diversion,
including my former colleagues from the Texas Senate. This administration is seeking any funds or any means to go around Congress to build his wall.

Congress is a coequal branch of government, Madam Speaker, with a duty to appropriate funds for Hurricane Harvey, so defunding or diverting those funds puts lives at risk and potentially displaces people from their homes, many in my own district in Houston.

We must do more to mitigate the damages caused by flooding. Diverting disaster funds to pay for a wall will not accomplish that goal.

I am proud of the bipartisan opposition to this effort, and I hope that we can work together in that same spirit to end this Trump shutdown.

OPEN OUR GOVERNMENT

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Madam Speaker, day 25. There is no reason for President Trump to keep the government shut down over his demands for an ineffective border wall.

On day one, the Democrats passed legislation to reopen our government. Today, we are taking further action, bringing forward a continuing resolution to fund the government through February 1, giving the President and the Senate GOP yet another opportunity to end the shutdown, while allowing time for us to do our work and negotiate.

President Trump should stop holding the health, the safety, and the paycheck of the American people hostage. We need border security, and Democrats stand strong on that issue, but we will not waste taxpayers' dollars. We will not waste billions of taxpayer dollars on an ineffective wall.

Mr. President, Congress, open our government.

END THE SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I think I just heard that we are in the 25th day of the shutdown. I see some of my good Republican friends over there, and perhaps we ought to engage in a debate about the wisdom of this shutdown.

Can anybody find any good reason for the shutdown?

Mr. MEADOWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARAMENDI. At the moment, Mr. Meadows, perhaps I would yield and you can give me a 30-second explanation of why the shutdown makes sense, but let's talk about the shutdown.

Let's talk about the reality that the President proposed in his budget for 2019 that we should spend somewhere around $1.6 billion for border security, not specifying walls or all of it, but just border security.

We, of course, do what we always do. We took that and we put it through the ringer. We came out with $1.6 billion for border security, including some wall in there.

But we didn't finish the task, so we didn't get referred out for Appropriations last September and kicked the ball down the road, which is what we really do best, boom, boom, boom, bounce down the road until right after Thanksgiving.

Then we hadn't quite completed it, so in a day when none of us were here, by unanimous consent, again, we kicked the ball down the road until December 11.

Then the Senate sent over a piece of legislation that was unanimously passed in the Senate by voice vote, and it wound up over here, the President decided that he needed $5 billion for a border wall.

Now, perhaps there was a discussion of appropriating during that process. I don't know. But in any case, it was in none of the bills. Suddenly, we had a $5 billion addition to border security. All of that happened overnight.

At the same time, the President calls into his Oval Office the leadership, and he says that he will shut down the government, and he will take the mantle of the shutdown.

So, my good friends from the Republican side of this aisle, here we are on day 25.

A lot of things are going on out there. There is not much going on around here, unfortunately. But what is going on out there?

I got a phone call from a mayor of one of the small cities that I represent down in the agricultural part north of Sacramento. He said: Can you help us? One of the veterans in my district, a World War II veteran, is in hospice, and, over the years, he lost his Purple Heart for injuries that he suffered in World War II. We would like to get that back for him before he dies, but we can't. We can't help him.

We can't get that Purple Heart back for the veteran dies because the National Archives is shut down. Normally, we would make our request, and we would go to the National Archives. Somehow we would find the record, and we would get a replacement Purple Heart. We can't do that now. The National Archives is shut down.

Another one of my constituents wants to start a new business in one of the towns that I represent west of Sacramento. It is a little restaurant coffee shop needs an SBA loan. He worked it all through the bank. The bank is ready to make the loan. The papers can't be signed. SBA is shut down.

How long can he hang on? How long will that escrow remain open before this deal tanks? Well, it is 25 days thus far. Apparently, the deal is still in place. But businesses all across this Nation are not moving forward.

Recent estimates state that two-tenths of a percent of the economic growth of this Nation in this 25-day shutdown has been removed from this economy. We are looking somewhere just north of 2%, 3 percent, in that area, but two-tenths of that is now gone as a result of this shutdown.

Let us remind ourselves: This is entirely the making of the President who parachuted—no, bombed into our negotiations process here. $5 billion in the 12 hours between the passage of a compromised, unanimous vote by the Senate to keep government going and the arrival and the vote on that bill here on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, I will also state that our Republican colleagues accommodated the President and put the $5 billion into the legislation and sent it back to the Senate, and there it sat, sine die. That legislation is gone.

We, however, we want to do our government. We think it is really important that those veterans across this Nation who want to get their records are able to do so, and those men and women who want to start a small business are able to get their Small Business Administration loans approved.

How about Foreign Service officers? Oh, yes, the State Department isn't funded. Foreign Service officers are not able to get the visas and travel they need. They go through a whole course before they are sent off to some part of the world—language, culture courses. None of that is happening, to say nothing of the fact that about a third of the appointments in the State Department have never been filled to begin with.

Department of the Interior? Some of us stuck around here over the weekend. Normally, we would go down to the Smithsonian and see the National Museum of African American History and Culture, or maybe the National Museum of American History. Maybe we would go watch one of the presentations that are made at the national parks. No, that doesn't happen either. Woe on us here in Washington, but all across this Nation, the national parks are shut down.

Fish and wildlife, now, we have a real problem here. The fish and wildlife refuge in California isn't funded. And we are approaching the end of duck season. Oh, my goodness. You mean we can't go duck hunting, as we might want to do, at the fish and wildlife refuges? That is right. You are not going to be able to use those refuges.

We are approaching the end of that season. And you had January 15 for your date to hunt ducks at the refuge. None, can't do that.

Transportation, the Department of Transportation is shut down.

You tell me it is a small portion of the Federal Government. Well, it is a
small portion of the budget, but it is 85 percent of the activities of the Federal Government that are shut down: Department of the Interior, Department of Agriculture, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Transportation, and the Internal Revenue Service.

Don’t worry, we can’t collect taxes. That is a good thing, right? My conservative friend says you can’t collect taxes and that is all right. No, I want my tax refund, and I can’t get that either.

EPA, there are those who would argue that that is all good. Well, I don’t think so, not if you are concerned about air and water, the ability to swim in the rivers or to drink the water.

Let’s just say you are going out for your first tranche of funding. You need SEC approval. Well, you are not going to get it. The Securities and Exchange Commission is shut down also.

Eighty percent or more of the activities of the Federal Government are shut down.

There was a big headline in The New York Times, the failing New York Times, about the President and whether he is compromised. Well, I don’t know. That will prove itself out one way or the other with the Mueller investigation and all that is going on.

But I do know this, that if Putin wanted to harm America, he would shut down the American Government. That is precisely what the President did. I think the American Government for 25 days. What greater gift would Putin want than an American Government that is not functioning?

Oh, the military is still there, but the fifth branch of the military is the Coast Guard with 40,000-plus Coast Guard members who are out there on the water protecting the borders of America. By the way, the Coast Guard has confiscated 10 times the amount of drugs that are confiscated on the Mexican border. They are working without pay. Essential services, yes, they are.

But the back-office services are not working. They are laid off. Contractors who have contracts to get a paycheck from the Department of Transportation on the road that they are supposed to be building or have built, it is not going to happen.

It is time for us to open this government. It is time for us to open the government and put America back to work. Put the essential services back to work.

The Food and Drug Administration is shut down. Who is checking? Many of my colleagues here have young grandchildren who is checking the quality, the safety, of infant formula? The answer: No one.

Here we are. We are for border security. We Democrats are for border security. We have been for more than 20 years. We voted for walls in the past. We voted for improving the security of the border in every way possible, and we will continue to do so.

But to hold America hostage, to hold our government hostage, to hold 800,000 government employees and 40,000-plus coastguardsmen and -women without pay? No way.

To simply come in at the very last moment in a negotiation that had been going on for years and excuse me, it is $5.7 billion now: there seems to have been an escalation—a $5.7 billion border wall on our process, it is unconscionable.

We can open the government. Bills have been passed here, not with the help of our Republican friends, but with the new majority. We have passed legislation day after day after day to fund the government. Some of it is short term, as we did just an hour ago here on the floor, a short-term CR to open government until February 1 to get people back to work and negotiate, negotiate border security.

The President wants a wall. Where does he want the wall? What kind of a wall does he want? cyclone fence, steel spikes, concrete? Where? For what purpose? What is its effectiveness? What is he trying to stop? Where is he trying to stop that incursion into America? None of that is available today.

I have been on the Armed Services Committee for 8 years, 9 years now. We would not build a hanging for the Air Force unless we knew what its purpose was, unless we knew where it was, what it would cost, why it was necessary. But the President wants a $5.7 billion fund to build a wall somewhere along the 1,900 miles of the border.

Now, a couple of my colleagues were here a few moments ago talking about the President’s desire to have a national emergency. Well, he sure as hell created one. But I think he is talking about those young children who are climbing over the fences in diapers. I suppose those are the terrorists he is talking about.
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Madam Speaker, let’s talk about what he proposes to do about it. He would call for a national emergency which gives him—he believes, we don’t—but he believes the power to appropriate funds. The Constitution is very, very clear. There is only one part of our government that has the power to appropriate funds. It is us. It is the Congress. But apparently the President thinks he can declare a national emergency and acquire the appropriation power of Congress.

What does he intend to appropriate for his purposes of the border wall?

America has had some flooding in some of the districts of some of my colleagues that I see here on the floor. We passed the emergency legislation to deal with that. California has its droughts, but it also has its rain. This is the Oroville Dam. It is not subject to the emergency appropriations for disaster recovery. But the dam, the power of Congress.

What does the President want to appropriate for his purposes of the border wall?

America has had some flooding in some of the districts of some of my colleagues that I see here on the floor. We passed the emergency legislation to deal with that. California has its droughts, but it also has its rain. This is the Oroville Dam. It is not subject to the emergency appropriations for disaster recovery. But the dam, the power of Congress.

Here is what we want: we want government opened. It is inexplicable that after 25 days this government is shut

The levees downstream from Oroville on the Feather River are in the process of being repaired. Further downstream as you get to Sacramento, Madam Speaker, the State of California can say that the Sacramento River, major levee projects, is the most flood-prone part of America. I know there are some friends from the Southeast here who would debate that point. But let’s just say that there is a lot of America that is subject to flooding.

This is a dangerous one. Money in these supplemental appropriation bills for disaster relief is designed to shore up the levees of America.

Now, some folks would argue, yeah, but it is not going to rain this year. Maybe. Maybe it makes no difference. But if it does rain, the repair of that levee makes all the difference.

Here is a place that a lot of our friends don’t care much about: Puerto Rico. In the emergency disaster relief legislation that the President wants to raid is the repair of dams just upstream from San Juan, Puerto Rico. This is what happened during the hurricanes, and that dam spillway needs to be repaired.

The communities in Texas, California, the Carolinas, Florida, and the Gulf Coast don’t want this to happen again.

How do we save them from this ever happening again?

It is to use the money that we have appropriated for disaster relief to repair the levees so that flooding is less likely to happen. But the President decides that he is going to create an emergency declaration, and he is going to go into the Army Corps of Civil Works programs that were allocated as a result of the appropriations from last spring’s disaster relief legislation and rip $2½ billion out of those appropriations.

Some of us have reason to suspect with some evidence that he intends to go after Puerto Rico and California. It turns out that the projects in California may be of interest to some of my Republican friends, particularly the minority leader, because one of the projects is Lake Isabella just upstream from Bakersfield, California.

So, Madam Speaker, we say to the President: A, there is no emergency; B, the shutdown of government is one of your own making; and C, you don’t have the power to appropriate money yourself. Particularly, it is shameful to take money that we have allocated to protect Americans in Florida, Texas, California, Puerto Rico, the Carolinas, and even Missouri so that their levees and so that their flood control projects can be updated and improved and so that the safety of those communities can be enhanced.

Here is what we want: we want government opened. It is inexplicable that after 25 days this government is shut
down because the President is demanding $5.7 billion for a border wall without even telling us where that is going to be built. Oh, excuse me. That is a misstatement. It is going to be built on the Mexican-American border.

Is it going to be built where there is a real need?

What kind of a wall will it be?

That seems to change every 12 hours because there are no plans worthy of our—we are presumably responsible for the taxpayer dollars—consideration as to where, what the effectiveness would be, what the usefulness would be, what the cost would be, or even what the color will be.

Open our government. Pass the legislation in the Senate. The President said he will veto it. Okay. Put it on his desk. Let him veto it. He already says he is wearing the mantle of the shutdown. Let him put on another coat, another mantle of a veto, so that the American taxpayers precisely who is responsible for this shutdown.

We have done our job here. We have passed the legislation to fund this government—all but one department—for the remainder of this fiscal year until September 30. We have done that multiple times now, and we have left the issue of the Department of Homeland Security in which the issue of the border fence resides on a short-term leap so that all of us would be forced to come back to negotiate border security.

Democrats would undoubtedly go for improvements in the ports of entry. One out of five cars is not checked at the border. Maybe we ought to deal with that. Only a few of the containers arriving at our ports are checked. Most are not. Maybe we ought to deal with that. Maybe we ought to look at our airports where we know most presumed terrorists arrive.

So what are we doing here?

We are shutting down—we. Excuse me. We are not shutting down. The President is shutting down this government for 25 days.

I can only imagine the joy in the Kremlin. Consider for a moment Mr. Putin, saying: Oh, my God. The American Government is shut down.

He couldn't do it by himself. Only our President would do it to us.

We have got things to do here.

I notice one of my colleagues, Mr. Levin, has arrived, and I know he wants to join us on this issue in a few moments. In the meantime, I have got a few more things to say.

To my Republican colleagues who will soon follow me on this floor when this hour is done, I can get pretty heated about some things, and maybe I have been, but I want them to think about what is actually happening here in America and why we are in this situation.

My Republican colleagues had the power over the last 2 years to build any wall they wanted to build anywhere they wanted to build it—Canadian border. Mexican border. They had the power. They didn't do it. Excuse me. That is not right. I think 22 miles of new wall have been built in the last 3 years. That is okay. I think the appropriation was somewhere less than $50 million for that. Now here we are.

I would love to hear my Republican colleagues explain to the American public how it came about that we are in this situation when they had 2 years to build whatever wall they thought the President might want to build. It didn't happen.

I heard a wonderful and foolish—wonderful argument, because it was so foolish—that gee whiz, $5.7 billion is just a very small part of the total American budget for expenditures.

That is true. It is a small part. That is $5.7 billion.

Madam Speaker, $5.7 billion would provide a year and a half of funding for all of the tuition for every student at the University of California and the 23 State universities in California—more than 1 million students. Madam Speaker, $5.7 billion is no small amount of money.

How many kids could you educate? How much relief could we supply to people who are hungry here in America or some part of the world?

By the way, my Republican friends did create a massive deficit when they passed the tax bill last December—a massive deficit. It will approach over $500 billion this year. It just about doubled the annual deficit with that piece of legislation. I used to say the deficit hawks migrate in December. My guess is they are going to come back as we deal with the new appropriation bill, and as we do that, I would hope they would keep in mind the $5.7 billion for an unspecified wall in an unspecified location of an unspecified height to carry on an unspecified purpose—$5.7 billion.

So let us continue for a moment. I want to deal with one other thing. This is the kind of thing that probably, Madam Speaker, you have to see this picture. This picture is worth maybe 500 words, but nevertheless I am going to use 250 of them.

This is a picture of the President of the United States and the Governor of California at the Paradise fire. Somewhere around 16, 17,000 homes were destroyed. Eighty-seven American citizens were killed in that fire. An entire community of some 25, 30,000 people is gone. It just doesn't exist anymore. It is gone. It is ash. It is rubble.

Fortunately, my colleague, the American Government, you and I and others and those who preceded us, developed a program called the Stafford Act which provides the generosity of Americans to help rebuild families and communities throughout Paradise, California; or Redding, California which also suffered a few thousand homes burned and destroyed, not nearly as many deaths fortunately.

So the Stafford Act is what we know as FEMA. Federal Emergency Manage-

ment Agency, the declaration at the county level and at the State level of a disaster, then at the Federal level of a disaster, and then a presidential decla-

ration of a disaster.

The Federal Government then steps in because it is prudent and wise to re-
built, to help the individuals who have lost everything, through the Small Business Administration and some di-
rect grants, and to help communities put back in place their infrastructure. It is a wonderful expression of Ameri-

can empathy and generosity.

Two weeks ago my colleague Mr. LaMalfa's constituents, who has the district just north of me, many of whom now live and have found housing in my area just south of Paradise, were greeted with a tweet from the Presi-
dent.

I am going to paraphrase what the tweet said; I don't have it with me right now. It basically said: I will stop all FEMA funding until the State of California properly manages its forests.

Madam Speaker, I must tell you, we have seen tweet after tweet, and they range from disgusting to awful and occasionally one that you go: “Okay.” But with this one we said: What in the world are you talking about, Mr. Presi-
dent? What are you tweeting about?

You are going to deny these people—you were there, Mr. President. You were there. You saw the devastation.

We counted the 87 people who died, and many of those are still sitting through the remains of these houses and may find even more. You were there. And you say you are going to cut off support until California manages its forests properly. You know not what you talk about or tweet about, Mr. President.

The fact of the matter is that the Federal forests which you oversee, Mr. President, are the ones that are mis-

Managed, for a whole variety of his-

toric reasons, many of which we have actually made steps to improve here in legis-

lation.

So what is with this man that he would wake up one morning and say: No more help from the Federal Govern-

ment.

Does he think everything is about le-

verage? Is that what he thinks, that he could use his power, awesome as it is, to leverage something?

That is precisely what he is doing with the wall. That is precisely what he is doing with 25 days of this Nation's government shutdown. He is using the citizens of America as leverage. He is using the 800,000 employees, the De-
partment of Interior, the Department of the Treasury, the IRS, the EPA, the De-
partment of Transportation, the Coast Guard, as leverage for his border wall promise.

It is despicable. It has got to end.

I need time to cool off.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentle-
man from Michigan (Mr. Levin), my colleague, who comes from an extra-
tordinary family.

And another generation has joined us.
Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Madam Speaker, I appreciate Mr. GARARMEDE's leadership on this issue.

I don't think there is—I have not been able to find—another democratic nation in our world that shuts down its government over policy arguments, wasting $1.2 billion of GDP a week for no purpose.

Madam Speaker, I want to share a few stories of the impact of this senseless shutdown on workers, on people in my home State.

When we went home on Friday, I organized a meeting at our airport, Detroit Metropolitan Airport, with a range of Federal workers who have been affected. We just wanted to listen to them and hear their stories.

We invited from Upton and my Democratic colleagues from Michigan, and those who traveled home were able to make it. I just want to share a few of those stories.

There is Dave, a biologist at the NOAA research lab in Ann Arbor. He has been furloughed, not getting paid. They study the water currents in the Straits of Mackinac.

LINE 5, our locally famous pipeline that literally just goes in the water in the bottom of the Great Lakes under the Mackinac Bridge, if that breaks or has a rupture, the research of this group is what determines how we would fight that oil spill, which would devastate the economy of the Great Lakes.

That supercomputer is shut off. It is just not working. And if we have that, if there was an accident there, the whole Midwest would be out of luck.

They run an experimental weather computer that supplements the basic work of the National Weather Service and contributes to our weather forecasting. God forbid we have a huge storm somewhere in the United States where we need it working because they are not doing their work; they are not able to work. Just imagine some huge pileup of cars on one of our interstates that happens because we are not doing our best weather forecasting.

We heard from Mark, who is the president of his local. He works at the EPA lab in Ann Arbor. That lab is shut down.

They are the ones who determine the fuel efficiency of the cars you buy. Our auto industry is not able to move their cars forward toward the market because they cannot begin to sell a car until it has the EPA rating.

That EPA lab also does enforcement of fossil fuel companies in our region.

That is not happening.

We heard from Wanavira, a TSA agent for the last 2½ years. She is a veteran. So many of these people were veterans. She is a veteran. She was a Detroit cop for 10 years, and now she is a TSA agent.

She had to go to the food bank to make sure she had food for her family because she is not getting paid. She is being forced to work without pay.

We heard from Jennifer, another TSA agent. She and her husband—I forget which was which—one of them is 11 years and one of them is 16 years working for TSA. Friday was a payless payday for the whole family, no income coming in.

Her comment was: We have got this week figured out. But next week—meaning, the week we are in right now—they don’t know how they are going to put food on the table.

We heard from Young, who works for the Customs service. He said his friends think he is on vacation because he has been furloughed by our government. But his comment was that he didn’t think a vacation included calling your mortgage lender and your car loan creditor to beg for a month of forbearance. He never thought that he would get rich as a public servant, but he also didn’t think he would have trouble paying for his 5-month-old daughter.

We heard from Angel, a computer programmer for the IRS. She has twin girls in college. They just started a new semester. She has no money to buy their books. She has no money to buy their other supplies. She is another veteran.

She herself has student loans. She tried to go on edugov to figure out if she could get a month off. Website closed.

So we need to work hard to break through to the Secretary of Education to work with her to give forgiveness for student loans for Federal employees who are affected.

And, finally, I have got to share the story of Tim. It is a frightening one because he inspects our planes, and half of them are working and half of them are furloughed, and they are not inspecting our planes to the extent that they normally do.

This is no joke. I do not want this shutdown to end because our friends finally come to their senses after some horrible thing happens to a plane, our cars, or our new things that aren’t being inspected.

But Tim is a Navy vet who went to work for General Motors. He lost his job in the Great Recession.

Madam Speaker, in a previous life, I created and ran something called No Worker Left Behind. I ran the workforce system of the State of Michigan, and I created, essentially, the largest experiment by any State in actually supporting a school who were unemployed or underemployed.

We put 162,000 Michiganders back to school. This gentleman, Tim, was one of them. He studied IT. And out of that program in Oakland County, Michigan, he got a job with the FAA. And here he is, working without a paycheck now.

And so many of his coworkers are furloughed.

He just wants to serve his country. He has two kids in college, again, and they need funding for tuition, books, and so forth.

Madam Speaker, there is no reason that 820,000 Federal workers are forced to work for no pay or are simply off without their livelihood. And so many more government contractors are being victimized, and so many small businesses who run a restaurant or a barber shop near a government facility are robbed of their income.

The economic effects are devastating. There is no reason for it.

I appreciate Mr. GARARMEDE's leadership on this. I just wanted to come and join him in calling on our colleagues in the Senate to join with us in voting to reopen our government right now.

After all, we passed what they had passed, what our Republican friends had passed. It is not our appropriations, how we would want them, as Democrats. We passed their appropriations.

And in a bipartisan spirit, let’s reopen our government, and we can have all the negotiations we want over policy matters.

Mr. GARARMEDE, Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing our attention to the real-life problems that these employees have personally and that are being created for Americans, who are not the ones who are broken pipeline or an airplane that wasn’t inspected. It is very important that we all know those things. I thank the gentleman for joining us.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), my colleague, and ask him to please share with us his thoughts on the government shutdown.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Madam Speaker, I applaud the gentleman from California for leading on this issue.

I find that there is a false perception when it comes to Federal workers that they are all based in the Washington, D.C., area. We even heard some comment to that effect from the President not so long ago.

In fact, so much of our Federal workforce is spread throughout the country. In the Philadelphia area that I represent, we have the fifth highest number of Federal workers in the country. Furthermore, there are all those who actually are impacted in some way by this government shutdown, not just the 800,000-plus who are going right now without a paycheck.

My ask is very simple. I want the Senate majority leader to allow a vote on the same bill that passed unanimously—unanimously—in the Senate just a few weeks ago.

On that Wednesday, it passed on voice vote unanimously in the Senate. We were here on Thursday morning, prepared to vote on that same legislation.

But what happened between Wednesday afternoon and Thursday morning? The President received a great deal of criticism from his base, and then suddenly the bill that passed unanimously from the Senate less than 24 hours before was not good enough or a threat, and now here we are, stuck in the longest government shutdown in American history.
I also want to make this point, because all of us in government so often have gone from crisis to crisis to crisis. This is a real systemic problem in which we—of all of us, regardless of party—are shooting ourselves in the foot and actually reducing our economic growth and GNP growth over the next year, completely needlessly. Almost every Western democracy does not do it this way.

Once we get beyond the shutdown, a bipartisan group of legislators should look at the(g)h issues that continue to fix to this and the other sort of major way in which we shoot ourselves in the foot, which is when we actually come into danger of not raising the debt ceiling and playing really with fire.

These are mechanisms that most other Western democracies don’t have. They certainly have their partisan fights; only, instead of two parties, often, it is more than two major parties.

So I do think that once we get beyond this crisis, we do need to figure out a way to prevent this from ever happening again.

There are going to be different legislators in these seats, inevitably all of us will be gone. There will be the switch of party control that has happened multiple times in this century and will happen.

We need to figure out a way to avoid these needless government shutdowns in the future that are only costly. They hurt real people who are living paycheck to paycheck—people, by the way, who are Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and nonvoters. And there is really nothing to be gained out of these government shutdowns.

So let us work together to end this government shutdown. It is completely unnecessary. It could end tomorrow if there were willingness in the White House and on the Senate side. And then let’s also work together to ensure that this is not only the longest government shutdown in American history, but also the last.

Mr. GARAMENDI. The gentleman is quite correct about the nature of the shutdown and the impact that it has on Americans.

Can I be optimistic and encourage him to figure out how to stop these from ever happening again? And when he grows a very gray head of hair and a gray beard, perhaps he will have figured it out. It just hasn’t happened.

I was around for the 1995 shutdown. I was the Deputy Secretary at the Department of the Interior, number two, and that massive Department which I spoke of earlier, the parks, the Fish and Wildlife services, all of those organizations—gone.

At that time, we did not have the requirement that essential services would be provided; there was just no body working. And that went on for, I think, 23 days, which until this week was the longest. It was a long time ago, and here we are once again and in between, I think there are ways.

I notice many of my colleagues on the Republican side are here, will soon have the opportunity to take the floor and will probably debate many of the points or agree with many of the points that I made. Mr. MEADOWS asked for time, and I didn’t put on it, to negotiate a real border security, dealing with the immigration issues, dealing with DACA, dealing with fences and border ports of entry, the kind of technology that is necessary to know what is inside that container, the kind of technology that is necessary, and the kind of personnel necessary to check not one of five cars but every car and every truck and every plane and every ship. We ought to do that. But right now we are in the heat of this, and we are not getting anywhere.

And then let’s take the time over the next 30 days, 60 days, whatever you want to put on it, to negotiate a real border security, dealing with the immigration issues, dealing with DACAs, dealing with fences and border ports of entry, the kind of technology that is necessary to know what is inside that container, the kind of technology that is necessary, and the kind of personnel necessary to check not one of five cars but every car and every truck and every plane and every ship. We ought to do that. But right now we are in the heat of this, and we are not getting anywhere.

So as he takes the floor in the next hour, I will listen and our team will listen. I would ask him to encourage his colleagues, our colleagues in the Senate, to pass the legislation that has been sent to them, which is actually the Republican appropriations bills, take a very significant major step towards reopening government, and then let’s take the time to thoughtfully, properly address a very complex, very long-lasting problem in America: immigration, border security. I know most of them, and I think that is what they would really like to do.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and avoid engaging in personalities toward the President.

THE CRISIS AT THE BORDER

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

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak about the crisis at the border, what is happening now, and what we can expect if we don’t resolve this issue.

I can’t help but comment on a few things that my good friend, the gentleman from California, said. And just in case he wasn’t paying attention, we are talking about 234 miles of border security fencing or wall or barrier of some sort, as enumerated by the Secretary of Homeland Security—not the President; the Secretary of Homeland Security.

So when he says it is unspecified where it will be and what it will be, it is very closely and very particularly specified by the Secretary of Homeland Security and the President, and it is the 10 worst sites along the border where there is no barrier now.
Let's get on with the other business of the afternoon.

Madam Speaker, I am here this afternoon with nearly a dozen of my colleagues in the House Freedom Caucus who will lay out the case, with specifics, for the President’s policy on border security, aimed at keeping America safe and enforcing our laws. These are for America’s policies.

The government has been shut down for the longest period in modern history. We are in the midst of a border crisis and whether to fund the construction of a border wall on points along our southern border.

Right now, our immigration is our single greatest policy failure, a failure that is a manufactured one. It was created from political cowardice, short-termism, and self-interest, but it is a moral, legal, and humanitarian catastrophe of epic proportions.

The President is fighting to fix it, and the Freedom Caucus is fighting to fix it right alongside him. Squarely in our way is a party gripped by denial, their policy equivalent of hear no evil and see no evil.

We learned as children that putting your head in the sand doesn’t change the reality of the situation. The facts are facts. They don’t have a political position. It is not about how we feel or what we wish the facts are. They are what they are.

Let me quote a recent Vox article, a publication, mind you, that is no friend to conservatives or the Trump Administration:

Hundreds, or even thousands, of migrant families are set to be released from government detention along the U.S.-Mexico border over the next several days. But while the mass release of families may cheer critics of the Trump administration’s treatment of immigrant families, the government’s new plan will probably lead to hundreds of families getting dropped off en masse at bus stations—literally out in the cold.

Now the U.S. Border Patrol is so jammed that it had to releasethese children legally responsible for them on Christmas Eve. And that is not the Border Patrol’s fault; it is an activist judge in California who said that Customs and Border Protection must release these individuals. But there is nowhere for these families to go. Charities at the border are full. Detention facilities at the border are full.

More quotes from the same article:

But over the summer and fall of 2018, it has become clear that really is a crisis at the border—because more families are coming to more places than U.S. officials have ever been capable of dealing with.

During the peak of unauthorized migration into the U.S. circa 2000, the overwhelming majority of migrants were single men; only 10 percent of Border Patrol apprehensions were entire families or unaccompanied children.

In November 2018, 57 percent were families or children. More families crossed the U.S.-Mexico border without documentation in November 2018 than in any month since Department of Homeland Security started tracking family apprehension separately.

More children and families crossed in November 2018 than crossed during the peak of the “border crisis” in June of 2014.

This is Vox, mind you. This is analysis from a liberal publication. Let me repeat the line.

But over the summer and fall of 2018, it has become clear that there really is a crisis at the border.

Again, this is from Vox.

Now, let me quote the Washington Post, as you know, another great fan of our President. This is an article from January 5:

In recent weeks, so many parents with children have been among the 2,000 unauthorized migrants who are being taken into Federal custody each day that authorities have resorted to mass releases of families onto the streets of El Paso and other border cities. U.S. agents are bringing dozens of migrants, including entire families, each day to clinics and hospitals after stays in jam-packed holding cells where children sleep on concrete floors and huddle in plastic sheets for warmth.

If this isn’t a crisis, can someone tell me what is?

To all reporters hyperventilating in TV studios who fact-check the Freedom Caucus and the President, I am sure it is not a crisis; but to these print reporters at Vox and The Washington Post who did their jobs and reported the news, this is a crisis.

The agency tasked with basic Federal responsibility in this situation, Customs and Border Protection, lacks the resources—literally out in the cold.

This is the current status quo. This is why we are here. This is why nothing is happening in Washington, D.C., about ending this shutdown, because some folks on the other side of the aisle, in both this body and the one across the Capitol, refuse to deal with the lack of resources.

I ask my Democratic colleagues: Is this what you support, this status quo? Do you support leaving illegal foreign nationals, human beings, on the streets of the United States at bus stations and by the side of the road? □ 1700

Do you support incentivizing them to journey through one of the highest intensity drug trafficking zones in the world, where the job of horrific things occur? Do you believe this is moral? I don’t. Neither does the President, who requested another $5 billion for detention beds so we can protect our borders and the illegal aliens who violate them. It is in writing in this president’s budget request at OMB, which I will include in the RECORD.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.


Hon. Richard Shelby,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Speaker:
The President continues to stress the need to pass legislation that will both reopen the Federal Government and address the security and humanitarian crisis at our Nation’s Southwest border.

The Administration has previously transmitted budget proposals that would provide continuing resolutions to automatically reduce the entry of illegal immigrants, criminals, and drugs; keep out terrorists, public safety threats, and those otherwise inadmissible under our laws; and that those who enter without legal permission can be promptly and safely returned home.

Appropriations bills for fiscal year (FY) 2019 that have already been considered by the current and previous Congresses are inadequate to fully address these critical issues. Any agreement for this year should satisfy the following priorities:

Border Wall, Customs and Border Protection (CBP): The President requests $5.7 billion for construction of a steel barrier for the Southwest border.

Central to any strategy to achieve operational control along the southern border is physical barrier and full funding for CBP’s Border Security Improvement Plan. This would require an increase of $4.1 billion over the FY 2019 funding level in the Senate version of the bill.

Immigration Judge Teams—Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR): The President requests an increase of $252 million in funding for 750 additional Immigration Judges and support staff to reduce the backlog of pending immigration cases. The Administration appreciates that the Senate’s FY 2019 bill provides this level of funding, and looks forward to working with the Congress on further increases in this area to facilitate an expansion of in-country processing of asylum claims.

Law Enforcement Personnel, Border Patrol Agent Hiring, CBP: The President requests $211 million to hire 750 additional Border Patrol Agents in support of his promise to keep our borders safe and secure. While the Senate’s FY 2019 bill and the House proposal with an increase of $571 million over the FY 2019 funding level in the Senate version of the bill.

Law Enforcement Personnel, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE): The President requests $751 million for 2,000 additional law enforcement personnel, as well as support staff, who enforce our U.S. immigration laws and help address gang violence, smuggling and trafficking, and the spread of drugs in our communities. This would require an increase of $571 million over the FY 2019 funding level in the Senate version of the bill.

Detention Beds, ICE: The President requests $4.2 billion to support 52,000 detention beds. Given that in recent months, the number of people attempting to cross the border illegally has risen to 2,000 per day, providing additional resources for detention and transportation is essential. This would require an increase of $706 million over the FY 2019 funding level in the Senate version of the bill.

Humanitarian Needs: The President requests an additional $300 million for urgent humanitarian needs. This includes an additional $113 million for the construction of additional temporary facilities for processing and short-term custody of this vulnerable
population, which are necessary to ensure the well-being of those taken into custody.

Counter-narcotics/weapons Technology: Beyond these specific budgetary requests, the Administration looks forward to working with Congress to provide resources in other areas to address the unprecedented challenges we face along the Southwest border. Specific proposals would prevent the flow of illicit drugs entering our country and reduce the long-term costs for border and immigration enforcement activities.

The Administration looks forward to advancing these critical priorities as part of legislation to reopen the Government.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL T. VOUGHT,
Acting Director.

Mr. PERRY. The President has asked for $800 million for things like medical care for these migrants, for transportation, for meals, and for short-term custody facilities to deal with the influx of illegal aliens our laws have caused.

He has asked for 57 new immigration judge teams to process these people, hear claims with merit, and deal with claims that do not.

And, yes, he asked for the wall to cover the 10 worst sites, as described by the Department of Homeland Security, to prevent entrants from pouring across the border, especially in the dead of winter and the extreme heat of summer.

These are rational measures, and they are humanitarian measures.

The cheap and disingenuous moralism of the Democrats in Congress has brought us to this point. They have opposed these proposals to improve this system, not only in this Congress, but in every Congress before. This is the same posturing that is worsening this crisis, and I will say it again: This is a crisis.

Now, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have a clear choice to make. They can bow to the demands of their radical base that believes there is no difference or distinction between citizen and noncitizen, or they can come to the table to work with the President, which is our job; to protect the vulnerable, including the 30 percent of women who are sexually assaulted on the trek to the U.S.-Mexican border, the children who are preyed upon by human traffickers; the innocent who are trying to make a better life for themselves but live in fear of the drug cartels and many others; to protect our borders; and to protect American citizens.

They can provide Immigration and Customs Enforcement the tools, legal and financial, to do its job.

What is not up for debate is whether the children shivering on the floor because we can’t house them is a crisis. That is the bottom line here.

Even worse, American families are losing loved ones at the hands of illegal foreign nationals under preventable circumstances—preventable, completely preventable.

Earlier today, we heard from Angel Moms, a sister and a brother, American citizens who lost loved ones because we aren’t enforcing our immigration laws. This is completely and wholly unacceptable.

We are a compassionate nation and a nation of laws, but the same laws apply to all of us. It is not this law for some and this law for others. We cannot allow ideology to prevent us from addressing the crisis. The situation is too dire for these people at risk, and the situation for America is critical.

Tonight, the House Freedom Caucus stands with the President, and I am proud to stand with my colleagues to make the case to the American people. Madam Speaker, we will next hear from Mr. Chip Roy on the effectiveness of walls, and then we will hear from Mr. Brooks from Alabama on the danger of these uncontrolled border policies to Americans, followed by Mr. Biggs from Arizona, on what it is like to live in an unsecured border because he lives in Arizona.

We will hear from Mr. Hice on opioids and the way our porous borders contribute to that crisis that is affecting every single town in the country. Mr. Yoho; Mr. Meadows, our great chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina; as well as Mr. Cloud from Texas.

This evening, we are going to get beyond the talking points and specifically lay out our case.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Roy).

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as a proud Texan, I am proud to give my first remarks on the floor of the United States House of Representatives today on the important issue of border security, critical to my district and critical to the State of Texas and our Nation.

Hundreds of thousands of people seek to come to this country, both legally and illegally, each year. They are drawn to the hope of the greatest free society the world has ever known. But we are in danger of losing that which separates us from the other nations of the world, the rule of law. Nowhere is that more pronounced than the chaos and the lawlessness of our southern border.

Freedom cannot flourish in chaos. Prosperity cannot emerge from fear. Yet, we have failed to secure our Nation because Members on both sides of the aisle have buried their heads in the sand over the last several decades, talking instead of doing. Americans are weary of our opinions and ready to see us do the job we were sent here to do.

This isn’t about numbers or statistics. It is about people. It is about Jared Vargas, a vibrant young college student studying computer science with dreams of working in the cybersecurity field. His life was cut tragically short when he was brutally murdered by an illegal alien in San Antonio last June.

Jared’s mother, Lori; his twin brother; and his younger sister don’t care if I personally believe fences would be more effective than drones, or vice versa. And they don’t care if any of my colleagues believes that 2,026 homicide charges against illegal aliens in 2018 is not enough to justify a border wall. For them, one matters enough.

The Vargas family does care that Jared’s murderer had been convicted of murder twice and had been arrested for a DWI and released just a month before he killed Jared.

This current debate before us has a face. It has a name. That name is Jared. And his family wants justice for Jared.

But it is also about the little girl who, today, will be exploited by drug cartels who know that sex trafficking can be more lucrative than trafficking drugs.

It is about the young woman in Central America who saves money and pays every last dime she has to someone who promises to take her to a better life in America, only to be forced into a shipping container. She wakes up in Greece to find that she has been sold into the sex trade, and there is no one around her who speaks her language.

According to Doctors Without Borders, roughly one-third of women making their way across the border are victims of sexual assault. I am old enough to remember, as a Senate lawyer, when Senator Tom Coburn spoke on the Senate floor in 2007 about rape trees. I find it unacceptable that today, a decade later, we are still in this place, where our colleagues believe we have failed to do anything as a body, as a Congress.

In my visits to the border, one thing is clear: Dangerous cartels are calling the shots. I am down here at night. I am by myself. I have no cell, no radio. I can’t see the river
through the thick cane. I can’t drive along the river. And the cartels have operational control of the border.

That is what we are sending our guys down on the river, in the Rio Grande, to do to defend this Nation. So it is up to us to put partisanship aside and secure our border. Fences, cameras, radios, cell phones, more Border Patrol agents, additional immigration judges, cleared cane, navigable roads along the river, we need all these tools.

To be clear, that is what is in the President’s plan. That is what we are fighting to get. To be clear again, fences are a vital and necessary part of that security.

It is absurd for anyone to argue that fences do not work, take your pick of an example throughout history, from the wall around medieval fortresses to the fencing around the White House and our military installations today.

Ask yourself whether leaving your yard open, monitored by drones, will save you from liability if a child falls in your pool.

The truth is, fences have worked since the dawn of time. Currently, we have seen a 40% reduction in crossings along the San Diego sector of the border. Before construction began in 1986, there were 630,000 arrests. Compare that to almost 32,000 arrests in 2016.

Fences work. Yet, 10 years ago, I heard members of the Senate Judiciary Committee assure that fences don’t work because migrants then shifted from California to Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas.

Only in Washington is that logic passable. Fences don’t work because they worked? That may have been the first time, though it won’t be the last, that I heard someone say fencing is a 1st or 3rd or 18th century solution for a 21st century problem.

But in El Paso, in Yuma, in Tucson, in Mexico, fencing was put in place, and we have seen reductions of up to 90 percent or more in illegal crossings.

This body has repeatedly authorized foreign assistance to our allies to help secure our own.

We have repeatedly authorized fencing for the United States of America, but we are here today trying to actually get it funded and get it built. It is time we stop worrying about things that everybody in America knows.

In Texas, let’s stop talking. Let’s go down to Brownsville. Let’s start building the fence where we need it and work our way up the river.

To my colleague who was speaking early about, well, where is the fence going to go? If we face an obstacle, let’s discuss it. If a rancher needs access to water, we consider leaving an opening, post a guard, put up a camera, and then continue moving up the river.

Let’s go for one simple goal. The United States of America should have operational control over its borders, not dangerous cartels.

Many on both sides of the aisle like to pretend that we shouldn’t build a fence because it might be possible to go over or under it. Of course, that is possible, but that is not a reason not to build a fence.

The fundamental question is this: Are we more secure with agents and drones, or are we more secure with agents, drones, and fences?

This is not a partisan issue: It is an humanitarian issue. It is time for us to stop bickering or hiding behind excuses and secure the border now.

It is time for America to reclaim operational control of its border, pay Federal workers who are doing their job, and make America secure again.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS), the chairman of the Freedom Caucus.

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise today because we have just heard, an hour before we came on the House floor, more debate about opening the government than when we actually have had people negotiate to actually open the government.

You know, there are all kinds of reasons why everyone is saying that the government is shut down, but the biggest reason is because no one is willing to negotiate on the other side of the aisle.

I can tell you, the President, 16 blocks from here, was sitting here over Christmas and over New Year’s, and, indeed, were here last weekend when 30 of my colleagues from across the aisle went to Puerto Rico on a junket with lobbyists to talk about how important the government shutdown must be to them.

Well, I can tell you that the biggest fallacy in all of this is that all the problems that my colleagues oppose seem to demonstrate, and the urgency that is there, I haven’t seen the urgency.

We come in; we get sworn in; and what happens? They go home. The second weekend, what happens? They go to Puerto Rico.

Even today, while the President invites Democrat colleagues to go 16 blocks from here and negotiate on how we may solve this, what do they do? They turn down the President.

Now, I can tell you, Madam Speaker, that there are a lot of things that are said on this particular House floor, but more than I have heard over the last week when we have our colleagues who were suggesting that this is easy to fix. They are exactly right. It is easy to fix. All we have to do is provide a little funding for border security and build a wall, because we have a stake are the lives of innocent people.

Madam Speaker, I looked in the face of moms today who had lost their kids. It truly broke my heart to think that, here we are debating this issue, and yet, for some reason, my colleagues opposite won’t give a single dime.

Let’s find a single Democrat who is willing to give any amount of money to border barriers, and let’s have a negotiation.

But you know what? You can’t find them. You can’t find them, not because they are in Puerto Rico. You can’t find them because they have built a wall between us and the very communities that we’re here to protect.

So, Madam Speaker, I am here today to suggest that we are here willing to negotiate. We are here willing to open back up the government, but not until the Democrats are willing to meet us halfway.

I can tell you, this President stands ready to make a deal, but, quite frankly, it has been only one side of the equation willing to negotiate.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership. I thank all my colleagues for being willing to stand up.

Let’s get this done right. Let’s secure the border once and for all. And let’s, indeed, make America safe again.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, in 2018, more than 2,000 illegal aliens were apprehended by Federal law enforcement officers for homicides committed on American soil; that is roughly 2,000 dead in just 1 year. And that does not count some number of the 70,000 Americans whose lives are snuffed out each year by poisonous drugs, much of which is shipped illegally into America across our porous southern border.

Americans would know more about these horrific killings if the media devotes just a fraction of the time it spends on extolling illegal aliens and attacking our brave border patrol and ICE officers and agents to telling the stories of American lives needlessly ended by illegal aliens and our porous southern border.

Today I share a few stories about those who died solely because of illegal aliens and our porous southern border.

Louise Sollowin was a beloved mother, wife, and grandmother. Louise spent 50 years helping her sister fire up the oven at Omaha, Nebraska’s, Orsi’s Italian Bakery, where she worked well into her 80s.

In 2013, after 93 years of life, Louise was brutally raped and beaten to death by an illegal alien. To make matters even more horrific, Louise’s daughter found her bleeding, battered, and dying mother with a naked illegal alien by an illegal alien. To make matters even more horrific, Louise’s daughter found her bleeding, battered, and dying mother with a naked illegal alien passed out on top of her.

In 2010 in Houston, Texas, 14-year-old Shatavia Anderson was shot in the chest and killed by two illegal aliens. Shatavia loved her family and loved talking on the phone. She proclaimed that one day she was “gonna be somebody.” Shatavia was robed of that dream by illegal aliens.

In July 2018 in my hometown of Houma, Louisiana, two drug-cartel related illegal aliens took Oralia Mendez and her 13-year-old granddaughter, Mariah Lopez, from their
Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama and yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

Mr. HICE. Madam Speaker, a part of this group dealing with a problem that we all know is a reality and yet so few seem to be willing to do anything about.

We have thousands of new aliens entering our country every day, and this surge of illegal immigrants flooding across our porous borders puts our Nation at risk in more ways than one.

In 2017 alone, more than 900 Americans died every week from the opioid-related crisis and overdoses. Every American, everyone in this chamber knows personally someone who has been affected by this, be it a family member, a friend, a coworker, a neighbor, where the opioid crisis has penetrated into these lives. And its advance is unprecedented, marching down the streets of our Nation.

The story of the opioid epidemic certainly begins many times with prescription pain medications, pharmaceutical companies, pill mills, overprescribing in many of these kinds of ways, but today we see the opioid crisis being driven by the widespread availability of cheap, powerful drugs like heroin, often laced with synthetic opioids like fentanyl.

Make no mistake about it: this is a human tragedy. It is a family tragedy. It is a national tragedy. It is a national crisis that we are facing right now, largely because of loopholes that we have in our immigration laws, but also unquestionably because of the physical barriers that don’t exist. As a result, we have illegals continuing to storm into our country and bring with them all sorts of illegal activity.

Earlier today, I stood alongside my colleagues and families who have been so personally impacted, have lost loved ones because of our deeply flawed immigration policies and so forth.

One in particular I met today Susan Stevens. Susan had a daughter, Victoria, who 1 year ago next week lost her life. She was a cheerleader, she was an artist. She was a vibrant young lady whose life was taken from this world largely because of our inability to deal with and stop the smuggling of illegal drugs coming into our country and to secure our border.

We have all heard the statistics. Nearly 90 percent of heroin coming into our country comes into our country by way of the southern border, 90 percent. Sadly, stories like Victoria Stevens’ are becoming all too common; we are hearing these stories on a daily basis.

I am stunned when my colleagues on the other side look at the President’s cry at this national crisis at our border as some sort of political stunt. This is no political stunt. This is reality.

Two weeks ago we all watched as Speaker Pelosi jokingly made the claim that she would be willing to give a single dollar to secure our border. I would remind the Speaker, this is no joking matter and this is no laughing matter. These are real lives. This is a Nation that is being impacted by her refusal to deal with the issue at hand.

This country ought to be a safe haven for law-abiding citizens, but instead we are watching communities that have become vulnerable and susceptible to crime.

How many more families need to lose loved ones before we take action? How much more does it matter to us to see the laugh of their child because we are not taking action right here, before we secure our borders? What is it going to take? The Mexican cartels are a cunning enemy, and yet Democrats refuse to acknowledge the situation. They call it a manufactured crisis.

I guarantee you, had they been here today with the dangerous drugs, illegal activities, and our broken borders.

This is precisely why we must deal with the President’s request for a border wall and to do so immediately. The consequences are too dire. We cannot continue to wait.

We are here today committed to ensuring the integrity of our borders and the safety of the American people through the building of the wall on our southern border. We are here today fighting for the families of the victims who want a reasonable immigration system to protect our children and our grandchildren.

Tackling this immigration problem and protecting American families from criminal aliens is a fundamental responsibility and duty that we all have, and I am honored to stand with my colleagues to press this issue and to call the Democrats to come to the table and deal with the issue.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, again, I thank my friend, I appreciate such the time.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, you know why we can’t get a deal on the border security wall? You know why we can’t get a deal? Because today’s left has taken the most radical positions in American history.

They applaud Kaepernick when he disrespects the flag, they embrace Governor Cuomo when he says America disrespects the flag, they embrace Governor Cuomo when he says America disrespects the flag, they embrace Governor Cuomo when he says America disrespects the flag, they embrace Governor Cuomo when he says America disrespects the flag, they embrace Governor Cuomo when he says America disrespects the flag.
Mr. Speaker, this is not just a fight about a border security wall. It is bigger than that. It is about those fundamental values, those fundamental principles, that make us the greatest Nation in history.

The House Freedom Caucus and the House Republicans stand with our President. We know there needs to be a border security wall. We know this needs to happen to deal with all the things that have been talked about. That is why we are here. That is why this fight is so fundamental. And that is why it is important we stand with the President of the United States and make sure it gets done.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for organizing this.

To be honest with you, I really can’t believe we still have to have this conversation. The idea that the United States of America should turn a blind eye to protecting its national borders violates one of the few responsibilities enumerated to the Federal Government in the Constitution, the one we just swore an oath to just a couple weeks ago, to ensure the security of our Nation and provide for its defense. How can anyone argue that we are safer as a nation by not having any idea who is entering and exiting our borders?

Unlike many Members of Congress, I was born and raised in southern Arizona, mere miles to the Mexican border, not too far away, an hour or so drive. I have met with Border Patrol agents, and all, I mean all, all sizes, all colors, all talents come to so they can chase down their goals, chase down their dreams, make life better for themselves and their family.

That is this country: a special place, where people come and respect the Constitution, cherish the Bill of Rights, and embrace the rule of law.

But today’s left, specifically on this issue, Democrat Congressman BLUMENAUER said, abolish ICE; Secretary Clinton, when she was running for the highest office in the land, said we need a borderless hemisphere; Speaker PELOSI said walls are immoral. And just last week, Stacey Abrams, Governor candidate from the State of Georgia, said noncitizens should be able to vote. Think about that: noncitizens should be able to vote.

Americans believe, Republicans believe, the House Freedom Caucus believes that borders need to be strong. Americans believe, with good reason, that immigration needs to be secure. Americans and Republicans and the House Freedom Caucus believe that a border security wall will help stop the drug problem, the gang problem, and the human trafficking problem.

Mr. Biggs. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, when she says go out and harass anyone who supports the wall, was never that great, and they cheer on the Democrats. The Democrats have lost their country.

This is important. This is why this is important. That is why this construction was needed. That is why this is important. That is why this construction was needed.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, when she says go out and harass anyone who supports the wall, was never that great, and they cheer on the Democrats. The Democrats have lost their country. This is why this construction was needed. That is why this construction was needed.
when House Speaker PELOSI, in arguing against more funding for security at the southern border, claimed that President Trump was “manufacturing a crisis.”

The facts on the border establish that a crisis exists. According to the Department of Homeland Security data, 161,000 family units arrived in fiscal year 2018, an increase of 50 percent, and 60,000 unaccompanied children arrived in the same time period, an increase of 25 percent. Asylum claims have increased 2,000 percent in the past 5 years, although most of these claims will be found invalid later, after judicial review.

These surging numbers are overwhelming our resources on the border and creating a humanitarian, security, and legal crisis.

The Mexican side of the border is often controlled by Mexican criminal cartels or gangs. They charge a fee to assist border crossings. To get here, many migrants put themselves in the hands of these vicious smuggling gangs, which are looking for profit and are uninterested in basic human dignity.

On the dangerous journey to the border, 7 out of 10 migrants suffer from violence, and 81 percent of women and 71 percent of men are sexually assaulted. Too often, the fees these gangs charge are indentured servitude in the sex trade. Porous borders only encourage more business for the criminal gangs who commit these abuses.

Further, more than people are being brought across the border, as you have heard. Increased amounts of illicit substances are entering as well. Meth, trafficked across the border by these cartels into places across the country, including my district in southwest Virginia, increased by 38 percent from fiscal year 2017 to fiscal year 2018. That same period saw a 22 percent increase in heroin and an astonishing 75 percent increase in fentanyl.

Even when current security measures intercept people crossing the border illegally, there isn’t enough room in facilities to detain these individuals until a judicial hearing can be held. Accordingly, most illegal immigrants are released with notice to appear at a hearing in the future. The time of the hearing, they have either disappeared back into the clutches of the cartels or into the underground economy.

In my opinion, these facts classify the situation on the southern border as a crisis.

President Trump has asked for $5.7 billion to build a barrier on the southern border and additional funding for personnel. What is more, he is willing to negotiate with the Democrats in the House and in the Senate. Congressional Republicans are also ready to compromise.

In contrast, Democratic leaders refuse to budge. They say they will give no money for a wall. Speaker PELOSI even called a wall immoral.

Her views on a barrier’s immorality may come as a surprise to many on her side of the aisle. When Congress voted on the Secure Fence Act, which provided for 700 miles of fencing in 2006, it received the support of 64 Democrats in the House and 26 in the Senate, including CHUCK SCHUMER, now the Senate Democrat leader, and then-Senators Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton.

Instead, she appears afraid to get to yes on a deal with the President. Speaker PELOSI appears to be afraid to get to yes on a deal with the President.

Another objection she has raised to the wall is that illegal drugs and other smuggled goods also come through our legal ports of entry rather than across the border. President Trump responded by including an additional $755 million to combat smuggling at the ports of entry.

Further, Democrats say the government should be reopened before they can come to the table. But when debating immigration last summer, the House Democrats never offered a compromise on a wall. When debating spending bills this fall, House Democrats never offered to compromise on a wall.

For 30 years, the American people have been promised a barrier on the southern border. Particularly for the last 4 months when the government was, in fact, open, the last 4 months of 2018, House Democrats didn’t offer a solution. Why? Because we believe now that, if the government is reopened, they will suddenly find a way to compromise?

Reaching a compromise is difficult when one side doesn’t admit there is a problem. A porous border has caused a crisis.

I urge Speaker PELOSI to come to the table. Let’s talk about ways to secure the border, protect the American people, end the humanitarian crisis, and reopen the government.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding on such an important topic.

I am glad to be here tonight because I think it is important that we go out and make our case to the American people and tell the truth, which is not what you are going to hear in the media or from our Democratic colleagues, as we have heard earlier today.

The government now has been shut down for 25 days, breaking the record for the longest partial government shutdown in history. We would like to express our empathy and concern for those affected, and may this be resolved sooner than later.

Why has this been so long? Because Democrats refuse to come to the table to negotiate a solution. Instead, they would rather bring up messaging bills that don’t fund vital programs. Also, they can say they didn’t support President Trump’s border wall.

In fact, today, we passed a bill that passed in the House that we passed last Congress. It was on hatred and hate speech and all that. They won’t address this issue. They want to walk away from this.

They don’t want to support President Trump’s border wall so they can go to their constituents and say they won. This is all about the 2020 Presidential election. They aren’t concerned about border security or the security of the American people.

This is not a game. We are not talking about a game. We are talking about the rule of law, security for the American people and our Nation.

This President has been confronted with an unprecedented degree of obstruction from the Democratic Party. President Trump has asked the Democratic leadership if they would negotiate over the wall if the government was reopened. Speaker PELOSI said no. She has said over and over again that walls are immoral and not one penny for a wall.

Ms. PELOSI, I am asking you, and the American people are asking you, to do the right thing: negotiate border security and pay our patriotic workers who aren’t getting paid.

This obstruction is unnecessary and hypocritical. How is funding for border security unreasonable? The answer is that it isn’t.

Democrats have supported fences at the border in the past. In 2006, over half the Democratic Senators, including Hillary Clinton, CHUCK SCHUMER, and Barack Obama, voted to build 700 miles of security fence; 138 Democratic House Members voted for that bill.

Democrats must realize the importance of border security but would rather sacrifice security for political gamesmanship. This is a matter of national security and can no longer be ignored.

On average, 2,000 inadmissible, illegal migrants arrive at our southern border daily. That means, in the last 25 days, approximately 50,000 illegal migrants have sought entry at our border without going through the proper channels.

I remain a strong supporter of border security and will continue to defend the need for this essential funding. Our porous border and weak enforcement laws have allowed for illegal immigration, drug smuggling, and human trafficking to go unchecked.

Just last night, three MS–13 gang members were picked up and arrested for smuggling 16-year-old Gibbs. Their ages were 20, 19, and 17. All three were gang members of MS–13. Two of them had been previously released by a Federal judge, and all confirmed that they came into this country in 2016 under President Obama’s illegal DACA program.

If you talk to the Democrats, they tell you that $5.7 billion is too much to
pay for protection at our southern border; but what they won’t tell you is, if the U.S. were to grant amnesty or a path to citizenships for all illegal aliens currently living in our country, it would cost an estimated $2.6 trillion. That is an easy choice from the perspective of $5.7 billion as the price to pay for our national security.

We are facing unprecedented obstructionism from the Democrats, and we can’t reward them by backing down. We can and will win if we continue to fight.

When I talk to people in my district, when you can break down why are we here, what our cause is, and what our principles are, they support us. People on the border that are border security guards support us.

That is why I believe the Democrats will have to come to their senses and negotiate as more and more Americans support our view from what you have heard here today. I appreciate the Freedom Caucus for standing up and pointing these things out.

Meanwhile, this shutdown wore on through the weekend, and I along with my Republican colleagues stayed in town to end it, but the Democrats chose to stay home to watch the Government Convention in 2016. They put up a barrier. They won’t deal. In the face of their refusal to negotiate, we don’t have any choice. I and my colleagues are prepared to be here through the weekend, every weekend, until we can put enough pressure on the other party to be reasonable and come to a solution.

The right thing to do is to negotiate.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD).

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, we hear that walls don’t work, yet this is a picture of the Democratic National Convention in 2016. They put up a barrier. They put up a fence because they wanted to protect themselves like people in America want to protect themselves.

And there is a lovely gate, wall. They have them everywhere there is something that needs to be secured. Every single Democrat who is standing against securing our border has an outer wall because of definition laws.

If walls don’t work, they can eliminate that. People can come and go as they please. But they know deep down in their hearts, they secure their dead bolts. They secure their home. They may even have a wall around their outer wall because walls work.

Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.
in this Chamber just thinking about the history of our Nation and the historical moments that have taken place in here.

I love giving tours of the Capitol to constituents when they come. I bring them into this Chamber and, as they sit here, I share with them that it is from this rostrum behind me that President Franklin Roosevelt gave his day of infamy speech.

We walk down the hallway and we go to the rotunda, the magnificent rotunda that has portraits hanging in the rotunda that depict the history of America. I share with them about how this is the greatest legislative body in the history of the world.

We have become the envy of other nations, our deliberative bodies, for the strength of America and all that we have accomplished in this Nation, the mind-boggling things that we have accomplished, from aerospace to business and the ingenuity of America, because of the strength of our freedom that has been built by a legislative body that brings the different sides together and negotiates to come up with solutions, solutions that are good for America.

Our strength isn’t because we have always agreed. We, quite frankly, disagree. And our disagreements go back to the beginning of our Nation.

In that rotunda is a portrait portraying a turning point in American history, John Adams and John Dickinson from the American Colonies by Great Britain. They only disagreed on how to deal with it.

As I mention that, and as you know from history, the second vote barely passed. John Dickinson remained opposed to declaring independence. In fact, he was the last one on the resolution when it was brought before the floor. However, as soon as the resolution passed, John Dickinson left Philadelphia, and he joined the fight for independence.

We are at an impasse here in this historic Chamber today, not because we have a differing opinion, but because we are even refusing to come together to lay out the facts, to lay out the ideas, and to lay out the various solutions to this problem.

We are the greatest, most powerful, and most influential legislative body in the world. We have been the envy of the entire world. Other nations have modeled or tried to model their legislative bodies after ours. But we should be embarrassed to where we are today because the system is broken, and it isn’t once and for all. It is broken because of what we have turned this into. We have broken the system because we have chosen to ignore our own rules, our own laws, and our own procedures.

Most Americans may not realize it, but we have a deadline. We have a deadline every year of September 30 to fully fund the government. But the last time that was done was in the 1990s. We have continued to kick the can down the road. Every September we get to the point that we just do a continuing resolution, and we put it off to another date and to another date until we get to a point that creates a crisis and we must fund the government. Then somebody holds the funding of the government hostage for what they call political partisan reason that they want.

The 4 years I have been in Congress I have worked diligently with others to try to change this status quo system of ignoring our own laws, rules, and procedures and consolidating the power of appropriations to just a few who get to call the shots and allow others to hold the American workers, the citizens, and the businesses that rely on those workers who were furloughed, hold them hostage in a purely partisan wrangling. I don’t like where we are. I don’t like the way the process is broken. We should not be here because we should have fully funded the entire government before the end of September.

Now, to give credit where credit is due, over the last couple of years the House Republicans have made great efforts to try to accomplish that. In 2017, we were actually able to pass all 12 of our appropriations bills out of this Chamber before the deadline. It didn’t happen in the Senate, but we were able to do it here. This year we made an even greater accomplishment; we passed several of them. We passed five out of here that also went to the Senate. The Senate passed it. It went to the President’s desk, and he signed it. But it is those remaining appropriations bills that have us where we are today because we did not follow our own rules.

I don’t like it. Most of the Members I know on our side don’t like it. My dad, a World War II veteran, used to give me a piece of advice. He said: Son, if something is something in life you don’t like, you have two choices. You can do something to change the situation or just accept the status quo and go on with your life. But complaining never accomplishes anything.

We are at an impasse where two sides have dug in on what they both claim are ideological principles. Let’s look at where we are. One side, the Republican side, believes that the drug trafficking, the weapon trafficking, human trafficking, sex trafficking, and most importantly, travel coming across the border is a national security and humanitarian crisis. In fact, the Vice President, when he met with us last week, used those words, that this is a national security and humanitarian crisis. But you only have to look at the border. The President of the United States also agrees that we have a crisis at the border.

However, the other side that is also dug in, the Democrats, don’t believe that we have a crisis. In fact, the talking points of the day have been, as you heard earlier, that the crisis has been manufactured, that the desire to build a border wall or a physical barrier is a vanity project for the President, or as one reporter stated as he was at the border, he said: Things are tranquil here.

So we have one side claiming a crisis, and the other side claiming conspiracy.

I believe we do have a crisis at the border. I believe that that crisis is real and that crisis has been going on for quite some time. As you can see on the board next to me here, I am not the only one who believes that not only do we have a crisis but we have had a crisis that has existed for quite some time.

The President of the United States in 2014 stated: “We now have an actual humanitarian crisis on the border.” In fact, what he said was: “We now have an actual humanitarian crisis on the border that only underscores the need to drop the politics and fix our immigration system once and for all.”

Now, some of you who are watching on television right now will look at that and immediately attribute that to our current President, President Trump. But if you think back, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States in 2014 was President Barack Obama. He is the one who said: Yes, we do have a crisis. It is a humanitarian crisis at the border.

But it is some of my Democratic colleagues on the other side say that the crisis doesn’t exist, that it is manufactured, and that it is a conspiracy. It really doesn’t exist. Things are tranquil.
Well then you have to ask the question: What changed?

We must have done something significant during that time period. But nothing has changed. We still have the status quo when it comes to our border and border security.

In fact, President Obama went on to say: "In recent weeks we've seen a surge of unaccompanied children arrive at the border, brought here and to other countries by smugglers and traffickers.

"The journey is unbelievably dangerous for these kids. The children who are fortunate enough to survive it will be taken care of while they go through the legal process, but in most cases that process will lead them to being sent back home."

This is exactly what our current President is saying. We have a humanitarian crisis as well as a national security crisis. In fact, for the 4 years I have served in Congress, I have been saying: What is this crisis at the border? It should not be categorized just as an immigration crisis, but it is a national security crisis.

When I served on the Homeland Security Committee, we had many briefings by the then-Obama administration Department of Homeland Security who went through all of what was going on at the border, the crossings at the border, the drugs, the weapons, and who were they intercepting, and I identified at that time that we had a crisis at the border.

But this issue at the border goes beyond the time I have been in Congress. It has been going on for decades. It is a decades-old problem that because of status quo, because of the broken system that we are working under, because politicians are comfortable with the status quo, we have not done anything to address it.

In 2006, I was serving in the State legislature in Georgia. I was a young businessman who didn't like the way things were going in the State, so I took the advice of my father that if there is something in life you don't like, do something to change the situation. So I ran for the State house, and I was elected.

We were dealing with issues in Georgia of immigration. In fact, a young man by the name of Dustin Inman had lost his life because an illegal immigrant hit the car killing Dustin Inman and permanently making his mom disabled. It appeared to us that the Federal Government, the Congress in Washington, D.C., wasn't doing anything to fix the situation, so a group of legislators got together.

We said: Look, we may have to address some of this on our own. So we will go to the border. We will spend several days at the border to see what is going on ourselves.

Border security at the border. I spent time with Border Patrol agents. We went up and down the border. They showed us where the physical barriers were working, but they also showed us where they had problems, and it was usually where the physical barrier ended. They shared with us the lack of funding that they had and the lack of adequate Border Patrol agents. They told us of the dangers that they were facing, but also showed us the frustrations of catch and release.

We also spent the night with a rancher, after we had met with several residents who lived along the border. They were telling us the horrific stories of crime on their property and in their neighborhoods, because of the cartel activity going on at the border. While we sat at this rancher's home that evening—because of the lack of the adequate number of Border Patrol agents, he had to set up his own security systems and surveillance systems just to protect his property and protect his employees on his ranch.

I kept a journal. The other day I went back, and I pulled that journal out from 2006. I was reading over my experiences, and I got to the last entry of that journal that I wrote when I went home. That journal said: I believe the government in Washington, D.C., doesn't want to solve the problem at our southern border.

Again, they are happy with the status quo.

Americans have been asking Congress to do something, not just about illegal immigration but about the drugs coming across into our Nation. As you heard earlier, the Department of Homeland Security has intercepted enough fentanyl used in opioids to kill every single one of the entire population of the United States. They want us to do something about the sex trafficking, other drugs coming across the border, weapons, criminal activity, human trafficking, and terrorism, the terrorists who are traveling across the border.

But we can't solve any of these issues nor reopen this government until we are willing and ready to come together and have a national debate, a debate about the merits of each side. Each side needs to come forward and present what their priorities are and what their ideas are for the solutions.

Republicans have done that. We have laid out several different ideas and several different solutions. We have yet to hear anything from our colleagues on the other side except for the word no. We must lay out our priorities. We must lay out our ideas, not just hurl insults at each side.

Then we must debate, and the debate must be based on truth, on facts, not perceptions and not accusations. It has to be based on what the American people, not what is best for the politicians or political victory or preparing for the next election.

If we are going to get to this place there has to be something that takes place. First of all, we have to have meetings, we have to have discussion, and we have to have negotiation. Just as Dr. Benjamin Franklin did at the onset of this Nation, he brought the parties together in meetings. They began discussing, and then they started negotiating. That is how they came up with compromise.

You have to have all three. You can't have one without the other. You can't have a discussion without first having a meeting.

Two weeks ago, congressional leaders were invited to the White House to; first of all, have a meeting to discuss, Where do we go from here to end the shutdown; to do something about border security; to move forward? But the answer given to the President when he asked was: Are you willing to negotiate border security which includes building a physical barrier?

The answer was no, end of story, end of discussion.

Meetings aren't effective unless you actually are able to have a discussion and both sides are willing to negotiate. Mr. Speaker, you also have to be able to deal with facts. Both sides have to be able to deal with facts. Again, the President invited leadership of the House to the White House to the Situation Room to discuss the facts and the issues that you have heard several of here tonight.

However, as the Secretary of Homeland Security began to go through these issues one by one, she was interrupted by the Speaker of the House, Ms. Pelosi, and was told that she wasn't interested in hearing the facts. In fact, according to a news media report, it was, "I reject your facts."

Secretary Nielsen said: "These aren't my facts, they are the facts."

I want to deal with the truth, the facts. One question that I always asked back home is: Your colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to say they are for border security, they are for national security and they just don't want a wall. Well, that is a question I have. So when the Democrats rejected the facts that came from the Department of Homeland Security about the atrocities that are going on, the criminal activity that is going on, the President took it upon himself, and he sent it to Members of Congress. Immediately upon receiving this data, my
colleagues and my friends on the other side started dismissing the data.

When it came out in 2017 that the Department of Homeland Security intercepted 3,755 terrorists, that number was immediately challenged. And the other side was quick to point out, well, not all of those were caught at the border.

And they were right: not all were caught at the southern border. In fact, they properly pointed out that many of them were caught at our ports of entry at airports, so we should focus in that area and not on a border wall, even though a number were caught at the border.

Well, that is fine. They say they are for border security; however, I question that because, when President Trump, in his first year in office, identified this very problem, that we had terrorists coming in from nations that are known to harbor, train, and fund terrorists and he tried to put a travel ban on people coming in from those countries, the Democrats objected to it and actually took it to court and tried to stop him from actually implementing that.

So it leads to the question: Do they really want border security?

When the statistic came out that 6,000 illegals associated with gangs have been apprehended by ICE, again my colleagues challenged that statistic and brought up that, well, only 800 gang members were actually apprehended at the southern border—only 800.

Just the other day, the district attorney of one of the largest counties in Georgia said that the greatest threat to Georgians today is gangs. And, as we started looking at how do these gang members come in, our colleagues on the other side adequately pointed out that most of these gang members were not coming across the border, but they were here as a result of visa overstays. “But we really want border security, so we should address that.”

Last year, H.R. 4760, in June, was brought to this floor, which actually made visa overstays a Federal misdemeanor, but my colleagues on the other side did one of them—voted against that bill.

The Department of Homeland Security also put out the statistic that 17,000 adults were detained at the southern border with criminal records. The other side has made the argument that these are just families that want a better life.

Again, they have rejected the facts. So my question is: Do they really want border security? Are they really willing to come to the table and lay out what their priorities for border security really are?

Is it port security at our airports? Well, obviously, they opposed the President when he took that route.

Is it addressing visa overstays? Well, obviously they voted against that bill when we brought it forward.

Do they really want to keep the government open and address border security? Well, they all voted against the continuing resolution the Republicans brought to the floor back in December and opted to close the government.

Do I believe that my colleagues want terrorists to come into the Nation? No, I do not.

Do I believe they want more gang members to infiltrate our communities? No, I don’t believe that is what they want.

I don’t believe they don’t think that there is a crisis at the border. I just think that they are happy with the status quo.

You see, this city often runs on people who have learned how to navigate the swamp. They learn how to use the status quo to their advantage.

And if you go back and you look over the history of this Nation, especially the modern history of this body of Congress, we are still debating several of the issues that we were debating 10, 15, and 20 years ago. It seems that these become campaign issues more than they are issues that we want to resolve for the American people. Why? Because we don’t want to address the status quo.

What we have in the White House right now is a President whose main objective is to change the status quo in Washington, to change the way we do things. Those ideas I support because what we are doing now is broken. The way we are doing it now is broken.

There is only one way out of this situation. It is for my colleagues from the other side of the aisle to actually agree to attend the meetings.

In fact, the President opened up the White House today for another meeting to start discussing and hopefully get to negotiations, but the leadership on the Democratic side refused to even show up.

We offered several compromises last year in December to avoid the shutdown, but the resounding response we received from the other side was “no.” Every attempt that we have brought to this floor to try to resolve the situation at the border has been met with a resounding “no.”

At some point, we have to get away from our own partisan political wrangling and understand that what we are doing is for the safety and the security of the American people. It is time to quit just saying “no” and say “but if.”

I appreciate every person who was elected to represent the American people, but now is the time to sit down, to negotiate and understand so we can reopen the government and, more importantly, ensure the safety and the security of all Americans.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
This doesn’t even include the amount of fentanyl that crossed our southern border in fiscal year 2017, which was enough to kill every single American via overdose.

If you talk to the Democrats, they will tell you $5.7 billion is too much to pay for protection at our southern border, but what they won’t tell you is how much more it costs the Federal Government and American citizens by not securing our border.

The argument the Democrats want you to believe is that this argument is strictly about the border wall. Therefore, they fear, if President Trump gets any funding for the wall, they lose, like this is some kind of game that we are playing to win.

This is about them wanting power and winning the White House in 2020—shameful.

This is about border security, period.

Democrats, I ask you to do what is right: Come to the negotiating table to end this shutdown. You don’t lose, but America wins.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, Americans pay the price for our failure to secure our southern border in many, many ways. Our failure to control our southern border is a national disgrace.

Some of the ways Americans pay for our failure is through illegal immigration, reduced wages from illegal immigration, drugs, violent crime, human trafficking, gangs, abuse of our welfare system, and potential terrorism.

There are too many to explore here, but I want to focus on just a few of the larger problems. One is illegal immigration.

First, I want to say I am not anti-immigration. I am anti-illegal immigration.

You have to understand that, as a sovereign country, we have the right to decide who and how many people are allowed to become citizens of our country. And we are a very, very generous nation. Don’t let anybody tell you that, because we are against illegal immigration, we are not a generous nation.

We accept 1.1 million legal immigrants per year. That is almost twice as much as the next highest country—1.1 million legal immigrants per year.

Now, let’s talk about that number—Is it too high, too low—but that is what the law allows.

Most countries use their immigration system to make themselves more competitive, and that is what I am all about: make America great again, make the United States competitive again. You see, a competitive economy makes America the land of opportunity, and I am all about opportunity for my children and grandchildren and your children and grandchildren.

Most countries use the immigration system to make themselves more competitive by using high-skilled immigration. In other words, if you have a skill set or an educational background that that country needs, you go to the front of the line.

Our immigration system, on the other hand, is based on chain migration. Only 12 percent is skill based. That is less than half of what the average developed OECD country provides. Canada and Mexico base much more of their immigration on skill set than we do here in America.

The result of our chain immigration-based system is that primarily low-skilled, uneducated people are admitted through our legal immigration system. In fact, over half of our legal immigrants—legal immigrants. I haven’t even gotten to illegal immigration yet. Over half of our legal immigrants end up relying on our welfare system, and this clearly makes us less, not more, competitive.

President Trump and I agree that we should shift to a skill-based immigration system like Canada and Mexico have to grow our economy and give more opportunity for our children and grandchildren.

So all that is bad enough, that we base our immigration on chain migration, that 65 percent of the folks coming in here have a low skill set and over half of them end up on welfare, Medicaid, food stamps, and the like, but now let’s talk about illegal immigration.

On top of that 1.1 million primarily unskilled legal immigrant workforce that we bring in every year, we have a flood of illegal immigrants. Nobody knows exactly how many, but it is hundreds of thousands of folks. The low end of the estimates is 300,000 to 400,000 people per year on top of the 1.1 million that we admit legally.

In a 2015 study, Harvard Professor George Borjas found that legal immigration, that 1.1 million legal per year, added 25 percent to the low-skilled workforce over the last 20 years.

Then you add illegals on top of that. Professor Borjas said, for every 10 percent you add in competition, you reduce wages by at least 3 percent.

Folks, if you add 25 percent more competitors, wages will go down. That is Economics 101.

If you look at this chart, this is a chart of wage increases in the United States from 2000 until now. You can see those folks at the upper end of the scale. They are not really affected by low-skilled illegal immigration, and their wages went up and went up substantially.

If you look at the 75th percentile, they are not affected either. Their wages went up and went up substantially.

But the median income, they are flat. They haven’t had a raise in 20 years. The people at the 25th percentile, that is the lower end, they haven’t moved at all. They are the people who are the most hurt by illegal immigration, by competition from low-skilled illegal immigrants who work for nothing and who cheat hardworking Americans out of jobs and out of wages, and this chart proves it.

Let me tell you, not only does it cheat the people on the low end of the scale, but it actually helps the people on the higher end of the scale.

People like your children and your grandchildren with a high school education, people who are trying to get their heads above water but they can’t because they are drowned by a flood of illegal aliens who work for practically nothing. This primarily affects those on the lower end of the income scale, as I just showed you, who just can’t seem to get ahead.

Friends, Democrats used to say they are for the working man, and they love to talk about income inequality. The people on the high end have gone up; the people on the low end haven’t.

Well, guess what? Here is why. Illegal immigration plays a huge part in that.

So let’s stop complaining about income inequality, and let’s actually doing something about it. Let’s secure our southern border, stop the flood of illegal immigration, and let’s work for practically nothing and cheat the folks on the low end of the scale out of jobs and wages, and let’s watch wages rise.

It is not that hard to understand. It is common sense. It is Economics 101. The American middle class has suffered declines as a result of our uncompetitive economy, and illegal immigration is one of the primary reasons.

Now, let’s talk about what illegal immigration does to our social safety net.

In addition to drowning our middle class, illegal immigration strains our social safety net and costs taxpayers billions of dollars.

These figures are from the Center for Immigration Studies, and the chart represents the percentage of immigrant-led households in blue and native-born households in red.

The percentage of immigrant households that get food aid in America is 45 percent; native-born households, 21 percent. So illegal immigrants get twice as much food aid as native-born citizens.

Medicaid. 50 percent of illegal immigrants get some type of Medicaid benefit; only 23 percent of native-born Americans.

Cash benefits, when you include the earned income tax credit, 31 percent of illegal immigrants get some form of cash subsidy from the United States Government; only 10 percent of native-born Americans.

If you take all that in total, 63 percent of illegal immigrants get some type of government benefit, as compared to 35 percent of native-born folks.

The last column represents the percentage of uninsured. Twenty-four percent of the illegal immigrants have no insurance as compared to 7.5 percent of native-born households.
When you think about people showing up at the emergency room and hospitals, and the government and taxpayers having to cover the bill, 25 percent of the illegal immigrant families are one of the main sources of that problem.

Last year, in my home county, Horry County, South Carolina—now, Horry County is a long way from the southern border, over 1,500 miles. But there was a claim brought against the school system in Horry County, South Carolina, by the Department of Justice. It seems that the Department determined that Horry County wasn’t doing enough to accommodate students who couldn’t speak English.

Well, you wouldn’t think that would be that much of a problem in South Carolina, being that we are such a long way from the southern border. As it turns out, 5,511 out of 44,700 students in Horry County were English as a second language. That is 13 percent of the student body in Horry County, South Carolina. So the school board agreed to settle that claim by paying $600,000 more to provide more accommodation for those students who couldn’t speak English.

Let’s get off of illegal immigration and talk about one of the other great scourges that Americans endure as a result of our failure to secure our southern border.

In 2017, 72,000 Americans died from drug overdoses. That is up 100 percent in a decade. For most diseases and sicknesses, the cures are getting better and deaths are leveling off. It is the opposite for the drug scourge.

That 72,000 Americans who died in 2017—think about this guys; listen to this—is more than traffic deaths, which was 37,000, and homicides at 17,000, combined. Traffic deaths and homicides killed 54,000 Americans in 2017. Drug overdoses killed 72,000 people. It is exponential.

Last year, there was a 38 percent increase in meth, 22 percent increase in heroin, and 73 percent increase in fentanyl seized at our southern border, and that is only what we seized. If that is not a crisis, I don’t know what a crisis is.

The DEA reports that 300 Americans die every week from heroin, 90 percent of which comes across our southern border. Madam Speaker, 95 percent of the overdoses comes across our southern border, and much of the fentanyl comes across our southern border.

The opioid epidemic is ravaging communities across the country, including my home State and district. In the past 3 years, 2014 to 2017, the number of opioid-involved overdose deaths in South Carolina increased by 47 percent—47 percent—from 508 to 748.

In 2017, 134 opioid deaths were in my little congressional district that I represent, the Seventh District of South Carolina, I asked Sheriff Thompson in Horry County, and I asked Sheriff Boone in Florence County, where these drugs are coming from. They looked at me and said 80-plus percent comes from the southern border. That mirrors the reports from the DEA.

As the President has stated, the status quo response to the crisis at our southern border is no longer effective. Nancy Pelosi, as a part of the President’s border security plan is amoral. I don’t think so. But 72,000 Americans dead last year, I know that is amoral. 750 South Carolinians dead last year primarily from drugs coming across our southern border, I know that is amoral.

The scourge of drugs caused by our failure to control our southern border doesn’t just affect us. It affects our southern neighbors as well.

Did you know there were more than 30,000 murders in Mexico last year? I don’t know what is more disturbing that as we had, and they have a third of our population, so their murder rate is six times ours. Why is that?

Well, large portions of Mexico are controlled by drug cartels. You see, our failure to control our southern border has made unimaginable power and wealth. They outreach the government in more than half of Mexico, and they will fight to protect that power and that wealth.

Madam Speaker, 30,000 murders, six times the rate of murder in the United States, and it is largely our fault, because we haven’t controlled our southern border. When a gang comes knocking on your door in Mexico or Guatemala and says they are going to take your son and he is going to be a part of their cartel, when they come and say, hey, your daughter is looking good, and they are going to grab her and sell her into human trafficking, what are you going to do? Are you going to sit there and say I can’t?

I can tell you what a lot of them are doing. They are picking up everything they have, and where are they heading? They are heading to the southern border of the United States.

So the refugee crisis—think about this—because we have failed to control our southern border, because we have enriched and emboldened these drug cartels and drug lords, and we have allowed them to take over governing large areas of South America, we have created the very refugee crisis that is creating a crisis at our southern border right now, because we have failed to control the flow of drugs. We have failed to stop these criminal organizations.

The Democrats claim they are for border security, but they refuse to take any action or even participate in good-faith negotiations. Just last week, NANCY PELOSI offered $1 toward additional border security. Hillary Clinton, Chuck Schumer, and Barack Obama, when they were Senators, all voted in favor of funding a border wall in 2006. Why are they against it now?

I will tell you why. It is their hatred for President Trump stopping them from doing what is best for their constituents. They see this as a political game, and they want to win, no matter what the cost.

Let me tell you what the cost was last year: 72,000 dead Americans, 750 in South Carolina, 130 in my district, and I promise you there were at least that many in NANCY PELOSI’s district.

Democrats try to make this argument solely about a wall. President Trump has repeatedly said we do not need a wall for the entire length of the 2,000-mile border, but physical barriers in selected areas are both effective and necessary.

The Yuma border sector had the highest number of illegal crossings in the country before a barrier was built, resulting in a 95 percent decrease in apprehensions and a 91 percent decrease in crime. San Diego, once ground zero for illegal immigration, has seen a 92 percent decrease in apprehensions since the fence was constructed.

The $5.7 billion passed by the House Republicans in December would have enhanced border security, not just a wall. Any meaningful plan to deal with illegal immigration must also require employers to verify the employment status of workers they hire and penalize employers if they break the rules.

This system is called E-Verify, and it is already in place. It is managed by the Federal Government, but, amazing, employers are not required to participate. So in addition to border security, we have to have E-Verify.

It is time to stop the politics and secure our border.

Democrats are terribly worried about who gets blamed for the shutdown. Frankly, I don’t care who gets the blame. This is a fight, and it is a fight to keep drugs off our streets and out of the hands of our children. It is a fight to keep our communities safe. It is a fight for higher wages for hardworking Americans, for more jobs, and for our economy. And, friends, it is a fight worth having.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS
Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself and Mr. HARRIS):
H.R. 545. A bill to allow penalty-free distributions from retirement accounts in the case of Federal employees and certain Federal contractors impacted by the Federal Government shutdown; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself and Mr. HARRIS):
H.R. 546. A bill to provide for the issuance of revenue bonds to fund construction of a physical border barrier and related technology, roads, and lighting along the United States border with Mexico; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:
H.R. 547. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to adopt and implement a plan to prevent the use of magnetic and biological implants by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. LA MALFA, Mr. SMIPSON, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. McCLINTOCK):
H.R. 548. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to vest in the Secretary of the Interior functions under that Act with respect to species of fish that spawn in fresh or estuarine waters and migrate to ocean waters, and species of fish that spawn in ocean waters and migrate to fresh waters; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):
H.R. 549. A bill to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:
H.R. 550. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Armed Forces Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself):
H.R. 551. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the maximum penalty for mail theft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALVERT:
H.R. 552. A bill to direct the United States Postal Service to develop a single, unique ZIP Code for Eastvale, California; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. GAVETTI):
H.R. 553. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of military pay under the Survivor Benefit Plan for military surviving spouses to offset the receipt of veterans dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. KEATING):
H.R. 554. A bill to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 to prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any funds to promote military recruitment in countries or areas that are not safe for U.S. military personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SENSENIBRENNER (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. MORTON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. TUTT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. DEA, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CARRAJAL, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HUGHINS of New York, Mr. MATSUMI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. DELAURA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RAJ H. RANA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SCHAFTKOWSKY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RUFFERBERGER, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CHOW, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. Tipton, Mr. Peterson, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. NURSE, and Mr. BRINDISE):
H.R. 555. A bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. DREW, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LEE of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS of California, Mr. HUNTSINGER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MAST, Mr. TOBIN, Ms. HASTINGS, Ms. CORTEZ-MEDINA, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):
H.R. 556. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to modify the Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214) to include a specific block explicitly identified as the location in which a veteran of Armed Forces service one or more email addresses by which the member may be contacted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MAST, Mr. MOUTOUN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. MORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CARRAJAL, Mr. GALLACHER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. LANGEVIN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. COOK, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. O’HALLERAN):
H.R. 557. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to modify the Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214) to include a specific block explicitly identified as the location in which a veteran of Armed Forces service one or more email addresses by which the member may be contacted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. CHENEY:
H.R. 558. A bill to designate the mountain at the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyoming, as Devils Tower, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. NUNES):
H.R. 559. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a demonstration program to adapt the successful practices of providing foreign aid to underdeveloped economies to the provision of Federal economic development assistance to Native communities in similarly situated remote areas in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SABLAN:
H.R. 560. A bill to amend section 6 of the Joint Resolution entitled ‘‘A Joint Resolution to approve the Covenant To Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, and for other purposes’’; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SABLAN:
H.R. 561. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the oversight of contracts awarded by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans and their spouses; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MAST, Mr. MOUTOUN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. MORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CARRAJAL, Mr. GALLACHER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. LANGEVIN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. COOK, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. O’HALLERAN):
H.R. 562. A bill to establish a Department of Agriculture loan program to support mentorship and apprenticeship opportunities for veterans of the Armed Forces to become farmers or ranchers; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):
H.R. 563. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to modify the Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214) to include a specific block explicitly identified as the location in which a veteran of Armed Forces service one or more email addresses by which the member may be contacted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. CHENEY:
H.R. 564. A bill to designate the mountain at the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyoming, as Devils Tower, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. NUNES):
H.R. 565. A bill to include Portugal in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E1 and E2 nonimmigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of Portugal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. LAKEON of Connecticut):
H.R. 566. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to remove the manifestation perk policy required for the provision of radio communication for cholecyst, porphyria cutanea tarda, and acute and subacute peripheral
neuropathy associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. CRIST:
H.R. 569. To amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the portion of wages and salary subject to payroll taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. NORTON): H.R. 568. A bill to require the Governor of a State to submit to the Attorney General an annual report on the number of individuals who represented themselves in court in criminal matters or juvenile delinquency matters; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Ms. GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Ms. Adams, Mrs. Bratton, Mr. Butler, Mr. Clay, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Ms. Brownley of California, Mr. Carrahal, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Ms. Castro of Florida, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Clark of Massachusetts, Ms. Clarke of New York, Mr. Cleaver, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Cornell, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Crist, Mr. Cummings, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. DeLauro, Mr. DelBene, Mrs. Dingell, Mr. Doyle of Pennsylvania, Ms. Engel, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Espallat, Mr. Frank, Mr. Frankel, Ms. Gomez, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Higgins of New York, Ms. Norton, Ms. Jayapal, Mr. Jeffries, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Ms. Kaptur, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Khanna, Mr. King of New York, New Hampshire, Mr. Krishnamoorthi, Mr. Kuster of New York, Mr. Lamb, Mr. Langvin, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Ted Lieu of California, Mr. Lipinski, Ms. Lofgren, Mr. Lowenthal, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Lucey, Mr. Lucero, Ms. Carolyn Lursen of Washington, Mr. Soto, Ms. Speier, and Mr. Suozzi):
H.R. 569. A bill to protect victims of stalking from violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mrs. Murphy):
H.R. 570. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with regard to stalking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. Suozzi, Mr. Sherman, and Mr. Diaz-Balart):
H.R. 571. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to any person who fails to ensure that there is international peace or stability of Iraq or the Government of Iraq; 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 Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. Duncan, Mr. David P. Roe of Tennessee, Mr. Harris, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Olver, Mr. Payton, Mr. Barin, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Banks, Mr. Mooney of West Virginia, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Walker, Mr. Gersh, Mr. Meadows, Mr. Arrington, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, Mr. Posey, Mr. Hunter, Mrs. Wagner, Mrs. Lesko, Mr. Ratcliffe, Mr. Long, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Webb of Texas, Mr. Norman, Mr. Conaway, Mr. Rooney of Florida, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Kevin Hern of Oklahoma, Mr. Allen, Mr. Watkins, and Mr. Palazzo):
H.R. 573. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from conducting or supporting any research involving human fetal tissue that is obtained pursuant to an induced abortion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. Walker, Mr. Hice of Georgia, Mr. Garttt, Mr. Budd, Mr. Mooney of West Virginia, Mr. Norman, Mr. Jordan, and Mr. Duncan):
H.R. 574. A bill to clarify standards of family detention and the treatment of unaccompanied alien children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. Walker, Mr. Hice of Georgia, Mr. Garrett, Mr. Budd, Mr. Mooney of West Virginia, Mr. Norman, Mr. Jordan, and Mr. Duncan):
H.R. 575. A bill to provide a method by which the economic costs of significant regulatory actions may be offset by the repeal of other regulatory actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, 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 Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mr. Aguilar, Mrs. Bratton, Mr. Bischoping, Mr. Blumenauer, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Ms. Brownley of California, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Casey, Mr. Cotechini, Mr. Clark of New York, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Correa, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. DelBene, Mr. DelBENE, Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Espallat, Mr. Foster, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Garamendi, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Heck, Mr. Higgins of New York, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Kelly of Illinois, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Larsen of Connecticut, Mr. Lee of California, Mr. Loeb, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Ms. McCollum, Ms. McEachin, Ms. Meng, Ms. Moore, Mr. Moulton, Ms. Nadler, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. O’Halleran, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Pasnetta, Mr. Pascarella, Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. Peters, Ms. Pingree, Mr. Polcan, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Raskin, Mr. Rayburn, Mr. Roahrall, Mr. Ruiz, Mr. Rush, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Schiffer, Mr. Schneider, Mr. Schrader, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Sires, Ms. St. John of Utah, Ms. Soto, Ms. Speier, and Mr. Suozzi):
H.R. 569. A bill to protect victims of stalking from violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mrs. Murphy):
H.R. 570. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with regard to stalking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. Suozzi, Mr. Sherman, and Mr. Diaz-Balart):
H.R. 571. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to any person who fails to ensure that there is international peace or stability of Iraq or the Government of Iraq; 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 Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. Duncan, Mr. David P. Roe of Tennessee, Mr. Harris, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Olver, Mr. Payton, Mr. Barin, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Banks, Mr. Mooney of West Virginia, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Walker, Mr. Gersh, Mr. Meadows, Mr. Arrington, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, Mr. Posey, Mr. Hunter, Mrs. Wagner, Mrs. Lesko, Mr. Ratcliffe, Mr. Long, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Webb of Texas, Mr. Norman, Mr. Conaway, Mr. Rooney of Florida, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Kevin Hern of Oklahoma, Mr. Allen, Mr. Watkins, and Mr. Palazzo):
H.R. 573. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from conducting or supporting any research involving human fetal tissue that is obtained pursuant to an induced abortion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. Walker, Mr. Hice of Georgia, Mr. Garrett, Mr. Budd, Mr. Mooney of West Virginia, Mr. Norman, Mr. Jordan, and Mr. Duncan):
H.R. 574. A bill to clarify standards of family detention and the treatment of unaccompanied alien children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mr. Aguilar, Mrs. Bratton, Mr. Bischoping, Mr. Blumenauer, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Ms. Brownley of California, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Casey, Mr. Cotechini, Mr. Clark of New York, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Connolly, Mr. Correa, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. DelBene, Mr. DelBENCH, Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Espallat, Mr. Foster, Mr. Gallego, Mr. Garamendi, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Mr. Grijalva, Mr. Heck, Mr. Higgins of New York, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Kelly of Illinois, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Langevin, Mr. Larsen of Connecticut, Mr. Lee of California, Mr. Loeb, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York, Ms. McCollum, Ms. McEachin, Ms. Meng, Ms. Moore, Mr. Moulton, Ms. Nadler, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. O’Halleran, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Pasnetta, Mr. Pascarella, Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. Peters, Ms. Pingree, Mr. Polcan, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Raskin, Mr. Rayburn, Mr. Roahrall, Mr. Ruiz, Mr. Rush, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Schiffer, Mr. Schneider, Mr. Schrader, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Sires, Ms. St. John of Utah, Ms. Soto, Ms. Speier, and Mr. Suozzi):
H.R. 569. A bill to protect victims of stalking from violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mrs. Murphy):
H.R. 570. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with regard to stalking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. Suozzi, Mr. Sherman, and Mr. Diaz-Balart):
H.R. 571. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to any person who fails to ensure that there is international peace or stability of Iraq or the Government of Iraq; 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 the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIPPTON (for himself, Mr. LAMMOUR, and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 580. A bill to amend the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to improve the transparency and oversight of land conveyances involving disposal or acquisition of National Forest System lands or Bureau of Land Management public lands, to provide protections and certainty for private landowners related to resurveying such public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOYER:

H.J. Res. 29. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of terms an individual may serve as a Member of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOYCE:

H.J. Res. 30. A joint resolution disapproving the President’s proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.Res. 42. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. LAMMOUR, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. MARINO):

H.Res. 44. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of January 20 through January 26, 2019, as “National School Choice Week”; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself and Mr. CONAWAY):

H. Res. 45. A resolution congratulating the American Farm Bureau Federation for a long tradition of advocacy on behalf of agriculture and rural America and for holding its 100th annual convention; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. SOTO introduced a bill (H.R. 581) for the relief of Alejandro Juarez, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 545. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, under which “Congress shall have the Power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 546. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 547. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 548. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 and clause 18.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 549. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 550. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 551. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 552. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 553. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. The Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 554. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 555. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 556. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 557. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 558. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 559. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 4 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 560. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 4 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 561. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 562. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 563. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18).

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 564. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 565. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 567. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 568. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 569. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 570. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 571. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 572. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 573. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. ROYAL:

H.R. 574. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.
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By Mr. LA MALFA:
H.R. 572.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:
H.R. 573.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. MEADOWS:
H.R. 574.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 4
By Mr. MEADOWS:
H.R. 575.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1 grants that “All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States...” Article I, Section 8 grants that “The Congress shall have Power to... Regulate Commerce... Among the several States...” Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 grants that “The Congress shall have Power to... Make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregone Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”
By Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD:
H.R. 576.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. SCHNEIDER:
H.R. 577.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, sections 4, 6, and 8.
By Mr. THOMPSON of California:
H.R. 578.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I
By Mr. TIPTON:
H.R. 579.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment X
By Mr. TIPTON:
H.R. 580.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment V
By Mr. SOTO:
H.R. 581.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. HOL DING:
H.J. Res. 29.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article V of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. ROYER:
H.J. Res. 30.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 8: Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. FUJISE, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. DeFazio, and Mr. DANNY TAYLOR of Illinois.
H.R. 38: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. COLDE, and MRS. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 51: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. CASE, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 93: Mr. HECOX.
H.R. 95: Mr. ZIELINSKI, Mr. COX of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LOUAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GIANFORTI, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. CARRAJAL.
H.R. 113: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 114: Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 149: Mr. LOUREMILK.
H.R. 141: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 150: Mr. NORMAN, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 211: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 220: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 229: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI and Ms. OCARIO-CORTEZ.
H.R. 250: Mr. BUCHON.
H.R. 302: Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 273: Ms. PARKINSON and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 279: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 280: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 296: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. GRIEVE of Tennessee, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 299: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. LOWERY, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 301: Mr. RAIBER and Mr. MOILENAAR.
H.R. 305: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 316: Mr. MCCINTOCK.
H.R. 339: Mr. SARBANES, Ms. LEE of California, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. HAALAND, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. TRAHAEN.
H.R. 365: Mr. WELCH, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 367: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. BURRELL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PLASKETT, Mr. CARRAJAL, Miss RICE of New York, and Mrs. TRAHAEN.
H.R. 389: Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 372: Mr. SHEPHERD.
H.R. 374: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 385: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 396: Mr. COLDE.
H.R. 414: Mr. SOTO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 421: Mr. KILMER, Mr. SUCOZZI, and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 427: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 437: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. WALORSKI of California, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 438: Mr. MCCINTOCK.
H.R. 446: Ms. MENG and Mr. BRINDESI.
H.R. 453: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 465: Mr. DeSALVNIER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HAALAND, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 483: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. JONES, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KIANNA, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 489: Mr. STAUBER and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 490: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. BUCHON.
H.R. 491: Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 493: Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Hill of California.
H.R. 504: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 527: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 540: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPUR, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DeSALVNIER, Ms. DELAUR, and Ms. FRANKEL.

H.R. 541: Ms. WATERS.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. CORREA and Ms. SPERRH.
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.J. Res. 23: Mr. NORMAN.
H. Res. 27: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 33: Mr. LAMB, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RYAN, Mr. HUSTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CORREIA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. DINGELL, and Miss RICE of New York.
H. Res. 35: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HARDER of California, and Ms. BROWNLY of California.
H. Res. 40: Ms. GARRASS, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. STEFANIK.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 268 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative BISHOP (GA) or a designee to H.R. 268, the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2019, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 272: Mr. PETERSON.
The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, rescue us. Come quickly and bring the stability and unity we need.
May our lawmakers who seek You find You, receiving from Your divine presence wisdom, mercy, and power. Cleanse the inner fountain of our hearts from anything that will hinder Your will from being done.
Lord, You are our helper and redeemer. Do not delay.
We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:
I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 266
Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for a second reading.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to proceed.
The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 1, a bill to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, and for other purposes.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING
Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, over the course of this partial government shutdown, we have seen our Democratic colleagues engage in increasingly acrobatic contortions in order to dodge a serious conversation about the urgent humanitarian and security crisis down at our southern border. Their refusal to come to the negotiating table has serious implications for the hundreds of thousands of Federal workers going without pay and for all Americans who deserve a nation that can secure its own border.

Along the way, we have heard that new funding of any sort—any sort—of border barrier, even the kinds that Democrats have supported so recently and so often, would now be an immorality. An immorality?
We have heard serious proposals brushed aside with joking offers of $1 to address the critical issue. We have even heard frank admissions that, 30 days from now, there would be no progress toward an agreement on border security, even if the government were reopened.
Under normal circumstances, we could expect lines like these from the furthest left organizers and most vocal liberal protesters. But these are not normal circumstances. These are the words, believe it or not, of the Speaker of the House, the gentlelady from California, Nancy Pelosi.

It is unclear exactly when the Speaker made the determination that the explicit requests of the men and women who secure our borders and the safety of our communities would take a backseat to the political whims of the far left, that the border efforts toward which Democrats have agreed to direct billions of dollars in the past have transformed overnight into something evil. But here we are, day 25. We know the new and unreasonable position of the Speaker of the House.

So here, in the Senate, my Democratic colleagues have an important choice to make. They could stand with common sense, with border experts, with Federal workers—and with their own past voting records, by the way—or they could continue to remain passive spectators, complaining from the sidelines as the Speaker refuses to negotiate with the White House and ensures that our Nation keeps going round and round and round this political carousel. It is up to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

BORDER SECURITY
Madam President, on another matter, the substance of the border security issue is not the only subject that is occasioning a spectacular display of inconsistency from my colleagues across the aisle.
If you recall, since last week, the apparent position of Senate Democrats has been that the Senate itself cannot engage in any of the people’s business until government funding is resolved.
Democrats have held this position so dogmatically that three times now they have voted against advancing a bipartisan and urgently needed package of legislation that concerns Israel, Jordan, and the civil war in Syria. It has been the Democrats' very own "Senate shutdown" on top of the partial government shutdown they are prolonging. What about our ally Israel? What about the innocent people of Syria? I guess they are just out of luck—just out of luck. The Democratic leader has made clear that they will just have to wait. They will just have to wait until he decides to end his filibuster of these bipartisan bills, which, until last week, by the way, he supported. It is a bizarre position—a truly bizarre position.

It has directly contradicted the stated foreign policy views of many of our Democratic colleagues, but this has been the Democratic leader's position: Filibuster the expanded assistance for Israel. Filibuster the new consequences for giving aid and comfort to the Assad regime as it butchers its own people. That is what the Democratic caucus has overwhelmingly voted to do on three occasions.

But now, we are informed that it was all just a farce. The Democratic leader actually doesn't mind doing other business because he now intends to bring a privileged and political stunt of a motion relating to the administration's use of sanctions against Russia.

So now at least we know the score. Our Democratic colleagues don't really object to legislation as such: they just object to debating a bipartisan package of bills to reinforce our support for Israel, help Jordan stand firm amidst regional chaos, and take action to hold accountable those who have tortured I and, murder leader's position: Filibuster the new consequences for giving aid and comfort to the Assad regime as it butchers its own people. That is what the Democratic caucus has overwhelmingly voted to do on three occasions.

But now, we are informed that it was all just a farce. The Democratic leader actually doesn't mind doing other business because he now intends to bring a privileged and political stunt of a motion relating to the administration's use of sanctions against Russia.

So now at least we know the score. Our Democratic colleagues don't really object to legislation as such: they just object to debating a bipartisan package of bills to reinforce our support for Israel, help Jordan stand firm amidst regional chaos, and take action to hold accountable those who have tortured I and, murder leader's position: Filibuster the new consequences for giving aid and comfort to the Assad regime as it butchers its own people. That is what the Democratic caucus has overwhelmingly voted to do on three occasions.

But now, we are informed that it was all just a farce. The Democratic leader actually doesn't mind doing other business because he now intends to bring a privileged and political stunt of a motion relating to the administration's use of sanctions against Russia.

There is no reason this bill shouldn't sail through Congress and be signed by the President. A bipartisan bill to support Israel, defend Jordan, and provide justice for innocent Syria—that is the President's good fortune—that the President has selected such a completely qualified and thoroughly prepared leader to fill this vacancy.

First and foremost, of course, is the fact that Bill Barr served in this position before. As Attorney General under President Bush 41 in the early 1990s, he fulfilled his oath and led the Department of Justice with honor and with skill. He was widely regarded as a capable administrator and as a strong, independent, and principled advocate for fairness and for following the law.

His tenure confirmed the great confidence that Republican and Democratic Senators had all placed in him when they confirmed him to that position unanimously. He controlled the Senate in 1991—Democrats controlled the Senate in 1991. That is when he was confirmed—confirmed on a voice vote. Boy, those were the good old days.

Amid the proceedings, our distinguished colleague Senator LEAHY expressed confidence that Mr. Barr would be "an independent voice for all Americans."

Then-Senator Joe Biden, who was then the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, put it this way at the time: He is "a heck of an honorable guy."

So 28 years ago, leading Democrats were practically heading up the Bill Barr fan club, and his subsequent service proved they had made the right call. In fact, this nominee has been unanimously confirmed by the Senate three times—three times.

Before serving as Attorney General, he worked as an Assistant Attorney General and a Deputy Attorney General. In every single Senator identify a good reason to oppose his confirmation—three times unanimously.

So it is beyond safe to say that Mr. Barr is eminently qualified and widely respected. I look forward to his testimony today and to the testimony of those who know him and his work. I hope every Senator will afford Mr. Barr the fair consideration he so obviously deserves.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.
the floor, they would receive a significant majority in the Senate, a veto-proof majority.

So I would appeal to Leader McConnell: Do what is right for the country. Do what is right for hundreds of thousands of federal employees laboring without pay. Do what is right for our farmers and small businesses, homeowners, and taxpayers. Do what is right for America.

President Trump may not care about the harm he is doing to all of these people, but our Republican Senators, including Leader McConnell, should.

A few years ago, Leader McConnell remarked: Remember me? I am the guy that gets us out of shutdowns. Well, Leader McConnell, now is the time. Leader McConnell, allow a vote on legislation and reopen the government.

In a short time, a few of my Democratic colleagues will ask the Senate for their vote. Will Leader McConnell help us reopen the government? Will some of our Republican Senators actually join us, not in nice words but in actually voting to reopen the government? Or will Leader McConnell block it yet again, aiding and abetting President Trump, who desires to extend the fight. Everyone knows that.

But every day it drags on, you lose the American people. Every day he is losing. The Gallup poll today had him at a near-record low of 37 percent popularity. Even some of his base is losing face.

President Trump, you are not going to win this fight with the American people. Every day it drags on, you are less popular. Every day it drags on, people blame you and the Republicans, not the Democrats. You are not winning the fight. You may be in your own untruth bubble, but you are not winning the fight. Everyone knows that. We certainly do.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM BARR

Madam President, on another matter, as we speak, the Senate Judiciary Committee is conducting its hearing on the nomination of William Barr to be the next Attorney General of the United States. It is an august position that demands the highest degree of credibility, transparency, and fidelity to rule of law, even during a normal Presidency.

But given President Trump’s actions, his disdain for rule of law, his derision of the rulings of an independent judiciary, his public contempt for law enforcement procedures of the Justice Department, the burden of proof for William Barr is higher than it would be for other Presidents.

This is not a normal Presidency. We don’t need an Attorney General who will just comply with this President. That is a danger to the Republic.

The Senate should expect unequivocal and explicit commitments from Mr. Barr to resist President Trump. Mr. Barr cannot merely give perfunctory, boilerplate assurances. Saying “I am for transparency” is not good enough. Will he release Mueller’s report—yes or no? If he can’t answer “yes,” he doesn’t deserve the position. Will he not interfere in any way with Mueller’s investigation? That this is not sufficient has been made clear by the Mueller investigation.

Barr cannot merely give perfunctory, perfunctory commitments from Mr. Barr to allow to履职 of Donald Trump’s dirty work if he gets to be Attorney General, and we should expect an unequivocal commitment from Mr. Barr to allow the special counsel to proceed. To do otherwise is to not only approve an Attorney General of Trump’s desire to extend his impulses of any President we have ever seen, to not impose sanctions on Russia. Well, we imposed sanctions on Putin’s cronies just before the special counsel finished his work. We should not allow any sanction relief for President Putin’s trusted agents or the companies they control before the conclusion of the investigation.

Finally—and maybe most seriously of all—there is a foreign policy issue here at stake. President Putin’s government, one of Russia’s largest banks, and the Russian economy have a direct interest in sanction relief for Deripaska’s companies. Why is the Trump administration proposing sanction relief when President Putin has not yet made any move to curtail or constrain his malign activities around the globe?

I would say to the leader, Democrats were not the ones who decided to relax sanctions on Putin’s cronies just before the Christmas holiday, hoping no one would notice. That was the Trump administration. If Leader McConnell wants to know why we are voting on Russian sanctions this afternoon, he should go talk to the White House.

So allow me to appeal directly to my Republican colleagues for your view on this issue, there are enough questions—enough questions—that we should vote for the motion to proceed so that you can hear the debate. It is an important debate. Putin is laughing at the damage he is doing to America. We cannot go along.

In the past, one of the finer moments of this Senate, which Leader McConnell talks about all the time, was when we joined in a bipartisan way to impose sanctions on Russia. Well, we should not relax that view. We should not relax that vigilance. The details here are complex. The Senate and the American people ought to have a real view of the underlying facts before voting. If that debate is allowed to proceed, I believe my Senate colleagues will see the wisdom of keeping the current sanctions in place.

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 will now call the roll.

Mr. THUNE, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, Democrats continue to talk about the need to fully reopen the government, and I cannot agree with them more. It is time that both parties sit down and get the government fully operating again. But there is a problem. Democrats may talk a lot about the need to reopen the government, but they are not willing to do the work that would be required to actually get the government open.

In a divided government, negotiation and compromise are essential. If you want to get something done in a divided government, you have to compromise. But that doesn’t seem to be something the Democrats understand. For Democrats, it is “my way or the highway.” They won’t give an inch. They want their way, and they want their way only. All of us would like to get something done, but we want what they want, with no changes, but we all know that is unrealistic. If you want to get something done, you usually have to compromise.

The White House has a strongly held position that has also made it very clear that it is willing to be flexible and negotiate with Democrats, but the Democrats refuse to play ball, and they continue to hold parts of the Federal Government hostage.

We heard from our colleague from New York, the Democratic leader, suggest that it should be Republican leader Senator MCCONNELL’s job to solve this problem, but the fact is—and we all know this—the negotiation in this circumstance has to be between the President of the United States and the Democrats in the Senate and the House who have refused to budge on that position.

The Republican leader has made it very clear that as soon as the President is willing to sign something and the Democrats here are willing to produce enough votes to give us the 60 votes that are necessary to pass it in the Senate and the House, he will move a bill through the Senate that we can get to the President and end this shutdown, get the government open again, and fund border security, which is an important priority for our country and for our national security interests.

Thom Tillis, who until recently, was also held by the Democrats. As recently as December, the Democratic leader indicated that to solve this budget stalemate, this impasse we seem to be having, we needed to have the support of the leaders in both the House and the Senate and the President before either Chamber should vote on legislation. He suggested that the President needed to come out publicly in support of it—in other words, to indicate he would sign any legislation that might pass Congress.

So that is where we are. It is not a function of the Republican leader’s. The Republican leader is prepared to produce the votes that are necessary to pass legislation to reopen the government. It is entirely dependent upon the President of the United States, who must sign that bill into law, and the Democrats here in the Senate, who have to produce the requisite number of Democratic votes that are required to pass it in the Senate. That is where we are.

Frankly, right now, there isn’t a negotiation going on. The Democrats’ refusal to negotiate is victimizing the very agency they are supposed to represent. The Federal workers who are struggling right now are struggling precisely because Democrats are refusing to work with this President, and that has a lot more to do with politics than it has to do with the issue itself.

Democrats need to negotiate with the White House to reopen the government, but they should also want to work with the White House on border security solutions. Border security is a national security issue. No country can be secure if dangerous individuals can creep across its borders unchecked and unobserved, and Democrats used to understand this.

In 2006, the Democratic leader and the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee voted for legislation to authorize a border fence. They were joined in their vote by then-Senator Biden, then-Senator Clinton, and then-Senator Obama.

In 2013, Senate Democrats—every Senate Democrat—supported legislation requiring the completion of a 700-mile fence along our southern border. This legislation would have provided $46 billion for border security and $8 billion specifically for a physical barrier.

As recently as last year, nearly every Senate Democrat supported $25 billion in border security.

My point is that the Democrats in the Senate have in the past recognized the importance, No. 1, of securing the border and, No. 2, how important a physical barrier is as a part of the solution to securing our border—not entirely dependent upon a border wall but certain a part of that solution, to include technological solutions, manpower, additional personnel, cameras, sensors, all the modern technology that we have, but in certain places recognizing that the fence works. The fence has worked. There is already 700 miles of fence on the southern border. I would point out that in 2009, the Senate Democratic leader said in a speech that “any immigration solution must recognize that we must do as much as we can to gain control of our borders as soon as possible.” That was in 2009 from the Senate Democratic leader. He went on to discuss, interestingly enough, progress that had been made on border security between 2005 and 2009, including “construction of 630 miles of fence they want to protect a significant barrier to illegal immigration on our southern land border.” That from the Democratic leader in 2009, again crediting the construction of 630 miles of border fence that creates a significant barrier to illegal immigration on our southern land border. In other words, in 2009, the Democratic leader not only didn’t oppose border fences, he praised them.

That is why our border is not secure. Tens of thousands of individuals try to cross our southern border illegally each month. Illegal drugs flow into this country through ports of entry and other unsecured areas of the border. Federal agents have seen a 135-percent increase in the amount of fentanyl seized between ports of entry, and 90 percent of the heroin supply in this country flows across our southern border. There is human trafficking, weapons trafficking, and more.

We need better border security, including more barriers, technology, and personnel along our southern border. We don’t know who is coming into our country and why. We need to ensure that our ports of entry can be secure and that we keep traffickers, terrorists, and dangerous goods out of this country.

House majority leader STENY HOYER was asked about the Democrats’ flip-flop on border security and whether there is any real difference between what they supported in the past and what they are opposing now. He said: “I don’t have an answer that I think is a really good answer.”

“I don’t have an answer that I think is a really good answer.” Well, Madam President, at least that is honest. Democrats don’t have a good answer because there is no real difference between what they have supported in the past and what they are opposing right now.

Before Christmas, I came to the floor to talk about the divided government we would be dealing with in 2019 and 2020. I noted that divided government doesn’t have to spell the doom of productivity. In fact, over the past 30-plus years, some of our greatest legislative achievements have been the product of divided government. But I also noted that in order for us to be productive in the 116th Congress, Democrats would have to decide to work with us. So far, they have decided not to.

In addition to refusing to negotiate on border security, Senate Democrats have also blocked the Senate from considering legislation to support Israel’s security, strengthen our relationship with our Jordanian allies, and hold accountable individuals who participate in the atrocities of the Assad regime in Syria.

Despite our divided government, we can still accomplish important things for the American people. But it is going to require an about-face from Democrats, who have so far made the 116th Congress about partisanship and their hostility to this President.

It is time for Democrats to stop talking about reopening the government and to take steps that would actually do so by committing to real negotiations with the White House. Then and
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only then can we get past this impasse, get the government open and functioning, and address what is a critical and important national security imperative for our country, and that is ensuring that our southern border is secure.

It is not about Republicans in the Senate. It is about the President of the United States, for whom this is a huge priority, something he is passionate about doing and a commitment he made to the American people. And it is about the Democrats here in the Senate—and in the House—but here in the Senate, where it takes 60 votes to pass anything—sitting down across the table from the President in good faith and dealing with what usually happens in circumstances like this, and that is to negotiate an agreement for both sides, give a little bit, have a little give-and-take.

As I mentioned, the President has been very flexible and very open to sitting down with Democrats. In the discussions I have been a part of, he has demonstrated his willingness to compromise. But have I yet to see a single step by the Democrats here in the Senate or in the House, in their leadership, a single inch of movement in the direction of trying to solve this problem. Instead, they seem bent on turning it into a political issue. That is not good for the American people. It is certainly not good for those employees who are struggling out there because they are not being paid and certainly not good for the crisis we face at our southern border and the security threat that poses for the American people.

I hope we will do better. We can do better, but it is going to require negotiation. It is going to require a willingness to sit down at the table in good faith and to get discussions going about how we solve this important problem.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Scott of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 21

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I am here with my colleague Senator Van HOLLEN. The two of us are going to make a unanimous consent request to reopen the government.

I know the distinguished majority leader is here. We are on day 25 of this tragic, outrageous, needless, and dangerous partial shutdown. Senator Van HOLLEN and I have met with government workers, and we heard their accounts. They can’t pay their bills. Mortgages are going without payment. I heard yesterday from a Federal worker who can’t pay their children’s extra activities at school for dance lessons. They can’t help their relatives deal with their problems. They are postponing needed health treatment issues.

I read last week on the floor of this body a letter from Kristen Jones and Grand Central Station controllers, who explained how they can’t take care of their family needs. So 800,000 people are furloughed without pay or working without pay—30 percent are veterans. Small businesses are shuttering their operations because they depend upon government business. From cleaners to restaurants, they are finding they don’t have the business they used to have.

Kevin Hassett, Chairman of the White House Council of Economic Advisers, indicates the economic impact is $1.2 billion a week on our economy. We heard that small businesses have to lay off employees because they are not getting their Federal partnerships. I used the example of the Senior Services. They laid off 76 employees because the USDA and Forest Service can’t honor their contracts. People can’t close on their home mortgages because they don’t have pay stubs to show their income. The FHA can’t certify loans with HUD being shuttered. Core missions are being compromised.

I talked to air traffic controllers yesterday—people in air safety. They don’t have their full complement. They are the most professional government workforce in the world, and they are dedicated professionals who do their job, but we are asking them to do it with half the number of employees and without getting a paycheck. That is outrageous.

This shutdown has to end. The President wants it. We are an independent body. We are a coequal branch of government. We could open up the government. Yes, we can negotiate border security, but we have to have the government. We could open up the government. You can’t negotiate under circumstances where the President is holding the country hostage, and he undermines his own negotiators. It cries out for Congress to take the lead.

I agree with Senator Graham when he says we should open the government and then let us negotiate using the regular process of Congress to debate the issues of border security, including immigration issues. We are a coequal branch of government. Two bills are on our desk. Both have passed the House of Representatives.

I am going to make a unanimous consent request with regard to H.R. 21, and my colleague Senator Van HOLLEN will deal with the rest of the government. H.R. 21 has six appropriations bills that are not related to the issue of border security. They have already been acted upon by this body. They are not part of this dispute. It is Financial Services and General Government. It is Agriculture, Rural Development, Fm Act., and Food and Environment. It is Transportation and HUD. It is State and Foreign Operations. It is Commerce, Justice, and Science. They passed this body either by a 92-to-6 vote for the Appropriations Committee or unanimous or near unanimous by our Appropriations Committee under Republican leadership in a bipartisan manner. We need to reopen the government.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 5, H.R. 21, making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019; I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I say in response to the distinguished majority leader, just don’t understand why the Senate is missing in action. We are a coequal branch of government. Let us speak about opening the government. There are Members on both sides who understand that we can debate border security and we can reach agreements, but you can’t do that with a partial government shutdown.

This is President Trump’s shutdown, and now with the majority leader’s objections, the Republicans in the Senate are assisting this shutdown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. McCONNELL. Let me repeat again what I have said now for some 3 weeks. The solution to this is a negotiation between the one person in the country who can sign something into law, the President of the United States, and our Democratic colleagues. For the Senate Republicans to participate in something that doesn’t lead to an outcome strikes me as not what the Senate ought to be involved in.

We have an important package of bills that have been held up during the Senate shutdown—never mind the government shutdown—related to our colleagues, our friends in the Middle East, the Israelis, related to the Syrian civil war and all the atrocities that have occurred. There is business to be done in the Senate.

The way to solve the government shutdown is for the administration and our good friends in the House in the majority and Senate Democrats to reach a legislative solution. When that happens, I will be more than happy to call it up because we know it will actually solve the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Briefly, in response to the majority leader, the first priority should be reopen government. That needs to be our very first priority of business.

In regard to the legislation the leader is referring to, let me point out that those bills could have been passed in
the last Congress where Republicans controlled both the House and the Senate. The majority leader made a decision on floor time that it was not a priority to be considered in the 115th Congress.

Let me also say, in regard to Israel, it will benefit from the foreign ops appropriations bill to be passed, which is part of my unanimous consent request of an additional $200 million, but that is being held up because of this shutdown that has been caused by the President and has now been assisted by the Republicans in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 1

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, the issue here is that, under the U.S. Constitution, the Senate really does need to do its job as a separate and co-equal branch of government.

Last week, Senator CARDIN and I were right where we are today—here on the floor, asking the Senate, asking the President that the Senate immediately take up and vote on the two House bills that are on the Senate calendar as we speak and pass them and send them to the President to reopen the government. Last week, the majority leader blocked a vote on that. He blocked consent to take up those bills to reopen the government. Since last week, much has changed, and much has stayed the same. Here is what has changed. The impact and the harm of the shutdown is growing by the day. It is metastasizing around the country. Here are some headlines: “The cascade of shutdown problems grows each week.” Another headline: “This is ridiculous: Small-business owners can’t get loans as shutdown enters Day 20.” That was day 20. We are now on day 25. “FBI operations damaged as shutdown continues.” “FBI Agents Group Says Shutdown Affects Law Enforcement.” They point out that those on the job at greater risk because those are who are furloughed who support them can’t give them the backup they need.

The FDA continues to not do its routine food inspections, and American veterans—and veterans make up 30 percent of the Federal workforce—are being disproportionately hurt by the shutdown.

We just heard it reported that the White House economists are doubting their projections. And the harm being done to our economy each week. It is already in the billions of dollars, and they are saying it looks as though it will be twice that much as this thing grows exponentially.

Services have been shut down for the American people. There were 800,000 Federal employees, as of last Friday, who received pay stubs like the one I am holding in my hand. This is one that was for an air traffic controller. Starting last Friday, 800,000 Federal employees did not get paychecks. Hundreds of thousands of them are on the job, working, and hundreds of thousands of them have been locked out of work. What they tell us is they just want to get back to work and do their jobs for the American people. If you look at this pay stub, at the net pay, it reads “zero”—a big, fat goose egg. I can tell you these Federal employees are getting bills, and they can’t even get their mortgage and rent bills. They can’t even pay zero. They stay the same. So here you have 800,000 Federal employees who are unable to make do—missing mortgage payments, missing rent payments, missing their monthly installments on community college or other school loans. On top of that, you have all of these small businesses that do work for the Federal Government that are beginning to go belly-up, and their employees are being told not to go in to work.

Since Senator CARDIN and I were here on the floor just last week, things have gotten much worse around the country, but here is what has stayed the same—that we have it in our power today to take up two House bills to open the government.

I was listening to the majority leader say: Well, you know, the President says he is not going to sign them. Yet we are a separate branch of government. We are the article I branch of government. I am holding in my hand, right here, the bill that Senator CARDIN asked us to vote on today. I think the public needs to know what is in it because what is in it has already been supported on a bipartisan basis by this U.S. Senate.

It has provisions to open about five Departments of the U.S. Government that have nothing to do with Homeland Security. We passed that by a vote of 92 to 6. The President says that he doesn’t want to sign it. He can veto it. With 92 to 6, it is a veto override—big time. Also contained in here are bills that passed the Senate Appropriations Committee by a vote of 30 to nothing and 90 to 1. That is what is in here—bipartisan bills.

So the question for this body, as a separate branch of government, is this: Why in the world are we not going to allow a vote to reopen the government on provisions that we have already agreed to on an overwhelming bipartisan basis—in fact, with a veto-proof margin?

The President can say that he is not going to sign it. That is his business. That is the executive branch. For goodness’ sake, let’s do our job here in the U.S. Senate, because every day that goes by with this growing harm, the Senate is more and more complicit, and we are an accomplice to the shutdown.

I know President Trump likes to talk about the fact that he has done things that no other President has done before in the history of the United States. This time, he is right. He has the longest shutdown of any President in the United States. He said he would be proud to shut down the government if he didn’t get his way. I know that no Senator here—Republican or Democratic—is proud to shut down the government, certainly, for the longest period in history.

So let’s do the right thing. Let’s do our job. Let’s not just say the President is the only one who can handle this. We can handle it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 6, H.J. Res. 1, making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security. I further ask that the joint resolution be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m. Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:29 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

STRENGTHENING AMERICA’S SECURITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST ACT OF 2019—Motion to Proceed—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

RUSIA SANCTIONS

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I rise today to express my support for S.J. Res. 2, a resolution of disapproval on lifting sanctions against the energy and aluminum companies En+ RUSAL, and EuroSibEnergo.

To start from the beginning, the United States of America has had very good reasons for sanctioning Oleg Deripaska. There are a number of significant national security risks at play. That is why repeatedly—not just in the current administration but in prior administrations—this individual has been denied a visa and why he has been personally sanctioned by the Treasury Department. As a matter of fact, the Treasury press release announcing the sanctions noted that Deripaska “has been investigated for money laundering, has been accused of threatening the lives of his business rivals, illegally wiretapping a government official, and taking part in extortion and racketeering.”
These are not the qualifications of someone who should get relief from the United States. I appreciate the fact that his company, RUSAL, has an enormous effect upon the aluminum markets. I appreciate the efforts the Treasury Department has made in restricting his control. But any businessperson knows that if you take an ownership position from 70 percent to 45 percent, and even with the voting power of 35 percent, you still control a company, particularly when this company was founded and the management team was all created by Mr. Deripaska.

As we see continuing challenges coming out of the Russian Government, as we see continued efforts of Mr. Deripaska, being one of Vladimir Putin’s closest allies and closest cronies, we would send absolutely the wrong signal if we in this body were to remove these sanctions.

I know my friend from Texas, John Cornyn, in a moment, I simply want to refer to the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Chairman Burr, who has frequently pointed out that Deripaska and his associates have come up a number of times in our Senate Intelligence Committee Russia investigation. All those facts can’t be laid out here right now, but I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this resolution that will come up later today, that we don’t send a signal that we are open for business as usual if we shut down a quarter of the government and cannot be business as usual if we shut down a quarter of the government and just leave it shut down.” Senator Booker said that Senate Democrats should block consideration of all unrelated bills.

All this comes as a result of the fact that the impetus is on the Democrats to come forward and negotiate a resolution of the shutdown in good faith. But to this point, the Speaker, Ms. Pelosi, and the minority leader, Senator Schumer, have simply refused to negotiate with the President.

I was with the President down in Texas, down along the border, on Thursday. He is willing to negotiate. We know we had broad bipartisan support for the Secure Fence Act, for example, in 2006, authorizing up to 700 miles of fencing on the southern border. The Democratic leader voted for that, and so did Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton. Later, in 2014, all Democrats voted for $40 billion in border security, including barriers, fencing, and tactical infrastructure along the border. Now they are saying, as the Speaker has said, that somehow this is “immoral.” Well, this is hypocrisy at its worst.

**Nomination of William Barr**

Madam President, on another matter, today the Senate Judiciary Committee is holding a hearing on the nomination of William Barr to be Attorney General of the United States. Mr. Barr is uniquely qualified for this position in large part because he held the job before. As a matter of fact, 27 years ago, he was nominated by George Herbert Walker Bush to be Attorney General of the United States. He was confirmed by a unanimous voice vote in the Senate. It received little fanfare at the time because it wasn’t particularly controversial—nothing like the contentious, partisan confirmation battles we have seen the last 2 years. There wasn’t an attempt—at least so far, and I am keeping my fingers crossed—to assassinate Mr. Barr’s character or try to decipher the notes in his high school yearbook like we saw in the Kavanaugh hearing. Instead, so far, and to the committee’s credit, we have focused on his qualifications.

He is clearly smart, articulate, and able. He has a clear understanding of what the role of the Attorney General is and, more importantly, what it is not. An Attorney General should not be a politician. As a matter of fact, the Attorney General has the very difficult job of balancing his responsibilities as the chief law enforcement officer in the country enforcing the rule of law along with the fact that he is a political appointee of the President. To me, that is one of the most difficult positions in government. But Mr. Barr has done it before, and I think he can do it again. He, of course, has great institutional knowledge of the Department of Justice.

In addition to Attorney General, he held the job of Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel and Deputy Attorney General before he was promoted to the top job.

Back in 1992, when Mr. Barr was confirmed, then-chairman of the Senate Judiciary, Joe Biden—President Obama’s Vice President—said he would be a fine Attorney General.

This morning, I heard Mr. Barr discuss those qualities that undoubtedly led Senators on both sides of the aisle to support his confirmation. He spoke of the importance of acting with professionalism and integrity. As a matter of fact, he said that at 68 years old, he basically had decided only to answer the call by the President to return to public service. He said: I am completely independent. I will make the hard decisions. I will make the right decisions. I will help restore the reputation of the Department of Justice to an apolitical, a nonpolitical department, which is exactly what we need.

He wants to make sure that the character and reputation of the Department of Justice is enhanced and renewed, and then it could withstand even the most trying political times, including those in which we presently live.

He spoke of serving with independence, providing no promises or assurances to anyone outside of this body rather than to faithfully execute and administer the laws of the United States of America.

It is clear to me that he maintains the same views he held 27 years ago. I share his view that the Department of Justice should function outside of the highly politicized times we live in. The fair and impartial administration of justice is the highest obligation and duty of this position.

I believe Mr. Barr is an outstanding nominee and, once confirmed, will be an outstanding Attorney General. I look forward to voting yes on his nomination.

**Government Funding**

Madam President, on the matter of the government shutdown—the 25 percent of the government that is presently not funded—last week, I traveled with the President, along with my colleague Senator Cruz, to the Rio Grande Valley, to McAllen, TX.

After the President held his roundtable, where he saw heroin, methamphetamine, and weapons, and heard about the human trafficking, including sex slavery involving children and girls, and women, and children, and women, after that presentation—after the President left, Senator Cruz and I sat down with a number of our constituents—county judges, mayors, law enforcement officers, as well as the folks from Border Patrol and Customs and Border Protection. They understand the border better than anybody because they live there. They are deeply concerned about the posturing in Washington and how the political arguments seem to overcome logic and listening to the experts when it comes to border security. I asked them for them to confirm once again what they previously told me: that we need to strengthen those border communities.
and keep our country safe, while keeping legitimate trade and commerce flowing across the border.

During our discussion, Scott Luck, Deputy Chief of the Border Patrol, talked about the positive impact of physical barriers and what positive impact they have at targeted locations along the southern border. He said:

The physical barrier has worked every place I have been. I have been in places where we did not have it; they put it in and it worked.

He mentioned Douglas, AZ, as one of those. He said:

There were more people coming into the country there than any other place in the country. I was there. It stopped. It stopped in California. It stopped in Yuma. It stopped in El Paso. It will stop wherever we put it.

Despite what our colleagues across the aisle are saying, physical barriers at the right places is coupled with technology and personnel. It doesn’t do you much good to have a physical barrier that somebody can go over or around or through and you don’t have a Border Patrol agent there to deal with them.

Actually, the physical border is the last place you are going to stop people trying to illegally enter into the United States, together with the narcotics and the human trafficking, but it is important to have those tools available to the Border Patrol, and that is what Deputy Chief Luck was stressing. He made the comments and observation that physical barriers alone are not the solution for the entire border—a holistic border security approach also requires technology and personnel.

When we were discussing the need for building physical barriers in strategic locations, my friend, Cameron County Judge Eddie Trevino, said something to Border Patrol Council President Brandon Judd that I think encapsulates the whole debate. He was talking to the Border Patrol and CBP and said:

If you need where you need it, I think we are all on board. If the politicians tell us where we need it, I think that is where we have our concern.

In other words, what Judge Trevino was saying was, let’s listen to the experts, the people who know how to use the right combination of technology, tactical infrastructure, and personnel at each given place along the border because it makes no sense to try to treat this like a one-size-fits-all. Anybody from down there to the border between the United States and Mexico knows that the geography and topography vary tremendously from place to place.

Let’s not try to dictate from Washington, DC, where every dollar goes and in so doing try to micromanage the Border Patrol and Customs and Border Protection and the Department of Homeland Security. Let’s leave that to the experts—the men and women who work to protect and secure our border every day.

What we continue to hear and what I continue to advocate is for a layered approach—barriers where they are appropriate, technology, and personnel. That is exactly what we have been talking about. That is what we voted for in 2006 with the Secure Fence Act. The Democrats supported that, along with Republicans. That is what law enforcement officials who used to use the border to operate optimally. Unfortunately, it is what Democrats are now refusing to negotiate and provide.

When looking at the border, it is not just physical security we need to be concerned about; we need to be concerned about our economic security as well.

During our discussions last week with local stakeholders, we also focused on the importance of facilitating legitimate trade and travel at our ports of entry. I was shocked by this figure, but the Customs and Border Protection Officer there, Mr. Higgenson, mentioned that the trade from Texas ports alone is valued at $300 billion per year of our nation’s trade with Mexico and border communities in particular, these ports fuel our economy, and we need to provide additional funding to ensure efficient movement across the border.

One thing we all agree on is that most of the high-end drugs—the heroin, the methamphetamine, and the fentanyl—come through the ports of entry. So let’s modernize those. Let’s provide the technology that is needed in order to stop poison into the United States. Legitimate trade and commerce is the lifeblood not only of our border region in my State, it is also the lifeblood of our Nation’s economy. There are 5 million Americans whose jobs depend on bina-

ational trade with Mexico alone.

Along with a number of my colleagues from Texas, we are sending a bipartisan letter to President Trump that thanks him for his continued work to secure our border. His advocacy for that layered approach, as well as for port of entry improvements, is vital to my State. In that letter, we also address recent ru-
mors to the effect that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ funds might be used for border security purposes, and I have urged the President not to take that route. While I will continue to ad-
vocate for additional border security, I believe those funds were intended to support disaster relief and should be used for that purpose. We need both border security and to lend a helping hand to those who are still recovering from natural disasters. We don’t have to rob from Peter to pay Paul. We need to do both.

I am grateful for the support that has been shown from the President to the people of Texas both in the days fol-

lowing Hurricane Harvey’s landfall and in the nearby year and a half since, and I hope he will continue to work with all of us to help countries impacted by Hurricane Harvey and as we work together to secure our border.

Mr. CARPER. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. CORNYN. I yield.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I thank the Senator for his comments. As Chairman of the Committee on the Border and as his State is on the border, he is well familiar with that part of the world.

As it turns out, as the former chair-
man of the Homeland Security Com-
mmittee, I have had a lot of the borders in the Senator’s State and in other States along the Mexican border. Not that long ago, there were a whole lot of Mexicans coming into the United States, as he knows, and not so many Mexicans going back to Mexico. In the year 2000, when illegal immigration peaked, huge numbers of Mexicans came in—not so much today. As the Senator knows, they are coming from Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. They are a good deal of and also a lot of stuff that makes sense.

I am all for investing there. I think Democrats and Republicans can find common ground, and I think we have. The appropriations bills that we have passed will actually fund that kind of stuff. They are not just Democratic ideas, and they are not just Republican ideas. They are good ideas and a lot of them come from our Border Patrol per-

sonal, as the Senator knows.

We can do all of this and more on the southern border with Mexico, but if people in Honduras, in Guatemala, and in El Salvador continue to live lives of misery because we are complicit in our addiction to drugs, they are going to still want to come up here. So we need to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time and also provide, through Alliance for Prosperity, which is, re-

ally, a modern-day planned Colombia, a little bit of hope and opportunity so they will feel less compelled to come to this country to have a better life.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-

ator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, if I could respond to my friend, the Sen-
ator from Delaware, he speaks correctly—accurately—about some of the symptoms and, I think, some of the cures that we need to put in place to deal with this extraordinarily complex problem. We would love to continue to work with him on coming up with what you’ve called it, I will call it “Plan Mexico” but “Plan Americas” because what we really have to deal with is a regional challenge.
He is exactly right in that most of the illegal immigration now is coming from Central America. Gaps in our immigration and human trafficking laws encourage unaccompanied children and family units to come up to the border because they know they can, potentially, get placed in the United States whenever they wait for their asylum claims to be determined by a court, and there is a backlog of 700,000 or 800,000 asylum claims. In other words, the criminal organizations that move people for money in the United States have cracked the code and have figured out how to be successful in placing people in the United States.

Unfortunately, it also helps to enrich those organizations that move the poison from south of the border into the United States. They contributed to the deaths of some 70,000 Americans last year alone. I am thinking particularly about the fentanyl, along with the heroin, going from China to Mexico and up across the border. Of that consumed in the United States, 90 percent of it comes from Mexico. I agree that it is the demand here in the United States that enriches the cartels, but they are, more or less, commodity agnostic. In other words, they will do anything that makes them money, these criminal organizations.

We need to have people sit down and work together, and I pledge to work with my colleague to try to do that. Yet we can’t get a solution as long as the Speaker of the House calls physical infrastructure or barriers immoral. This is kind of a nonstarter to a conversation that we need to have to try to negotiate our way out of this shutdown.

I welcome working with my friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I extend my thoughts in regard to the comments of the senior Senator from Texas in the need for border security. I appreciate his comments, and I, certainly, agree with them.

NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY 2018 FCS TITLE VICTORY

Madam President, I rise to take a minute to recognize the incredible achievements of the North Dakota State University Bison football team today.

On January 5, it earned its record seventh national championship title. For 7 out of the last 8 years, it has been the national champion.

In a hard-fought victory, NDSU defeated the Eastern Washington University Eagles by a score of 38 to 24 in Frisco, TX. With that win, the Bison have now won an unprecedented, as I say, seventh NCAA Division I football championship series championship, setting a record for the most FCS titles of all time. The Bison now have a total of 15 NCAA championship titles. In addition, the Bison won the 2018 football season with a perfect record of 15 wins and zero losses, displaying just an extraordinary resilience and skill.

This achievement puts the 2018 Bison in, truly, elite company as it has become only the fifth team to cap off an undefeated season with a national championship title. The 2018 team joins the 2013 NDSU team in accomplishing this impressive feat.

Further, NDSU is one of only five FCS teams to have ever won back-to-back titles. NDSU is the deserved holder of the longest title winning streak in FCS history, with its obtaining five titles in a row from 2011 to 2015. It has been victorious in every FCS title game in which it has played.

After the title game, NDSU quarterback Easton Stick became NDSU’s record holder for the most passing yards, having a total of 8,693 passing yards in his college career. He also became the NCAA record holder for the most all-time FCS wins by a quarterback, having a total of 49 career wins.

I also recognize the impressive achievement of NDSU’s head coach, Chris Klieman. During his 5 years as head coach, he led the Bison to an outstanding record of 60 wins and only six losses, winning our national championships in the process. Coach Klieman’s achievement of four titles in 5 years equals the NCAA’s FCS record for obtaining the most titles as a head coach. Coach Klieman and his entire staff instilled character and perseverance in the members of the NDSU Bison football team.

While I know it is bittersweet, I am sure the Bison Nation will join me in wishing Coach Klieman the best of luck in his continued career as the new head coach of the Kansas State University Wildcats next season. We welcome Matt Entz as the new head coach, who was formerly the defensive coordinator. He has, certainly, been part of this great dynasty.

Finally, I recognize all of Bison Nation for its vibrant and unwavering support of the team during another successful season. As they have grown accustomed to doing, the welcoming residents of Frisco, TX, saw a mass of Bison fans flock to their town for the FCS championship game. Fromホーム and wonderful in terms of their hospitality. Approximately 20,000 fans traveled from North Dakota and other areas to support our great team. They turned the stadium into a sea of green and yellow as they passionately cheered on our beloved Bison.

The Bison victory was not only a victory for the NDSU football team but for our State as the team brought yet another trophy back home to North Dakota. I congratulate the team, the coaches, and our great, great fans on another national championship.

Go, Bison.

Again, I am so proud of our great team, and I appreciate the opportunity to take this time to recognize its achievements.

I am pleased to yield the floor to my fellow Westerner from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, I thank my friend and colleague, Senator Hoeven.

Before I get into my prepared comments, let me first associate myself with his words and his eloquent appreciation and congratulations to the folks at NDSU and to the football team. Let me just say that I don’t care what President Trump says—in Bison Nation, we believe in winning.

MARCH FOR LIFE

Madam President, for the first time, I rise as a Member of this prestigious body, as a U.S. Senator, to talk about a critical issue that faces our Nation, which every citizen is right to life.

It is no coincidence that I rise today, the week of March for Life. This coming Friday is the 46th annual March for Life, during which citizens from across the country and hundreds from North Dakota, especially students from places like Shanley High School and the University of Mary and other institutions around our State, will unite to fight against the largest, deadliest, and most silent war this world has ever known. This, my colleagues, is the war against the unborn.

During my time in the House of Representatives in the last 6 years and throughout my campaign for the Senate last year, I promised the people of North Dakota that I will fight for life at all stages. I unite, today, with those who will march this Friday, who will walk with heavy and hopeful hearts and who will pray for the 60 million discarded children who have been denied their very first right to life.

Colleagues, I stand here to call to mind a child’s right to life and protection within the womb of his or her mother. Since Roe v. Wade, which the Supreme Court decided in 1973, over 60 million children have been denied their right to life. There have been 60 million children who have been refused love, comfort, a hug, care, opportunity, and breath. They were torn from experiencing the beauty of the world that we so desperately want to be torn from family and unknown friends.

To deny 60 million innocent children the right to these things is the highest injustice to our people and the highest offense to our God. I speak on behalf of the citizens of North Dakota and of all citizens who will gather this week to say that it is absolutely unacceptable that within this country, life is treated as a commodity rather than a gift from an omnipotent Creator.

Some of my pro-choice colleagues and friends may say that in taking this stance, I am standing against women’s rights—nothing could be further from the truth—and that this is an issue of a woman’s right. It is an issue for the millions of women who have been denied the right to life, fully support women’s rights. I just began supporting them 9 months earlier than some of my colleagues on the other side of this important issue.

To my colleagues who are pro-life who are supportive of this fight, I remind them that abortion is a great injustice, but it is particularly common in situations and communities that
have suffered other injustices. If we are going to be pro-life, I think we must be pro all of life and address the factors that cause women to decide to end the life of their unborn children.

The United States has seen a great evil in its history. We have seen and experienced slavery, discrimination, and human trafficking. All of these things are illegal, and these things are issues on which we as a country take a moral stance. However, abortion is legal. Sixty million lives have been ended legally in our country. Here, in Washington, DC, nearly 40 percent of pregnancies end in abortion.

In New York City, an African-American child is more likely to be aborted than born. As one Nation under God, we, as a country, should know better. We must know better, and I believe we do know better. No government should limit the lives of its youngest and most innocent citizens.

As a Senator, I give you my promise to fight for innocent life, and I ask my colleagues to join me. This is my promise to the people of North Dakota who have chosen me as their Senator and my promise to my fellow citizens, especially those who have never had the chance to hold an American flag in their hands. Within my first few weeks here, I have signed onto several pro-life priorities. I have signed a letter asking President Trump to veto any legislation that undermines the right to life. Additionally, I cosponsored the Protect Funding for Women's Healthcare Act, a bill that would end Federal funding for Planned Parenthood and shift that money to women's health services.

In North Dakota, we don't have any Planned Parenthood clinics, but we have 16 community health centers and over 20 federally qualified health centers. Shifting this money toward these health centers would help the women in my State to receive better and more accessible healthcare. Let me say that again. Shifting funding away from the abortion clinics and toward these community health centers would provide more funds to the health centers that care for women across the State of North Dakota.

Additionally, I have cosponsored the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act and the Title X Prohibition Act, two bills to protect the taxpayer from funding the abortion industry. I have cosponsored the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which would guarantee that a child who survives an abortion will receive the same medical care as a premature child of the same age, and the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act, which protects the rights of parents to be notified if their child is going to have an abortion.

Finally, I have cosponsored the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which would ban abortion after 20 weeks.

My fellow Senators, I stand here because of the citizens of North Dakota and of the United States who desire to see these bills and many other important pro-life bills pass and signed into law. They want an end to this injustice.

I recognize my responsibility to fight for the youngest, most vulnerable members of our society and our future generations. Today, I stand with my constituents and with the entire population of the United States, especially the men and women who have been rebuked by the public. I urge my fellow Senators to take a stand on this pressing issue as well. With our united efforts, the killing of our unborn citizens will continue to diminish.

Our work is fruitful. In every legislative session we see more and more laws passed at the State level to protect unborn life. From 2008 to 2014, the abortion rate in the United States dropped by 25 percent. Each year, we are making great strides and giving a voice to the voiceless.

This fight is not a political fight but a fight for humanity itself. It is a war against all of us and against all of our children, no matter our ideologies. We have to come together and fight the issues in our own parties and work across the aisle. We have to look at each other with open minds and open hearts to solve this crisis that has plagued our country. We must do better at reaching out and uniting with one another in defense of one of the most fundamental rights—the right to life.

The truth is this: We must uphold this right because "we hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed"—at the time of creation—"by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness." Without the first—that is the right to life—we can have neither liberty nor the pursuit of happiness. We have been denying the first for far too long. So let's join together now to give the future of our country, our next generations, the right to life.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I would like to commend my fellow Senator from North Dakota on his heartfelt comments today and express my support and agreement with him and with those comments.

He mentioned a number of pieces of legislation that he is cosponsoring. I am pleased to see that. I, again, have signed onto legislation to support life in this Congress, as I have in previous Congresses.

We will have the March for Life at the end of this week. I look forward to that. Last year, my wife and her sister actually walked in the March for Life. I have always made a practice of greeting our participants in the March for Life from North Dakota, and I certainly look forward to seeing them again here this year.

With that, I thank you for this time to make these comments, and, again, to extend a warm welcome to my colleague from North Dakota. I have worked with him for many years, and I very much look forward to working with him now here in the Senate.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, in the floor speech that I gave last week on the "Common Sense for Common Defense," I highlighted the fact that our competitors have increased their own military spending and focused on modernization and how we are going to have to do the same.

When I talk about competitors, I am talking about China and Russia. I think this President did a good job of outlining our national defense system and putting it into different categories, because when you talk about China and Russia—not many people are aware of this—China and Russia have increased their own military spending and focused on modernization and how we are going to have to do the same.

Our men and women in uniform are outstanding representations of what is disdained and despised America. Their drive and determination is the reason the United States of America has the honor of being the leader of the free world. That honor, however, is the product of hard work, not birthright. We earned it.

But over the last 2 years, our military supremacy has slowly degraded. General Dunford, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has acknowledged that our qualitative and quantitative advantage has eroded. Toward the end of the Obama administration, with many of our systems, like our brigade combat teams, only 35 percent of them could be deployed because of what happened to the defense budget and our maintenance capabilities.

The same thing happened to our Army aviation brigades. The same thing happened to our F18s. It is the Marines that fly the F18s, and we only had 30 percent of those that could be deployed toward the end of the Obama administration.

This is something that people are not aware of. This is very significant. We need to pay attention to this, if there is ever any question. Constant dollar defense spending dropped $200 billion from 2010 to 2015. That was in the last 5 years of the Obama administration.

In 2010, the budget was $794 billion, and then 5 years later, it dropped down to $586 billion. That is unprecedented. Even after the Korean war, it didn’t drop that much, but, nonetheless, it did. It has never happened before, and we have to make up for it.

That is exactly what we are doing. Our fiscal year 2018 budget brought it back up to $700 billion. Our 2019 budget brought it back up to $716 billion, and we anticipate—and it has been mentioned several times—that in our 2020 budget it is going to be around $750 billion.
We have a slide here that puts it in a little different perspective. As you can see from the slide, at the end of the Cold War, we had about the same number of fighter aircraft as our adversaries at that time—that was Russia and China. It is not clear on the slide, but the orange is the third generation fighters, and the blue is the fourth generation fighters. It shows that now we are getting into the fifth generation. Actually, at that time, we were way ahead of them. This is a thing of the past now.

While we had the same amount, we were still superior because our aircraft were the newest and the most capable in the world. Our fighter aircraft—in fact, most of our military equipment—was better, more modern, and more effective than the Russians or the Chinese had. Now that has changed. During this most recent period of time, we went around the country for 10 years, increasing the quality, and the numbers stayed the same. So we got to the point where many of the things the Chinese and Russians had were better than what we had.

As demonstrated on the chart, our fighter force was reduced nearly 50 percent in total numbers over the last 25 years, and we failed to modernize. Secretary of the Air Force Heather Wilson, said our Air Force is too small to do what the Nation asks. Not only is it too small, but the average age of our aircraft is now 28 years old. How many of us in here drive a car that is 28 years old?

In 1990, we brought over 500 aircraft a year—1990, 500 aircraft a year—but recently, that number has been reduced to 50 a year.

When I go out and talk to people who are in my State of Oklahoma and anywhere in the country, there is the assumption that somehow we have the very best of everything. That used to be the case. That became the case after World War II, but then during the last 10 years is when things dropped. We are going to have to do better because, at this rate, it would take us over 40 years to modernize a fleet that is already too old and too small. Meanwhile, our adversaries have transformed their aircraft fleets with modernization programs and have increased their overall size and capabilities. In fact, the Chinese and Russian air forces have recapitalized and are now, or soon will be, fielding aircraft with capability matching our own but at a much faster rate. If they get to the point where we are in terms of modernization, they are already way ahead of us in terms of numbers. According to the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Goldfein, if we take no action, both the Russian and Chinese forces will be bigger and more technologically advanced than us. We know this is true.

Artillery is measured in terms of rapid fire and range, and that is where we are falling behind them.

The problem is not just the Air Force. The Army, likewise, has gotten smaller and less capable in the same decade. Specifically, in terms of long-range fires—defined as tubed artillery and tactical missiles—you can see the same trend. This is our artillery system. There are three different types of artillery, but you can see that as time has gone by, we have actually fallen behind. If you look at us over here, in 2018, our total is 2,886, as opposed to 22,000 for the Russians and 10,000 for the Chinese. The numbers are there, and we know that is happening, and we know it is taking place as we speak.

In the last 25 years, we have kind of rested on that advantage that things were better than they had. While our adversaries have also reduced the amount of long-range fires over the same period of time, they have significantly modernized their force. We are now in a situation where both of these countries—that is, Russia and China—not only have more artillery than us, but theirs is better than ours.

GEN Mark Milley, the Army Chief of Staff said: “In terms of artillery, the Army is outgunned and outranged by our adversaries.” Unfortunately, people don’t know this, and people are going to have to know this to know what happened to us in the last decade.

One can look at the devastating results from Russia’s action against the Ukrainian army. We all remember that in 2014 they made it possible through the modernization of their artillery systems. The results were there. They were. They inflicted damage.

Recognizing the problem is normally the first step in developing an acceptable solution. The fiscal year 2018 and 2019 budgets got us back in the right direction, but in fiscal year 2018 we have gone up to $700 billion for a defense budget and in fiscal year 2019 to $716 billion. So we are on the road to recovery. We recognize, the people in this body know what has happened to our abilities and our superiority in these areas that is no longer there.

This is kind of interesting. We had a hearing on this the other day. Of all the presentations I have heard, the assessment and recommendations of the National Defense Strategy Commission—that is what this book is right here—was put together a few years ago. They have actually made these assessments and come to the conclusion that if we want to do something—what they have come up with in this is a formula as to what it is going to take right now and for the foreseeable future. They say all of our defense budgets coming up are going to have to be an increase of somewhere between 3 percent and 5 percent above inflation. Of course, that is exactly what these 3 years will do, so we are making headway in that respect.

This growth projection is also one of our Secretaries as well as our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff say is going to be necessary for us to get back up even with and competitive with both Russia and China.

I can remember not long ago being in the South China Sea and watching China actually building islands. It is not legal, but they do it anyway. If you look at what is on these seven islands out there, it is as if they are preparing for World War III. Our allies in the South China Sea plan very much concerned about this as to whose side they are going to be on if this happens.

We don’t want to shortchange our national security. We fully implement the national defense strategy, as found in this book, in a timely manner by avoiding continuing resolutions and eliminating the threat of sequestration.

A continuing resolution is something where, if we don’t get along in this body, we don’t pass our appropriations bills as we are supposed to pass, then we end up passing a continuing resolution that continues what we have done in the previous year. We can’t continue to do that.

The already widening gap with Russia and China will only grow faster if we don’t change our behavior. That is exactly what we plan to do. We need to fix it if we are going to do it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Blackburn). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. RES. 2

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senator be recognized for up to 7 minutes each: Senator Isakson, Senator Menendez, and Senator Crapo; and finally, following the use or yielding back of that time, Senator Schumer be recognized to make a motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 2, and that following his remarks, Senator McConnell be recognized to make a motion to table the motion to proceed following his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
DISAPPROVING THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL TO TAKE AN ACTION RELATING TO THE APPLICATION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION—Motion to Proceed

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I rise to speak against the resolution to disapprove administration’s agreement to delist Rusal, the Russian aluminum giant from the SDN list.

I will vote no today because this was a hard-fought negotiation, resulting in one of the strongest agreements ever devised by Treasury, thereby earning the approval and not a gift to the Kremlin.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is noted.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, I rise to speak against the resolution to disapprove administration’s agreement to delist Rusal, the Russian aluminum giant from the SDN list because Treasury spent the last 8 months getting it right and winning a hard-fought divestiture agreement. It is among the most robust and verifiable delisting determinations ever devised by Treasury, including thorough and complete approval and not a gift to the Kremlin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is noted.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is noted.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor today in support of S.J. Res. 2, expressing disapproval of the Trump administration’s desire to remove Deripaska and companies owned by Oleg Deripaska. In accordance with specific provisions in a law I helped write, Countering America’s Adversaries through Sanctions Act, the Senate has until Thursday to block this delisting; hence the urgency of this vote. If we wait, then under the law, we lose this important opportunity.

Mr. Deripaska is a notorious Kremlin crony who may have played a role in the Russian Government’s attacks during the 2016 Presidential election cycle. At this point, we simply do not know enough about his potential involvement in the cyber attacks and malign influence campaigns carried out by the Kremlin on the American people, and nowhere more so than in the full report of Robert Mueller’s completed investigation. Until then, I am not comfortable with any measure that diminishes sanctions pressure on a powerful Russian oligarch with deep ties to Vladimir Putin, including this recent deal agreed to by the Treasury Department.

I am a strong believer in the power of sanctions to incentivize behavioral change in support of our foreign policy priorities. I also deeply respect the integrity and professionalism of the career officials at the Treasury Department who administer many of our sanctions against Russia.

Nonetheless, the deal before us is seriously flawed. First, we must be clear that it is not the American people but, rather, Oleg Deripaska who would benefit handsomely from this arrangement. After his partial divestment in En+, which is the holding company for the Russian aluminum giant, he would not only work to enrich Deripaska but all but guarantee the unfettered Kremlin influence in a global concern that would also invite a set of unintended consequences involving economic and security costs for our Nation and for our economic allies. So today I am voting against Senator SCHUMER’s resolution to disapprove of the administration’s agreement to delist Rusal, the Russian aluminum giant, from the SDN list because Treasury spent the last 8 months getting it right and winning a hard-fought divestiture agreement. It is among the most robust and verifiable delisting determinations ever devised by Treasury, thereby earning the approval and not a gift to the Kremlin.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is noted.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is noted.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor today in support of S.J. Res. 2, expressing disapproval of the Trump administration’s desire to remove Deripaska and companies owned by Oleg Deripaska. In accordance with specific provisions in a law I helped write, Countering America’s Adversaries through Sanctions Act, the Senate has until Thursday to block this delisting; hence the urgency of this vote. If we wait, then under the law, we lose this important opportunity.

Mr. Deripaska is a notorious Kremlin crony who may have played a role in the Russian Government’s attacks during the 2016 Presidential election cycle. At this point, we simply do not know enough about his potential involvement in the cyber attacks and malign influence campaigns carried out by the Kremlin on the American people, and nowhere more so than in the full report of Robert Mueller’s completed investigation. Until then, I am not comfortable with any measure that diminishes sanctions pressure on a powerful Russian oligarch with deep ties to Vladimir Putin, including this recent deal agreed to by the Treasury Department.

I am a strong believer in the power of sanctions to incentivize behavioral change in support of our foreign policy priorities. I also deeply respect the integrity and professionalism of the career officials at the Treasury Department who administer many of our sanctions against Russia.

Nonetheless, the deal before us is seriously flawed. First, we must be clear that it is not the American people but, rather, Oleg Deripaska who would benefit handsomely from this arrangement. After his partial divestment in En+, which is the holding company for the Russian aluminum giant, he would not only work to enrich Deripaska but all but guarantee the unfettered Kremlin influence in a global concern that would also invite a set of unintended consequences involving economic and security costs for our Nation and for our economic allies. So today I am voting against Senator SCHUMER’s resolution to disapprove of the administration’s agreement to delist Rusal, the Russian aluminum giant, from the SDN list because Treasury spent the last 8 months getting it right and winning a hard-fought divestiture agreement. It is among the most robust and verifiable delisting determinations ever devised by Treasury, thereby earning the approval and not a gift to the Kremlin.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is noted.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is noted.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor today in support of S.J. Res. 2, expressing disapproval of the Trump administration’s desire to remove Deripaska and companies owned by Oleg Deripaska. In accordance with specific provisions in a law I helped write, Countering America’s Adversaries through Sanctions Act, the Senate has until Thursday to block this delisting; hence the urgency of this vote. If we wait, then under the law, we lose this important opportunity.

Mr. Deripaska is a notorious Kremlin crony who may have played a role in the Russian Government’s attacks during the 2016 Presidential election cycle. At this point, we simply do not know enough about his potential involvement in the cyber attacks and malign influence campaigns carried out by the Kremlin on the American people, and nowhere more so than in the full report of Robert Mueller’s completed investigation. Until then, I am not comfortable with any measure that diminishes sanctions pressure on a powerful Russian oligarch with deep ties to Vladimir Putin, including this recent deal agreed to by the Treasury Department.

I am a strong believer in the power of sanctions to incentivize behavioral change in support of our foreign policy priorities. I also deeply respect the integrity and professionalism of the career officials at the Treasury Department who administer many of our sanctions against Russia.

Nonetheless, the deal before us is seriously flawed. First, we must be clear that it is not the American people but, rather, Oleg Deripaska who would benefit handsomely from this arrangement. After his partial divestment in En+, which is the holding company for the Russian aluminum giant, he would not only work to enrich Deripaska but all but guarantee the unfettered Kremlin influence in a global concern that would also invite a set of unintended consequences involving economic and security costs for our Nation and for our economic allies. So today I am voting against Senator SCHUMER’s resolution to disapprove of the administration’s agreement to delist Rusal, the Russian aluminum giant, from the SDN list because Treasury spent the last 8 months getting it right and winning a hard-fought divestiture agreement. It is among the most robust and verifiable delisting determinations ever devised by Treasury, thereby earning the approval and not a gift to the Kremlin.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is noted.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is noted.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor today in support of S.J. Res. 2, expressing disapproval of the Trump administration’s desire to remove Deripaska and companies owned by Oleg Deripaska. In accordance with specific provisions in a law I helped write, Countering America’s Adversaries through Sanctions Act, the Senate has until Thursday to block this delisting; hence the urgency of this vote. If we wait, then under the law, we lose this important opportunity.

Mr. Deripaska is a notorious Kremlin crony who may have played a role in the Russian Government’s attacks during the 2016 Presidential election cycle. At this point, we simply do not know enough about his potential involvement in the cyber attacks and malign influence campaigns carried out by the Kremlin on the American people, and nowhere more so than in the full report of Robert Mueller’s completed investigation. Until then, I am not comfortable with any measure that diminishes sanctions pressure on a powerful Russian oligarch with deep ties to Vladimir Putin, including this recent deal agreed to by the Treasury Department.

I am a strong believer in the power of sanctions to incentivize behavioral change in support of our foreign policy priorities. I also deeply respect the integrity and professionalism of the career officials at the Treasury Department who administer many of our sanctions against Russia.
officials at the FBI—Americans deeply committed to the hierarchy of law enforcement—saw enough evidence to suspect that Donald Trump, the sitting President of the United States, could be an agent of the Russian Government. That is stunning. It is absolutely stunning.

Likewise, over the weekend, the press reported that President Trump went to extraordinary lengths to conceal the contents of his conversations with Vladimir Putin in Helsinki and elsewhere, even going as far as tearing up the notes of his interpreter. His own staff reportedly sought to learn the contents of the conversation, only to be told that the interpreter could not share the details because the President told him not to.

As the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I raised serious questions about what happened in Helsinki. I think the whole Nation was awaiting that performance there. We wanted to bring the interpreter forward or to get access to those notes, and now we know those notes were destroyed.

Throughout this Presidency, my colleagues and I have demanded accountability from this administration. I have been dismayed at the lack of clarity and transparency from the President when it comes to his dealings with foreign leaders, particularly Vladimir Putin.

I should note that President Trump has had numerous conversations with President Xi of China, Kim Jong Un of North Korea, and leaders of other heads of state across the world. We are not aware of the same standard of secrecy being applied to those exchanges. The President seems to only keep secret his conversations with Putin. And that begs the question, why? Perhaps because Trump and his 2016 campaign staff have repeatedly lied about the extent of their interactions with Russians. Perhaps because the Trump-Putin discussions extended to Russian financing for Trump Organization’s real estate deals throughout the 1990s and 2000s or the Moscow tower project we now know the Trump Organization was still pursuing well into 2017—not advocating on behalf of the American people. Perhaps because the President inappropriately shared classified information with Putin, much like he did when Foreign Minister Lavrov met him for a meeting in the Oval Office. We just don’t know, and we have a right to find out.

I ask that my entire comments be printed in the RECORD, ending by asking my colleagues to vote in favor of moving forward so that this can come to light.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ISAKSON. If the gentleman would like to finish his remarks, I would be glad to yield for a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank my distinguished colleague from Georgia—a member of the committee—for doing so. I appreciate his courtesy.

As I said, we don’t know, and we have a right to find out. Our own FBI was worried he might actually be a foreign agent.

Presidents certainly have a right to confidential conversations with world leaders. Never before in our history have we had a President under investigation by the FBI for being a foreign agent—an agent of the Russian Federation. In my mind, I think we have the right, the responsibility, and the obligation to ensure that we know what happened in all of these conversations between President Trump and Putin and to understand the full extent of this relationship.

I sent a letter to the President today, with the ranking members of the Armed Services and Intelligence Committees, demanding the preservation of all records associated with these meetings and the opportunity to interview the interpreter. This is a matter of U.S. national security.

This Trump-Russia connection gets more confounding by the day. We have to protect the integrity of all oversight efforts, including the objective, sober investigation still being conducted by Robert Mueller. We must take all measures necessary to protect this investigation, including a rock-solid commitment by the President’s nominee for Attorney General to not interfere in any way. Mr. Mueller’s work. The American people deserve to know who they elected to be their President and what is going on in this regard.

Again, it is time to move to legislation on DASKA, which Senator GRAHAM and I have introduced, along with others. We hope to reintroduce it again.

I think if this body is serious about protecting our institutions, our democracy, and about upholding an increasingly emboldened Kremlin, if we are serious about our oaths to support and defend the Constitution, then, No. 1, we will agree to move forward on this RUSAL question and move forward to find out the rest of the information.

I appreciate the distinguished gentleman yielding time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I wasn’t going to come over here today—just got off an airplane a little while ago—but I am here because of what I have been hearing.

What I have been hearing is that we need to be talking about the shutdown and not other subjects. When I met with the TSA agents on my plane flying up here, they said: Why don’t you get our work back for us?

We are not even talking about TSA. We are not even talking about the shutdown. We are talking about different opinions at different times and different things that don’t really matter in the scheme of things.

I appreciate what the distinguished ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee just said, but quite frankly, last week he was talking about how important it was for us to stay on the shutdown and not do anything. Now the minority side says it is important for us to get this Russian gentleman or oligarch—whatever that is—whom we are already punishing, and then we will go back to the shutdown.

There is only one thing we need to be doing—restoring the confidence of the American people in the Senate and the House. They don’t have it right now. We haven’t given them anything to hang their hat on, other than the thing we have been shut down for 23, 24 days. I am not a Johnny-come-lately—pardon the reference—to the issue of shutdowns. I have been in the Senate and House for 20 years. I voted against five shutdowns—every one I had a chance to. Shutdowns cost the government more money; they don’t save the government any money. They don’t solve any single problem whatsoever. It is like when you only shut down a little bit of the government, like we are right now. Not much of the government is really shut down—just the part that hurts the smallest income earners from our government. We are doing the wrong thing, punishing the wrong people, and that is just not right.

All the speeches you are going to hear today, including mine, don’t matter at all unless we, first of all, get on the shutdown, correct the problem, and find a way to bridge the gap. The President is not moving. The Democrats aren’t moving. The majority leader is not moving. We are not doing much. That doesn’t solve anything. Some would argue the degree to find a way to do something different that may not be the end deal but the bridge to do an end deal, or else we are all going to look silly.

My point is this: Everyone in this negotiation right now is sitting in their office or sitting and talking to some people, having a beer or doing whatever, and saying: How are we going to stick it?—the other party—and get this shutdown over before our people drive us crazy?

We are caught in our own trap. Things like what we are debating this afternoon just emanate that. Mr. President, how do you reconcile investment in the largest aluminum company in Russia, being divested of his interest down from 75 percent, I think, to 45 percent.

My home country of Sweden—one of the largest consumers of their product of aluminum and one of the biggest sellers of aluminum to the United States of America—has called me and said: You all are killing us. We are driven down from 75 to 45, and we have some more things to do. They are losing their vote. I think their vote is down to about 25 percent of the board. They have restricted...
CRAPO, and I—and all of us—should get one. I had to three or four times on it. And it makes a difference. I want to keep going up a little bit.

Let's get it worked out. Let’s not call it a Republican shutdown or a Democratic shutdown. It is an American shutdown. It is an American thing. Let's stop blaming everybody else. Let’s put the blame where it belongs—on all of our shoulders collectively. Let's do what we elected officials were elected to do, and let’s make a deal.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I am not going to talk about the substance of what we are here for.

To my dear friend, JOHNNY, whom I love and who serves the best barbecue I ever have every year, among his many other attributes, I will just make this point.

I have had three people from my State call me. A convention is coming up in one of our cities, and this shutdown is going to hurt the ability to bring that here. We are going to lose the revenue we would normally get from that. So we need to think about what we are doing. We are not winning any points with anything.

A lady who was waiting with me to get on the plane just laughed when I gave my answer to the TSA agent. I turned to her and almost asked: Why are you laughing? I said: You know, I understand why you are laughing because I can’t explain it either.
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I look forward to seeing whether the Democrats will support efforts to modernize our aging nuclear triad as the Russians have done.

I look forward to the Congress’s reviewing its existing sanctions policies to see how we can impose additional costs on Putin and his cronies who enable his malignant activities.

I look forward to the Congress’s ensuring that our sanctions efforts remain multilateral and maximize support from our European allies, whose participation is essential to imposing meaningful costs on the Kremlin.

But, in this narrow case, career civil servants at the Treasury Department simply applied and implemented the law Congress itself wrote and which the Democratic leader supported. Treasury’s agreement maintains sanctions on corrupt Russian oligarch Deripaska. It would continue limiting his influence over companies subject to the agreement.

In addition to subjecting the companies and their officers to unprecedented transparency and monitoring requirements, the agreement preserves Treasury’s ability to snapback sanctions on the companies and their officers. If there is any evidence of further malfeasance, I expect Treasury to use that authority to the fullest.

In the meantime, the Democratic leader’s political stunt should be rejected. I move to table this effort to overturn the hard and painstaking work of the career officials at Treasury, but I look forward to continuing our efforts to hold Putin and his cronies accountable in a thoughtful, far less politicized manner.

The motion to table the motion to proceed I move to table the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 2, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I believe the Senate’s voice should, indeed, be heard on national security policy. This is why I have moved to have the Senate’s first legislative business this Congress be a bipartisan package of foreign policy bills. I made it our first priority to move legislation that would have helped defend Israel and Jordan and provide justice for the Syrians who have been tortured and murdered by the Assad regime, but, apparently, he didn’t actually mean it because now the Democratic leader would like to dictate the terms of a debate on Russia.

We Republicans are hardly strangers to the need for strong policies concerning Russia. We have long seen Vladimir Putin for the KGB thug that he is. We have advocated for tough measures against him and the kleptocrats who surround him. Just ask the junior Senator from Utah who, only 6 years ago, was mocked by the other side for advocating tough policies against the Kremlin.

This Republican administration has taken far tougher measures against Russia than the previous administration did. It has designated 272 Russia-related individuals and entities for sanctions, exposed scores of Russian intelligence officers, shuttered Russian diplomatic outposts, and equipped Ukraine and Georgia to defend themselves against Russian aggression. Clearly, there is more work to be done, and I look forward to this Congress’s taking additional steps to defend our interests against the Russian threats and to additionally impose costs on Putin.

Specifically, I look forward to seeing whether the Democrats will join us in providing additional funding to rebuild our military in key areas to deter and defend against Russian investments and key weapons systems.
DISAPPROVING THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL TO TAKE AN ACTION RELATING TO THE APPLICATION OF CERTAIN SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution.

The clerk read as follows:
A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 2) disapproving the President's proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

RIGHT TO LIFE

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, it is amazing how much we talk about our kids. People talk about bipartisan things here all the time. There is a bipartisan conversation often about our family. Our kids, and how proud of them we are and about sharing our lives with each other.

My two daughters are a remarkable part of my family, of who I am. I can’t even process life without thinking about the two of them.

Our kids are some of the most valuable moments of our entire lives and our greatest memories. When they were little, we looked into their eyes and saw potential, and we dreamed for them. From our earliest days of pregnancy, Cindy and I talked about the future for our girls as we prayed for them, and it had sunk in what an honor they were. Kids are that way. That is that earliest moment that we talk about all the time.

What is remarkable about this photo is thinking about just exactly what this moment could be like because, in this moment, there are really two directions that it could go in America. This little one was born several weeks early. For that little one, life could go two different directions at any time.

This group of doctors is gathered earliest moment that we talk about all the time. Viability really doesn’t determine life, than viability now, thankfully. When a child lives on his own outside the womb, but there is no difference between the two. Both of them have faces and fingers and toes and hair and unique DNA, there is nothing different about that child right there than this child. You see, that child whom we saw in the picture before is the same age as this one, but, this time, this is a 3D ultrasound taken inside the womb, and there is no difference between the two. Both of them have faces and fingers and toes and nervous systems and functioning brains independently. This little girl has DNA that is different from their moms and their dads—DNA that is unique to those people. Whether you can see him or not, that heartbeat and that DNA is a child.

In America, we still have this ongoing dialogue: When is “life” life? I heard someone earlier jokingly say that if this life were discovered on Mars, we would say Mars had life on it, but we are still discussing whether this life is a life on Earth. What do we do with that?

Here is what we continue to debate and continue to have a conversation about. On January 22, 1973, the Supreme Court ruled on what is now the infamous Roe v. Wade decision. It was supposed to have settled the issue about life. It was supposed to have settled the issue that every single State has to allow abortion and that life, according to the Supreme Court in 1973, was always viability. When can this child live on his own outside the womb—viability?

Viability in 1973 was very different than viability now, thankfully. When we think about viability now, there are people born before 21 or 22 weeks—extremely early—who would have never survived in 1973 but who regularly survive now because of great medical care. Viability really doesn’t determine life, though. Life is something that begins much earlier. We all read about the 26-weekers on the cover and they have viability—from the time.

As Americans, we spend a lot of time trying to work on very difficult issues, but for some reason, this has become a partisan issue that is exceptionally divisive in this culture. This life and this child shouldn’t be a partisan issue. This shouldn’t be a Republican child or a Democratic child. This child has to be a child, and we should be able to pause for a moment and determine what we are going to do about her and determine: Is she valuable?

As a culture, we spend billions of dollars caring for the oldest and the weakest in our society because they need 24-hour care and because we respect that life and the dignity that it carries. We demand equal protection for women and men of all races, all ages, all sexual orientations, all faiths. We demand that as a culture because we believe in a culture, that every person should have respect and every person should have opportunity because of one’s great potential.

We put ourselves on the back when we adopt abused animals, when we stand up against human trafficking worldwide, when we help clean up ocean trash, or when we plant trees to beautify our communities. Yet we are having a tough time considering that child as a child.

We even require that cigarettes, alcohol, theme park rides, medicines, and many other products have warning labels on them to warn pregnant moms not to use the product because it could harm the child because, as a culture, we acknowledge that a mom’s smoking hurts a child. Yet, for some reason, we can’t seem to acknowledge that a child could be hurt by an abortion and that it really would end a life.

Is my guess that anyone who disagrees with this has already tuned me out because, as a culture, we don’t want to think about this life because if, for a moment, we pause and consider that maybe she is really alive and has purpose and value, we would have to swallow hard and acknowledge the millions of little girls just like her who have died in abortions in America—millions. To fight against having to deal with that, we just don’t want to think about it, and we just tune it out. Yet, if you are one who has actually stuck with me through the dialogue, let me walk through a couple of things just to think about.

Let’s start with a few things—the science. This little girl has DNA that is different than her mom’s and dad’s. It has cell division. It has something that we would look at in normal embryonic development called the Carnegie stages of embryonic development. For years and years, every medical school teaches the Carnegie stages of embryonic development. They look at cell division at the beginning point and acknowledge, as they go through the
process, that this is a child from the earliest moments and that it is a stage of life. Every single person who can hear me right now has gone through the Carnegie stages of embryonic development, just like this little one has. Every person has the ability—what I understand to be—that it is a natural part of life, that it is a stage of life, that it is an acknowledgment of life.

It is something that we acknowledge in the animal world because this Congress has passed laws to deal with dangers including a $100,000 fine if you damage a golden eagle’s egg. A bald eagle’s egg, if you go to marina turtles’ nesting spots to destroy or to even disturb the nests of marine turtles. In Oklahoma, we deal with barn swallows that will build their nests in the springtime in construction areas. All construction has to stop if a barn swallow builds a nest in a construction area, because those eggs are important, not so much because of the barn swallow but there is a committee understanding in this Congress that those eagle eggs, turtle eggs, and barn swallow eggs are future barn swallows, turtles, and eagles. We acknowledge that it is a life that is in process. So we protect it, but we can’t seem to make the simple logical step that that eagle egg becomes an eagle and she is a little girl.

The science screams at us in this area, but for many people, they just don’t want to think about it because, at this stage, she is in the womb. She is invisible. She hasn’t reached the stage at which you can see her. For many people, they say: She is only alive when I can see her. If I can’t see her, she is not real.

The problem is that the science doesn’t prove that out.

The second issue that we have to deal with is where we are as a culture and where we are as a country compared to others. This simple and asked: Is that a child or is that just tissue? Where is the rest of the world on this?

It is interesting to note that the rest of the world is in a very different spot than is the United States on this. This is a simple map of the world. Most of the world—and you will see it in gray here—says that abortion should stop at 12 weeks. That is 3 months. After 3 months, you can’t have an abortion anymore.

There are seven countries in the world that will allow abortion all the way up to 24 weeks. They are the countries that are here in black—Canada, the United States, China, North Korea, Vietnam, Singapore, and the Netherlands. They allow abortions up to 24 weeks.

At 24 weeks and on, in the third trimester, there are only four countries in the world that allow late-term abortions: China, North Korea, Vietnam, and the United States. Everywhere else in the world looks at that child and says that the child is a child—fully viable except the United States, China, North Korea, and Vietnam. Now, that is not a club I really want us to be in.

All of Europe has banned late-term abortion—all of it. All of Africa, most of Asia, and all of Central and South America have looked at this and, as separate cultures, they have said no to a late-term abortion—that he is a fully viable child.

Interestingly enough, there was a survey last week—a nation-wide survey—that asked Americans’ opinions on this issue about life. There were 75 percent of Americans who said there should not be abortion after 12 weeks of pregnancy—that is 3 months—except to protect the life of the mother. This was 75 percent of Americans. They are with this part of the world. This part of the world all says that same thing. That is most of Europe, and most of that area says OK to 12 weeks, but that after 12 weeks, you have to acknowledge that the child has a functioning nervous system and brain and is developing in all of those areas. Even if you don’t acknowledge where I am, where I believe that life begins—at conception—why can’t you at least acknowledge which is where most of the rest of the world is, he is a child that should be protected?

At what point do we, as Americans, slow down enough to look at what we don’t want to look at and at what the rest of the world has done, except for Vietnam, North Korea, and China? Why do we want to be in that group when we deal with the issue of life? Those are some of the worst human rights violators in the world. Why are we in that club?

Folks have recently said to me: You know, I understand this is a legislative issue, but it is really a faith issue. This is really about your faith, and your faith should not legislate who I am. Otherwise, a culture makes decisions, including our culture, not just about its faith but about its values as a culture.

Stealing is also a religious issue. It is in the Ten Commandments. So maybe, as a culture, we shouldn’t ban stealing because the Ten Commandments say you shouldn’t steal. No one would really say that because, as a culture, we all look at it and say that theft is a problem, that you shouldn’t be able to do that.

A culture makes its decisions based on its own personal values. So it is not just a religious issue, but our faith does impact our personal lives and decisions. It does affect who we are.

In China, where most faith is banned, they allow abortion at any stage. In fact, in China the state is the most important thing. Everything is about building up the state. The individual has no value. The state has the greatest value. China determines it has too many people. It forces women to have abortions. It compels them. Some can only have one child, and some can have two children, but every child after that has to be aborted because the state chooses that. Its greatest value is the state.

Our greatest value is the individual. That is why our documents begin with things like “we the people,” because the individual has value because the individual has importance.

I had someone who taught me and said: You know, your faith has this whole verse in the Bible that says: “I have knit together in my mother’s womb.” So this is a religious issue. You have a belief that each child was knit together by God in their mother’s womb.

Then they paused and said: That is fine for you to have that belief, but I have the belief that they were knit together, but it is when they are not done. They are not fully knit together. They are not really a shirt. They are only a sleeve, and if they are still in development, then, they are not fully developed. They are not really a child yet.

I smile at that and say: Actually, although this child was born premature, you are right. She is not fully developed. It is not just a sleeve. It is just a smaller shirt, but she will get there because everything about your life’s development—your hair color, your height, your health—is all bound up in the first cells as they start dividing in your own unique DNA.

This is not about a religious conviction. This is about a child and who we are as a culture.

Let me say this: I understand there is a lot of conversation about this. As I mentioned before, this has become a partisan, divisive issue. This is not trying to be a Republican or Democrat. I have met Republicans and Democrats who both can look at this picture and say that is a child, because this is a chart.

This shouldn’t be a divisive or political issue, neither should this be an attacking and condemning issue of the moms and dads who have walked through abortion. Quite frankly, I have great compassion for them. For those moms who have had an abortion, that memory never goes away for them. Years later, they sit in the food court at the mall and watch a small child playing nearby and think: That is how old my child would be right now if they were still alive. I have not met a mom, ever, who wasn’t affected by abortion and the memories that come back to them on that.

This is not a flippant issue for any person who goes through an abortion. I grieve for those folks and the struggle they have, but I also grieve for us as a nation in the devaluing of something so obvious as a child. We can do better as a country, but the first thing we have to do is stop and look.

As a nation, we have been through some moments that we are not proud.
of, but as a nation, we are proud of who we can become. As a nation, we are not proud that at one point, we declared African-American men and women as three-fifths of a man. As a nation, we are not proud of that. As a nation, we are not proud that we once told women they could not vote. As Americans, we are not proud that at one point, we took Japanese-Americans and interned them in camps because we were afraid of them. As Americans, we are not proud of that.

I pray there is a day that we are not proud that we looked away from little girls and little boys and said: You are not human enough yet. Your life can be stopped and look at what is obvious. That is a child. What are you going to do about that child?

One of the great books of the 20th century was written by a man named Ralph Ellison, who, by the way, was an Oklahoman. Ralph Ellison was a tremendous African-American author. In the early 20th century, he wrote a book called "Invisible Man." It is a remarkable journey to look into that time period. The author, who is really writing as the narrator of the book, is telling his story.

In the prologue of the book, there is a section I want to read to you because I think it is powerful, just thinking about the philosophy that Ralph Ellison put out. He said this:

I am a man of substance, of flesh and bone, fiber and liquids—and I might even be said to possess a mind. I am invisible, understand, simply because people refuse to see me. Like the bodiless heads you see sometimes in circus side-shows, it is as though I have been surrounded by mirrors of hard, distortion glass. When they approach me they only see my surroundings, themselves, or figments of their imagination—indeed, everything and anything except me.

Nor is my invisibility exactly a matter of biochemistry peculiar to my epidermis. That invisibility to which I refer occurs because of a peculiar disposition of the eyes of those with whom I come in contact. A matter of the construction of the inner eyes those eyes with which they look through their physical eyes upon reality.

Ralph Ellison was saying in the early 20th century that White America, when they turn into Black America, refused to look and ignored them as if they were invisible and just walked on.

As a culture, I am grateful that Americans are opening their eyes to each other as friends and as neighbors and as Americans. I wonder, one day, when the peculiar eyes that choose to pretend that this child is invisible, simply because she looks like this, when our peculiar eyes choose to look at what we have chosen to say is invisible and ignored away and to say: Let's see what we do as a culture. Let's march for life. Let's speak out for what is obvious, and let's determine what to do in the next step.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. McSALLY). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam 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. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I want to spend a few minutes talking about the partial government shutdown, which is happening right now, and how we got here. It is related to it, the men and women of the U.S. Coast Guard who are working today, like every other member of the military, risking their lives here, in my State of Alaska, and overseas in the Middle East, and are not getting paid to do so. They are the only branch of the U.S. military not getting paid to risk their lives for their country. They missed their first paycheck today, but here is the good news. We are offering a solution—a solution that is working through the Trump Administration that has a lot of potential.

Before I get to that, I want to talk a little bit about the partial government shutdown itself and make clear that I believe the Trump administration’s effort to accomplish it would be part of the solution. Every nation has the right and has the responsibility to protect its citizens and to protect its sovereignty. In my view, this is something that should not be controversial. Every nation has the right and responsibility to do this, and that is what the citizens of each country expect. It should not be controversial.

In fact, over the past 25 years, every single President of the United States—Democrat and Republican—has attempted to secure the southern border and has come before the Congress and said: I am going to secure the southern border. They have campaigned on securing the southern border. They have failed. Even today, the fact of Congress—Democrats and Republicans—year after year have come to the floor of both Houses and said: We need to do it.

In a big speech in 2014, President Obama called the situation on the southern border a crisis. That was 4 years ago. He called it a crisis—the previous President, President Obama. I agreed with his assessment then, and I agree with President Trump’s assessment now, which is the same assessment.

That is why the President is asking for $5.7 billion to secure our border. It is not an unreasonable request, particularly, when Members of this body, just last spring, when we were debating immigration reform and voted for dollar amounts that were much greater than that. Again, Democrats and Republicans, last spring, debating on the floor of this body immigration reform and border security, voted way north of $7.7 billion.

This is just one of the many solutions we need to grapple with in order to have a functional immigration system that secures our border, enforces the law, helps to grow our economy, and, importantly, keeps families together. Securing the border is an important goal.

I am hoping that as we all work on this. Speaker PELOSI, Minority Leader SCHUMER, the President, and my Republican colleagues could get to a compromise on this issue soon. We all need to come together.

The good news, as I mentioned, is that we might be on the verge of coming together—those parties that I just mentioned—on one of the issues that relate to securing our border, that relate to this broader challenge on the government shutdown. I am grateful for the Nations of the U.S. Coast Guard. I am hopeful that this could be a template for getting out of the broader partial government shutdown.

Texas helping with natural disasters, hurricanes—all heroic service. There have been many shutdowns before in the Federal Government, unfortunately, dating back decades, but this might be the first time ever that you have members of the military who are not getting paid during this partial government shutdown. The Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines are all out there risking their lives for our Nation. We greatly appreciate that. And guess what. They are getting paid to do it, as they should be, but the Coast Guard members are also out there risking their lives, especially in my State, the great State of Alaska. They are out in the Arctic Seas, the Pacific Coast, and most dangerous oceans in the world, keeping our fishermen safe and doing rescues. They are deployed overseas. They are deployed in the Middle East. They have been in Florida and Texas helping with natural disasters, hurricanes—all heroic service. There have been many shutdowns before in the Federal Government, unfortunately, dating back decades, but this might be the first time ever that you have members of the military being paid during the shutdown, with the exception of one.

Let me read a letter from the commandant of the Coast Guard, ADM Karl Schultz, to the men and women of the Coast Guard.

To the Men and Women of the United States Coast Guard,

Today you will not be receiving your regularly scheduled mid-month paycheck. To the best of my knowledge, this marks the first time in our Nation’s history that service members in a U.S. Armed Force have not been paid during a lapse in government appropriations.

That is the first paragraph in the Commandant’s letter to all the members of the U.S. Coast Guard. It is the first time in the U.S. history we are discussing service members in the Coast Guard.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Men and Women of the United States Coast Guard, Today you will not be
receiving your regularly scheduled mid-month paycheck. To the best of my knowledge, this marks the first time in our Nation's history that servicemembers in a U.S. Armed Services have not been paid during a lapse in government appropriations.

Your senior leadership, including Secretary and the entire Armed Forces, will maintain a steady flow of communications to keep you updated on developments.

I recognize the anxiety and uncertainty this situation places on you and your family, and we are working closely with service organizations on your behalf. To this end, I am encouraged to share that Coast Guard Mutual Assistance has received a $5 million donation from USAA to support our people in need. In partnership with CGMA, the American Red Cross will assist in the distribution of these funds to our military and civilian workforce requiring assistance.

I am grateful for the outpouring of support across the country, particularly in local communities, for our men and women. It is a direct reflection of the American public's sentiment towards their United States Coast Guard; they recognize the sacrifice that you and your family make in service to your country.

It is also not lost on me that our dedicated civil servants, risking their lives daily. They can't just quit their job. By the way, if they want to just go quit, they are going to be court-martialed. That is different, whether it is retirement pay, or pay. I am hopeful that is a temporary situation.

The strength of our Service has, and always will, be our people. You have proven time and again the ability to rise above adversity. Stay the course, stand the watch, and serve with pride. You are not, and will not, be forgotten.

Semper Paratus,
ADMIRAL KARL L. SCHULTZ,
Commandant.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Nobody thinks this is a good idea. Nobody thinks this is a good idea. So last week, a number of us in this body, Democrats and Republicans, put forward a bill that simply says we should pay the men and women of the Coast Guard, even if we are in a partial government shutdown, just like paying the men and women of the other branches of the military. They are risking their lives daily. They can't just quit their job. By the way, if they want to just go quit, they are going to be court-martialed. That is different than other Federal service. So that is what we said we were going to do.

When the President came to the Senate last week, I had the opportunity to raise this issue with the President and his team and highlighted the fact that this is very different, and we need to work together. We have a bill. If we get the President's support and signature on it, that would be a good way to move it forward, and I have been in communication with his administration ever since the lunch—working with us.

I am hopeful we are on the verge of a breakthrough because the White House has said the President recognizes this is a situation that is unique—so he has now said he is going to support this bill. We have Democrats, Republicans, the White House, and the President of the United States all saying, all right, we are not there yet. But I think it is a good start, and this is an important issue.

What is going on right now in this body is we are trying to UC this. We are trying to get unanimous consent from Democrats and Republicans on this bill. Again, leadership on the Democratic side and on the Republican side have all supported this bill: pay the Coast Guard like the other military service members. The White House is now supportive. Hopefully, tonight we are going to get this cleared, and we are going to get it over to the House; Speaker Pelosi and her team will recognize how dire and important this is—just like Democrats, the President, and Secretary Nielsen Secretary of Homeland Security all recognize this—and we get to a solution. It is not going to end everything, but it will be a solution.

I am asking my colleagues tonight, as this bill is being moved through the hotline for unanimous consent—and I thank all the Republicans who have already said they will support it. We get our colleagues on the Democratic side—again, there are a number of Democratic cosponsors on this bill. The President said he would sign it. We get it over to the House, and we start to get solutions as opposed to just roadblocks.

There are just two broader issues I want to raise. As I am indicating, this kind of work can be a template to getting to a broader solution with regard to the partial government shutdown. Democrats and Republicans in this body working together, the White House working with us, the Trump administration working with us, and, hopefully, the House will see the wisdom of this bill come over to them, and we will get a bill signed that takes care of almost 50,000 Active-Duty patriots—men and women—risking their lives, right now as we speak, with no pay.

I am hopeful that is a template.

Another broader issue that this matter actually raises—that we need to focus on a lot more in the Senate—is a problem I have seen in the last 4 years during my time here; that sometimes the executive branch, everyone involved—no matter how long and how strongly they disagree—is willing to live by the Constitution, and the Constitution says, the only way you can fund the government is if the House and the Senate pass a spending bill and the President signs it into law.

Likewise, we had a vote a few minutes ago about a decision made by the administration to delist a Russian company after some changes were made to the ownership structure. You may disagree with it or agree with it, but the bottom line is, that is the reason the vote happened today. I believe the law that said within 30 days of it being enacted, the Congress could act to disapprove. That is the way our constitutional system works.

So despite our sharp disagreements, despite our arguments, despite what appears outwardly to the country and many in the world as a sign of division and weakness, the result may not be
anything we support—or maybe it is—but at its core, let’s remind ourselves that the reason this is happening is because everyone involved, no matter how much they appear to dislike each other or how much they disagree, they are willing to take this step and for the sake of the Constitution of the United States of America.

**VENEZUELA**

Imagine an alternative for a moment. Imagine if the President, frustrated by Congress’s continuing unwillingness to fund one of his priorities on border security, frustrated by a decision in Congress to disapprove of a decision he made regarding sanctions, decided not only was he going to ignore Congress, but he was going to stop paying them, he was going to jail its Members, and he was going to create an alternative Congress, which he handpicked and controlled.

That sounds farfetched. That sounds clearly unconstitutional, but there are parts of this world where those kinds of things are happening, and one of them is in our hemisphere. What I have just described to you is exactly what has happened in the nation of Venezuela beginning as early as 2013.

What has happened there is that the supposed President—actual dictator—of the country, frustrated that the democratically elected national assembly would not support his initiatives to control the country, decided to create an alternative—what they call a constituent assembly—an alternative congress. They no longer pay the national assembly members at all. They have no staff; they have no budget; they are hardly allowed to meet; and several of them have been jailed.

As part of this process of replacing the national assembly or at least ignoring them and giving no force of law to what they vote on and creating this alternative national assembly called the constituent assembly, completely outside their Constitution, with no basis in law—that entity, that organism, called for an election, a new election for President. It was a snap election designed to not allow the opposition to organize in time, an election in which they control all the television stations, in which people had to show an ID card in order to vote, and that ID card also happened to be the card that got your food and medicine—or the limited amounts people get—not a fair election in any way.

The result is, last May, Maduro “wins” this “fraudulent” election, and the first day of the term of this fraudulent Presidency was last week.

Rightfully the President of the United States, along with leaders from multiple other countries—including Colombia, Brazil, Canada, and dozens of countries around the world—have said Maduro is an illegitimate President under the Constitution of Venezuela. The election you held isn’t free and fair. The election you held was authorized by an organism that is not recognized under the Constitution. You are not the real President. You are a fraud, and the only reason why you are in office is because you are threatening to jail or kill the people who are willing to raise this point against you.

The administration went further, and they said the constituent assembly of Venezuela is the only constitutionally, democratically elected government in the country.

The statements we have made in the last week are rooted in rule of law and entirely rooted in the Venezuelan Constitution, and they are not unilateral actions. These statements have been supported by other countries in the region, including Venezuela’s neighbors.

If, in fact, we are basing our public policy on the Constitution of Venezuela, there is one more provision we cannot ignore; that is, a provision in the Constitution that says that when there is a vacancy in the Presidency and the Vice Presidency, the President of Venezuela is the President of the national assembly.

We have a similar line of succession in the United States. In the absence of the President or the Vice President, the Speaker of the House automatically becomes the President of the United States. They might have a swearing-in ceremony, but by law that absence triggers the Presidency of the United States. They have a similar outline in Venezuela under their Constitution. So it stands to reason that if our policy is that Maduro and his Vice President are illegitimate because they were elected in an extra-constitutional, fraudulent election, then clearly the Presidency of Venezuela is vacant. And if we are recognizing the President of the National Assembly as the only constitutionally and legitimately elected body in the country, then we must respect the fact that that Constitution automatically passes the title of ‘President’ to the President of the Assembly.

What I come to the floor today to ask is that the administration—fully—hopeful in concert with Brazil and Canada and Columbia and other countries around the world—simply recognize what the Venezuelan Constitution clearly lays out. There is no President in Venezuela right now that has been democratically elected, and via their own Constitution, the current President of Venezuela, pending a new election, is Juan Guaido, the President of the National Assembly.

This is entirely rooted, as I said, in rule of law and under the Venezuelan Constitution. It doesn’t even require Mr. Guaido to assume the office; it automatically is bestowed upon him. It is a critical thing for us to do in order to begin to build a better future for Venezuela, along with our partners in the region.

I think the next actions that should be followed after that happens is that Mr. Guaido name a cabinet and name leaders to run the military.

From the perspective of the United States, since we have recognized the legitimate Presidency of the National Assembly’s President, pending a new election, I think the time has come to expel the Maduro-appointed Ambassadors and allow the new constitutional President to appoint replacements.

The frozen assets of the Venezuelan Government should be put at the disposal of legitimate government so they can use them to conduct a free and fair election, and also use them to begin to rebuild the country.

The opportunity exists now to work with the new President, pending the new election, to begin laying out plans to deliver humanitarian aid right now, along with our partners in the region in the world, but also to help put together a package of assistance to help Venezuela rebuild a country decimated by the current dictatorship.

These are bold moves, but they are entirely rooted in rule of law, entirely justified under the Venezuelan Constitution, and will be clear evidence that we will not stand by idly as democracy in the region is wiped out by this growing trend around the world of authoritarians assuming the vestiges of democracy—holding elections that aren’t real elections, having parliamentary bodies that aren’t real—in essence, dressing the part of democrats but behaving like dictators.

I strongly urge this administration publicly—and I have done so privately—to move quickly to recognize the President of the National Assembly of Venezuela, Juan Guaido, as the interim President of that country pending a transition to a new, free and fair election, and I hope this is an action we will take in concert with our partners in the region who recognize the exact same thing.

There is a window of opportunity here to shine the light of freedom and liberty through our actions, and I hope we move expeditiously in pursuit of that goal. And to the Venezuelan people—that they may know that we are standing with them, that we have been given a concrete opportunity to defend their aspirations for freedom and a better future but also to defend their Constitution.

To military officers in Venezuela who swore to uphold and defend their Constitution, I urge you today to stand together for you to abandon the current direction of the country and assume your responsibility that you have sworn to uphold, and that is the constitutional provisions of that country.

I believe with all my heart and I have every reason to believe without any doubt that this administration and this government, along with this Congress, stand ready to work hand in hand with the people of Venezuela to restore a rightful democracy and empower that people to head in the right direction. I urge the administration to move quickly to take the first step on our part to facilitate that. It is, as I said,
the last, best chance we have before it potentially becomes too late and the dark cloud of tyranny settles upon Venezuela the way it has over Cuba and increasingly over Nicaragua now for over two generations.

I urge the President and his administration to do what only they are empowered to do under our Constitution; that is, recognize the rightful heads of state of other nations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I know you are not allowed to respond to me, but allow me to welcome you to the Chair as a new Member of the Senate.

With a new year come a lot of changes. This month, a Democratic majority was sworn in to the House of Representatives. That new majority has heard the call from Americans to make the climate change challenge one of our top priorities, and what a change that will make from the last Congress.

Young voters who helped propel this change are urgently concerned about climate change. More than three-fourths of Americans agree on the need for climate action. Even a majority of Republican millennials agree on the need for action in face of our climate crisis. Indeed, a former Republican Congressman just wrote about climate change—"my party will never earn the votes of millennials unless it gets serious about finding solutions."

Of course, it is not just younger voters; polling shows that Americans of all ages and political stripes favor policy solutions that scientists and economists say are needed to tackle climate change. A recent survey of more than 10,000 registered voters showed that nearly two-thirds of Americans believe that investing in renewable energy will create more jobs than investing in fossil fuel. Among Republicans—here—52 percent of Republican voters think that focusing on renewables will create more jobs than fossil fuel—52 percent to 29 percent—and that is with the non-stop saturation, indoctrination of the Republican Party by the fossil fuel industry, with all of its propaganda and nonsense.

Of course, the facts bear out that renewable energy will create more jobs. It is already. Over two generations Americans are employed in the renewable energy and energy efficiency industries, compared to just over 1 million in fossil fuels. There is far more job growth in the renewable sector than in the declining, decrepit fossil fuel industry.

Solid majorities of Americans say they want more emphasis on renewable energy. Seventy-one percent want solar, 64 percent want wind, and 56 percent want more hydropower. By contrast, only 40 percent want more natural gas, only 25 percent want more oil, and only 18 percent want more coal. Seventy-one percent want solar, and 18 percent want coal. I think the Trump administration would do well to pay attention to those numbers—if it were, indeed, about the numbers, anyway.

So make the question harder. Go all in. Americans want a full transition to a 100-percent renewable energy system, and most say that the transition to a 100-percent renewable energy system for America will be good for working families—better than continuing on our fossil fuel path.

If you look at what Republicans say, by 2 to 1, Republican voters say that going to renewables will have a positive impact on working families, versus only 23.5 percent who say it will have a negative impact. The rest—"don't know" or "no impact either way."

But the people who favor 100 percent renewables as a good thing for working families—even among Republican voters, it is 2 to 1 over fossil fuel.

When Americans are told about a Green New Deal that will reduce emissions, they think that focusing on renewables will have a positive impact on working families, versus only 23.5 percent who say it will have a negative impact. The rest—"don't know" or "no impact either way."
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at least $4 million from Big Oil and the Koch brothers’ political network—at least $4 million. We don’t know for sure because of their clandestine, dark money funding network. Likely, it is far more.

More importantly, $4 million that the fossil fuel industry funded these groups with may likely be far more because so much of the fossil fuel industry’s funding is obscured through dark money channels to hide their hand.

What did they achieve? Well, they got a vote. Unlike the carbon pricing bills, they got a vote on the House floor. Speaker Ryan brought the fossil fuel-funded resolution to a vote, and with the Republican caucus largely a wholly owned subsidiary of the fossil fuel industry, the resolution passed.

There is a whole case study in corruption here, as the Founding Fathers would define it, but the simple lesson for today’s purposes: Money talks and big fossil fuel money commands.

This is the point I just went through and others show what Americans want. Americans want jobs, Americans want clean air, Americans want a healthy climate, and Americans want to be safe from extreme weather, wild fires, and rising seas, and Americans know clean energy solutions will get them there.

Americans are ready for bipartisan action, and before the Supreme Court’s decision in Citizens United came along, we had lots of bipartisan action in the Senate on climate. We had lots of bipartisan action in the Senate on climate, but with Citizens United, unlimited money launched into our politics and things changed, and now the strings are pulled by Big Oil, Big Coal, and a couple of creepy fossil fuel industry billionaires.

Special interest money has infected almost everything we do in Congress, and it is the flagrant fact of our non-response to the climate crisis. The warming is happening before our eyes to the point of decades—first from the scientists, then from the economists, now from practically everywhere.

I went to the capital city of the Presiding Officer’s State and was told there that the staffing requirements for police and fire were going to have to change because Phoenix, AZ, was becoming so hot that it was getting crowded in the Phoenix area because it was so hot to work in the new levels of heat that the city of Phoenix is experiencing. You have to be able to rotate people much faster through crime scenes and through fire scenes and you had to have other people willing to stand by and cool them off after they were exposed to superheating.

So it is everywhere now. If you live on the coast, it is sea level; if you live out West, it is wildfires, and it includes Republican voters and particularly younger Republican voters.

Remember what the recently departed Republican Member of Congress said: ‘My party will never earn the votes of millennials unless it gets serious about finding solutions.’

Well, clean energy is a solution. The fact of all this Republican voter support on the one hand is a sign of hope for the new year—of hope that elected Republicans will hear their voters and will take action and support the clean energy solutions that can avert the climate crisis. At the same time, the voters on the Republican side who are saying what they want are also being ignored. These numbers are equally telling of the secretive political forces at work in Congress to bottle us up and to prevent what even Republican voters want.

There is a rot in our politics, and our failure on climate change is a telling indicator of that rot. The whole world is watching. America is supposed to be ‘a City upon a Hill,’ an example for the world. They don’t stop looking when we are a bad example. We have to get serious about this. Time is running out. It is time to wake up, and it is time to clean up.

With that, I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McConnell. I thank my friend from Rhode Island.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McConnell. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for S.J. Res. 2. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on S.J. Res. 2, a joint resolution resolving the President’s proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation. John Thune, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, Todd Young, John Cornyn, Jerny Moran, John Boozman, Deb Fischer, John Hoeven, Susan M. Collins, Cory Gardner, Dan Sullivan, Marco Rubio, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Pat Roberts, Roger F. Wicker, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, Mitch McConnell.

Mr. McConnell. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McConnell. Madam President, I seek unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. Burr. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence’s Rules of Procedure be printed in the Record. There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

RULE 1. CONVENING OF MEETINGS

1. The regular meeting day of the Select Committee on Intelligence shall be every Tuesday of each month that the Senate is in session, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman.

1.2. The Chairman shall have authority, upon notice, to call such additional meetings of the Committee as the Chairman may deem necessary and may delegate such authority to any other member of the Committee.

1.3. A special meeting of the Committee may be held at any time upon written request of five or more members of the Committee filed with the Clerk of the Committee.

1.4. In the case of any meeting of the Committee, other than a regularly scheduled meeting, the Clerk of the Committee shall notify every member of the Committee of the time and place of the meeting and shall give reasonable notice which, except in extraordinary circumstances, shall be at least 24 hours in advance of any meeting held in Washington, D.C. and at least 48 hours in the case of any meeting held outside Washington, D.C.

1.5. If five members of the Committee have made a request in writing to the Chairman to call a meeting of the Committee, and the Chairman fails to call such a meeting within seven calendar days thereafter, including the day on which the written request is submitted, these members may call a meeting by filing a written notice with the Clerk of the Committee who shall promptly notify each member of the Committee and the Clerk of the time and place of the meeting.

RULE 2. MEETING PROCEDURES

2.1. Meetings of the Committee shall be open to the public except as provided in paragraph (b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

2.2. It shall be the duty of the Staff Director to keep or cause to be kept a record of all Committee proceedings.

2.3. The Chairman of the Committee, or if the Chairman is not present, the Vice Chairman, shall preside over all meetings of the Committee. In the absence of the Chairman and the Vice Chairman at any meeting, the ranking minority member, or if no majority member is present, the ranking minority member present, shall preside.

2.4. Except as otherwise provided in these Rules, decisions of the Committee shall be by majority vote of all members present and voting. A quorum for the transaction of Committee business, including the conduct of executive sessions, shall consist of no less than one third of the Committee members, except that for the purpose of hearing witnesses, taking sworn testimony, and receiving evidence under oath, a quorum may consist of one Senator.

2.5. A vote by any member of the Committee with respect to any measure or matter being considered by the Committee may be cast by proxy if the authorization (1) is in writing; (2) designates the member of the Committee who is to exercise the proxy;
and (3) is limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments pertaining thereto. Proxies shall not be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

2.6. When the Committee by roll call votes any measure or matter, the report of the Committee upon such measure or matter shall include a tabulation of the votes cast and the vote of the chair against such measure of matter by each member of the Committee.

RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEES

Creation of subcommittees shall be by majority vote of the Committee. Subcommittees shall deal with legislation and oversight of programs and policies as the Committee may direct. The subcommittees shall be subject to the Rules of the Committee and by such other rules they may adopt which are consistent with the Rules of the Committee. Each subcommittee created shall have a chairman and a vice-chairman who are selected by the Chairman and Vice Chairman, respectively.

RULE 4. REPORTING OF MEASURES OR RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. No measure or recommendations shall be reported, favorably or unfavorably, from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present and a majority vote of the Committee.

4.2. In any case in which the Committee is unable to reach a unanimous decision, separate votes or reports may be presented by any member or members of the Committee.

4.3. A member of the Committee who gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views at the time of the final Committee approval of a measure or matter, shall be entitled to not less than three working days in which to file such views, in writing with the Clerk of the Committee. The views shall then be included in the Committee report and printed in the same volume, as a part thereof, and their inclusion shall be noted on the cover of the report.

4.4. Routine, non-legislative actions required of the Committee may be taken in accordance with procedures that have been approved by the Committee pursuant to these Committee Rules.

RULE 5. NOMINATIONS

5.1. Unless otherwise ordered by the Committee, no nominations referred to the Committee shall be held for at least 14 days before being voted on by the Committee.

5.2. Each member of the Committee shall be presented with a copy of all nominations referred to the Committee.

5.3. Nominees who are invited to appear before the Committee shall be heard in public session, except as provided in Rule 2.1.

5.4. No confirmation hearing shall be held sooner than seven days after receipt of the background and financial disclosure statement unless the time limit is waived by a majority vote of the Committee.

5.5. The Committee vote on the confirmation shall not be sooner than 48 hours after the Committee has received transcriptions of the confirmation hearing unless the time limit is waived by unanimous consent of the Committee.

5.6. Nominations shall be reported to the Senate unless the nominee has filed a response to the Committee’s background questionnaire and financial disclosure statement with the Committee.

RULE 6. INVESTIGATIONS

No investigation shall be initiated by the Committee unless at least five members of the Committee have specifically requested that the Committee initiate an investigation. The Chairman or the Chair shall authorize such an investigation. Authorized investigations may be conducted by members of the Committee and/or designated Committee staff members.

RULE 7. SUBPOENAS

Subpoenas authorized by the Committee for the attendance of witnesses or the production of books, papers, records, or any other material may be issued by the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chairman, and by any person designated by the Chairman, Vice Chairman or member issuing the subpoenas. Each subpoena shall have attached thereto a copy of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress, and a copy of these rules.

RULE 8. PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE TAKING OF TESTIMONY

8.1. Notice.—Witnesses required to appear before the Committee shall be given reasonable notice and all witnesses shall be furnished a copy of these Rules.

8.2. Oath or Affirmation.—At the direction of the Chairman or Vice Chairman, testimony of witnesses may be given under oath or affirmation which may be administered by any member of the Committee.

8.3. Questioning.—Committee questioning of witnesses shall be conducted by members of the Committee and such Committee staff as are authorized by the Chairman, Vice Chairman, or the presiding member.

8.4. Counsel for the Witness.—(a) Generally. Any witness may be accompanied by counsel, subject to the requirement of paragraph (b).

(b) Counsel Clearances Required. In the event that a meeting of the Committee has been closed because the subject matter was classified in nature, counsel accompanying a witness before the Committee must possess the requisite security clearance and provide proof of such clearance to the Committee at least 24 hours prior to the meeting at which the counsel intends to be present. A witness who is unable to obtain counsel may inform the Committee of such fact. If the witness informs the Committee of this fact at least 24 hours prior to his or her appearance before the Committee, the Committee shall then endeavor to obtain voluntary counsel for the witness. Failure to obtain such counsel will not excuse the witness from appearing and testifying.

(c) Conduct of Counsel for the Witness. Counsel for witnesses appearing before the Committee shall conduct themselves in an ethical and professional manner at all times while appearing before the Committee. Failure to do so shall, upon a finding to that effect by a majority of the members present, subject such counsel to disciplinary action which may include warning, censure, removal, or a recommendation of contempt proceedings.

(d) Role of Counsel for Witness. There shall be no direct or cross-examination by counsel for the witness. However, counsel for the witness may submit any question in writing to the Committee. The Committee shall forward the question to the witness and counsel. The Committee may direct the witness to answer such questions or propound such questions to the witness. The Committee shall rule on the admissibility of such questions or suggestions as it deems appropriate.

8.5. Statements of Witnesses.—Witnesses may make brief and relevant statements at the beginning and conclusion of their testimony. Such statements shall not exceed a reasonable time period determined by the Chairman, or other presiding members. Any witness required or desiring to make a prepared or written statement for the record shall do so. Such statement shall be an electronic copy with the Clerk of the Committee, and insofar as practicable and consistent with the notice given, shall do so at least 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance before the Committee, unless the Chairman and Vice Chairman determine there is good cause for noncompliance with the 48 hours requirement.

8.6. Objections and Rulings.—Any objection raised by a witness or counsel shall be ruled upon by the Chairman or other presiding member, and such ruling shall be the ruling of the Committee unless a majority of the Committee present overrules the ruling of the Chair.

8.7. Inspection and Correction.—All witnesses testifying before the Committee shall be given a reasonable opportunity to inspect, in the presence of the Committee, each transcript of their testimony to determine whether such testimony was correctly transcribed. The witness may be accompanied by counsel. Any corrections the witness desires to make in the transcript shall be submitted in writing to the Committee within five days from the date when the transcript was made available to the witness. Corrections shall be limited to grammar and minor editing, and may not be made to change the substance of the testimony. Any questions arising with respect to such corrections and rulings shall be decided by the Chairman. Upon request, the Committee may provide to a witness those parts of the transcript that are not made part of the record at the conclusion of the Committee's decision on the transcript. After the conclusion of the Committee hearing, any witness may request in writing to appear personally before the Committee to testify or may file a sworn statement of facts relevant to the testimony, evidence, or comment, or may submit to the Chairman proposed questions in writing for the questioning of other witnesses. The Committee shall take such action as it deems appropriate.

8.8. Contempt Procedures.—No recommendation that a person be cited for contempt of Congress or that a subpoena be otherwise enforced shall be forwarded to the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present and a majority vote of the Committee.

8.9. Release of Name of Witness.—Unless authorized by the Chairman, the name of any witness scheduled to be heard by the Committee shall not be released prior to, or after, appearing before the Committee. Upon authorization by the Chairman to release the name of a witness, the name shall be released to the Senate unless and until the Committee has, upon notice to all its members, met and considered the recommendation, afforded the opportunity to object to the recommendation, and determined that such contempt recommendation or subpoena enforcement proceeding either in writing or in person, and agreed by majority vote of the Committee to forward such recommendation to the Senate.

8.10. Release of Name of Witness.—Unless authorized by the Chairman, the name of any witness scheduled to be heard by the Committee shall not be released prior to, or after, appearing before the Committee. Upon authorization by the Chairman to release the name of a witness, the name shall be released to the Senate unless and until the Committee has, upon notice to all its members, met and considered the recommendation, afforded the opportunity to object to the recommendation, and determined that such contempt recommendation or subpoena enforcement proceeding either in writing or in person, and agreed by majority vote of the Committee to forward such recommendation to the Senate.

9.1. Committee staff offices shall operate under strict security procedures administered by the Committee Security Director under the direct supervision of the Staff Director or any other person designated by the Committee. All United States Capitol Police Officer shall be on duty at all times at the entrance...
of the Committee to control entry. Before entering the Committee office space all persons shall identify themselves and provide identification as requested.

9.2. All classified and material shall be stored in authorized security containers located within the Committee’s Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF).Copies of documents removed from the Committee offices of such documents and other materials is strictly prohibited except for the Committee, the Office of the Committee staff shall disclose, in whole or in part, to any member of the Senate not a member of the Committee, to any other person engaged by contract or otherwise to perform services for or at the request of, the Committee staff or at any member of the Committee staff or at any permanent staff who have access to the information by virtue of their position at the Committee, acting jointly, or, at the initiative of both or either be confirmed by a majority vote of the Committee. After approval or confirmation, the Chairman shall certify that the information has been certified by the Office of the Attorney General as containing no information of a financial nature.

9.3. “Committee sensitive” means information that contains sensitive business or proceedings of the Select Committee on Intelligence, within the meaning of paragraph 5 of Rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and is: (1) in the possession or under the control of the Committee; (2) discussed or presented in an executive session of the Committee; (3) the work product of the Committee members or staff; (4) properly identified or marked by a Committee member or staff member who authorized the document; or (5) designated by the preparers of the document by the Chairman (or by the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director acting on their behalf), Committee sensitive documents and materials shall be stored in the same manner as classified documents and material in Rule 9.2. Unclassified committee sensitive documents and materials shall be stored in the same manner as classified documents and material in Rule 9.2.

9.4. Each member of the Committee shall at all times have access to all papers and other material received from any source. The Staff Director shall be responsible for the maintenance, under appropriate security procedures, of a document control and accountability registry which will number and identify all classified papers and other classified materials in the possession of the Committee, and such registry shall be available to any member of the Committee.

9.5. Whenever the Select Committee on Intelligence makes classified material available to any member of the Committee or to any member of the Senate not a member of the Committee, such material shall be accompanied by a verbal or written notice to the member or his designee of the necessity to protect such materials pursuant to section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress. The Security Director of the Committee shall ensure that such notice is provided and shall maintain a written record identifying the particular information transmitted and the committee or members of the Senate receiving the information.

9.6. Access to classified information supplied to the Committee shall be limited to those members who have appropriate security clearance and a need-to-know, as determined by the Committee, and, under the Committee’s direction, the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director.

9.7. No member of the Committee or of the Committee staff shall disclose, in whole or in part or by way of summary, the contents of any classified or committee sensitive papers, materials, briefings, testimony, or other information received by, or in the possession of, the Committee to any other person, except as provided in this rule. Committee members and staff shall not disclose classified or committee sensitive information to persons in the Executive branch or in the possession of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the members and staff of the Senate, provided that the following conditions are met: (1) for classified information, the recipients of the information must possess appropriate security clearances (or have access to appropriate security clearances of the originating office); (2) for all information, the recipients of the information must have a need-to-know such information for an official governmental purpose; (3) the Committee members and staff who provide the information must be engaged in the routine performance of Committee legislative or executive functions; (4) the information provided and committee sensitive information may only be disclosed to persons outside the Committee (to include any congressional committee, its committees, any congressional staff, or specified non-governmental persons who support intelligence activities) with the prior approval of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, or the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director acting on their behalf, consistent with the requirements that classified information may only be disclosed to persons with appropriate security clearances and a need-to-know such information for an official governmental purpose. Public disclosure of classified information in the Committee or any of its subcommittees or by any of its officers or members thereof may only be authorized in accordance with Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress.

9.8. Failure to abide by Rule 9.7 shall constitute grounds for referral to the Standing Rules of the Senate, and is: (1) in the possession or under the control of the Committee, and, under the Committee’s direction, the Staff Director and Minority Staff Director, such material shall be kept at a minimum and shall not be used to perform services for or at the request of, the Committee staff included employees of the Committee, acting jointly, or, at the initiative of both or either be confirmed by a majority vote of the Committee. After approval or confirmation, the Chairman shall certify that the information has been certified by the Office of the Attorney General as containing no information of a financial nature.

9.9. Before the Committee makes any decision regarding the disposition of any testimony, papers, or other materials presented to it, the Committee members shall have a full opportunity to present pertinent testimony, papers, and other materials that have been obtained by the members of the Committee or the Committee staff.

9.10. Attendance of persons outside the Committee at closed meetings of the Committee shall be kept at a minimum and shall be limited to persons with appropriate security clearance and a need-to-know the information under consideration for the execution of their official duties. The Security Director of the Committee may require that only those persons who have demonstrated competence and need shall be permitted to attend closed Committee meetings by any person in attendance shall be returned to the secure storage area in the Committee’s offices at the conclusion of such meetings, and may be made available to all agencies, offices, committee, or entity concerned only in accordance with the security procedures of the Committee.

9.11. Attendance of agencies or entities that were not formally invited to a closed proceeding of the Committee shall not discuss either the substance or procedure of the work of the Committee with any person not a member of the Committee or the Committee staff for any purpose or in connection with any proceeding, judicial or otherwise, either during their tenure as a member of the Committee or any time thereafter, except as directed by the Committee in accordance with Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress and the provisions of the Code of Conduct, in such a manner as may be determined by the Senate. The Chairman may authorize the Staff Director and the Staff Director’s designee, and the Vice Chairman may authorize the Minority Staff Director and the Minority Staff Director’s designee, to communicate with the Office of the Committee’s staff in a manner that does not divulge classified or committee sensitive information.

9.12. In the event that a member of the Committee staff shall be employed by the Committee and shall not discuss either the substance or procedure of the work of the Committee with any person not a member of the Committee or the Committee staff for any purpose or in connection with any proceeding, judicial or otherwise, during their tenure as a member of the Committee or any time thereafter, except as directed by the Committee in accordance with Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress and the provisions of the Code of Conduct, in such a manner as may be determined by the Senate. The Chairman may authorize the Staff Director and the Staff Director’s designee, and the Vice Chairman may authorize the Minority Staff Director and the Minority Staff Director’s designee, to communicate with the Office of the Committee’s staff in a manner that does not divulge classified or committee sensitive information.

10.1. For purposes of these rules, Committee staff includes employees of the Committee, consultants to the Committee, or any other person engaged by contract or otherwise to perform services for the Committee. To the maximum extent practicable, the Committee shall rely on its full-time employees to perform all staff work in support of the Committee. The Committee shall not retain as staff of the Committee or to perform services for the Committee unless that individual holds appropriate security clearances.

10.2. The appointment of Committee staff shall be approved by the Chairman and Vice Chairman, acting jointly, or, at the initiative of both or either, confirmed by a majority vote of the Committee. After approval or confirmation, the Chairman shall certify that the information has been certified by the Office of the Attorney General as containing no information of a financial nature.

10.3. The Committee staff works for the Committee as a whole, under the supervision of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee. The Committee staff shall be employed by the Committee, Member of Congress, congressional committee or entity concerned only in accordance with the procedure of the work of the Committee with any person not a member of the Committee or the Committee staff for any purpose or in connection with any proceeding, judicial or otherwise, during their tenure as a member of the Committee or any time thereafter, except as directed by the Committee in accordance with Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress and the provisions of the Code of Conduct, in such a manner as may be determined by the Senate. The Chairman may authorize the Staff Director and the Staff Director’s designee, and the Vice Chairman may authorize the Minority Staff Director and the Minority Staff Director’s designee, to communicate with the Office of the Committee’s staff in a manner that does not divulge classified or committee sensitive information.

10.4. As a precondition for employment on the Committee, each member of the Committee shall notify the Committee of any request for testimony, either during service as a member of the Committee staff or at any time thereafter with respect to information obtained by virtue of employment as a member of the Committee staff. Such information shall not be disclosed in response to such requests, except as directed by the Committee in accordance with Section 8 of S. Res. 400 of the 94th Congress and the provisions of these rules or, in the event the termination of the Committee, in such a manner as may be determined by the Senate. The Committee shall immediately consider action to be taken in the case of any member of the Committee staff who fails to conform to any of these Rules. Such disciplinary action may include, but shall not
be limited to, revocation of the Committee sponsorship of the staff person’s security clearance and immediate dismissal from the Committee staff.

10.9. The workplace of the Committee staff shall be an element with the capability to perform audits of programs and activities undertaken by departments and agencies with intelligence functions. The audit element shall conduct audits and oversight projects that have been specifically authorized by the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee. The audit element shall determine the purpose and extent of the trip. A full report shall be submitted with the Committee when the travel is completed.

11. SUSPENSION AND AMENDMENT OF THE RULES

(a) These Rules may be modified, amended, or repealed by the Committee, provided that a notice in writing of the proposed change has been given to each member at least 24 hours prior to the meeting at which action thereon is to be taken.

(b) These Rules shall continue and remain in effect from one Congress to the next Congress unless they are changed as provided herein.

APPENDIX A

S. RES. 400, 94TH CONG., 2D SESS. [1]
Resolved, That it is the purpose of this resolution to establish a new select committee of the Senate, to be known as the Select Committee on Intelligence, to oversee and make continuing studies of the intelligence activities of the United States Government, and to submit to the Senate appropriate proposals for legislation and report to the Senate concerning such intelligence activities. For carrying out this purpose, the Select Committee on Intelligence shall make every effort to assure that the appropriate departments and agencies of the United States provide informed and timely intelligence necessary for the executive and legislative branches to make sound decisions affecting the security and vital interests of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on Intelligence (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as the “select committee”). The select committee shall be composed of not to exceed fifteen Members appointed as follows:

(A) two members from the Committee on Appropriations;
(B) two members from the Committee on Armed Services;
(C) two members from the Committee on Foreign Relations;
(D) two members from the Committee on the Judiciary;
(E) not to exceed seven members to be appointed from the Senate at large.

(2) Members appointed from each committee named in clauses (A) through (D) of paragraph (1) shall be evenly divided between the two major political parties and shall be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate upon the recommendations of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate. Of any members appointed under paragraph (1)(E), the majority leader shall appoint the majority members and the minority leader shall appoint the minority members, with the majority having a one vote margin. (3) Members appointed by the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate shall be ex officio members of the select committee but shall have no vote in the Committee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services (if not already a member of the select committee) shall be ex officio members of the select committee but shall have no vote in the Committee and shall not be counted for purposes of determining a quorum.

(b) At the beginning of each Congress, the Majority Leader of the Senate shall select a chairperson of the select committee and the Minority Leader shall select a vice chairperson for the select committee. The vice chairperson shall act in the place and stead of the chairperson in the absence of the chairperson. Whether the chairperson or vice chairperson of the select committee shall at the same time serve as chairman or ranking minority member of any other committee referred to in paragraph (a)(1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(c) The select Committee may be organized in subcommittees. Each subcommittee shall have a chairperson and a vice chairperson who are selected by the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the select Committee, respectively.

SEC. 3. (a) There shall be referred to the select committee all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following:

(1) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of National Intelligence and the Committee on Armed Services.

(2) The Central Intelligence Agency and the Director of Central Intelligence.

(3) The intelligence activities of all other departments and agencies of the Government, including, but not limited to, the intelligence activities of the Defense Intelligence Agency of the Department of Defense, and other agencies of the Department of Defense; the Department of State; the Department of Justice; and the Department of the Treasury.

(4) Any organization or reorganization of any department or agency of the Government to the extent that the organization or reorganization relates to the activities or any activity involving intelligence activities.

(b) Authorization for appropriations, both direct and indirect, for the following:

(A) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of National Intelligence and the Committee on Armed Services.

(C) The intelligence activities of other agencies and subdivisions of the Department of State.

(F) The intelligence activities of the Department of State.

(4) The intelligence activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(H) Any department, agency, or subdivision which is the successor to any agency named in clause (A), (B), (C) or (D); and the activities of any department, agency, or subdivision which is the successor to any department, agency, bureau, or subdivision named in clause (E), (F), or (G).

(b)(1) Any proposed legislation reported by the select Committee except any legislation involving matters specified in clause (1), (2), (3), or (4) shall be referred to the select committee all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following:

(A) Any proposed legislation involving matters specified in clause (1), (2), (3), or (4) shall be referred to the select committee all proposed legislation reported by any committee, other than the select committee, which contains
any matter within the jurisdiction of the select Committee shall, at the request of the chairman of the select Committee, be referred to the select Committee for its consideration and be reported to the Senate by the select Committee within 10 days after the day on which such proposed legislation, in its entirety and including annexes, if any, is referred.

(2) In any case in which a committee fails to report any proposed legislation referred to it within the time limit prescribed in this subsection, such committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of such proposed legislation, in its entirety and including any annexes, if any, unless the Senate provides otherwise, or the Majority Leader or Minority Leader requires a date, an additional 5 days on behalf of the Committee to which the proposed legislation was sequentially referred. At the end of that additional 5 day period, if the Committee fails to report the proposed legislation within that 5 day period, the Committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of such proposed legislation unless the Senate provides otherwise.

(3) In computing any 10 or 5 day period under this subsection there shall be excluded from such period any days on which the Senate is not in session.

(4) The reporting and referral processes outlined in this subsection shall be conducted in accordance with the Standing Rules of the Senate. In accordance with such rules, committees to which legislation is referred are not permitted to make changes to the text of the bill as referred and its annexes, but may propose changes or alterations to the same in the form of amendments.

(5) Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as prohibiting or otherwise restricting the authority of any other committee to study and review any intelligence activity to the extent that such activity directly affects a matter otherwise within the jurisdiction of such committee.

Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as amending, limiting, or otherwise changing the authority of any standing committee of the Senate to obtain and receive reports of the intelligence activities of any department or agency of the Government relevant to a matter otherwise within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 4. (a) The select committee, for the purposes of accountability to the Senate, shall make regular and periodic, but not less than quarterly, reports to the Senate on the nature and extent of the intelligence activities of the various departments and agencies of the United States. Such committee shall promptly call to the attention of the Senate or to any other appropriate committee or committees of the Senate any matters requiring the attention of the Senate or other committee or committees. In making such report, the select committee shall proceed in a manner consistent with section 8(g)(2) to protect national security.

(b) The select committee shall obtain an annual report from the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Such reports shall review the intelligence activities of the department concerned and the intelligence activities of foreign countries directed at the United States or its interest. An unclassified version of each report shall be made available to the discretion of the select committee. Nothing herein shall be construed as requiring the public disclosure in such reports of the names of individuals engaged in intelligence activities for the United States or the divulging of intelligence methods employed or the amount of funds authorized to be appropriated for intelligence activities.

(c) On or before March 15 of each year, the select committee shall submit to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate the views of the select committee regarding the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 regarding matters within the jurisdiction of the select committee.

SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the select committee is authorized in its discretion (1) to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, (2) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (3) to employ personnel, (4) to hold hearings, (5) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, (6) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of witnesses and the production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents, (7) to take depositions under oath, and (8) to procure the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof, in accordance with the provisions of section 2204(b)(1) of title 2, United States Code.

(b) The chairman of the select committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

(c) Subpoenas authorized by the select committee may be issued over the signature of the select committee or any member thereof, any member signing the subpoenas.

(d) The select committee may require persons to provide testimony to the select committee.

(e) The select committee may, upon the request of the Senate or of the Majority Leader or Minority Leader of the Senate, obtain from the President of the Senate, in accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and with the prior consent of the President, a statement of the reasons why the President declines to transmit to such committee any information which has been classified under established security procedures, which has been submitted to it by the Executive branch, and which the Executive branch requests be kept secret, such committee shall—

(i) first, notify the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate of such request; and

(ii) second, consult with the Majority Leader and Minority Leader before notifying the President of such vote.

(f) The select committee may, upon the request of the Senate or of the Majority Leader or Minority Leader of the Senate, obtain from the President of the Senate, in accordance with paragraph 5 of rule XVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a statement of the reasons why the President refuses to transmit to such committee any information which has been classified under established security procedures, which has been submitted to it by the Executive branch, and which the Executive branch requests be kept secret, such committee shall—

(i) first, notify the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate of such request; and

(ii) second, consult with the Majority Leader and Minority Leader before notifying the President of such vote.

(g) The select committee may, upon the request of the Senate or of the Majority Leader or Minority Leader of the Senate, obtain from the President of the Senate, in accordance with paragraph 5 of rule XVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a statement of the reasons why the President refuses to transmit to such committee any information which has been classified under established security procedures, which has been submitted to it by the Executive branch, and which the Executive branch requests be kept secret, such committee shall—

(i) first, notify the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate of such request; and

(ii) second, consult with the Majority Leader and Minority Leader before notifying the President of such vote.

(h) The select committee may, upon the request of the Senate or of the Majority Leader or Minority Leader of the Senate, obtain from the President of the Senate, in accordance with paragraph 5 of rule XVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a statement of the reasons why the President refuses to transmit to such committee any information which has been classified under established security procedures, which has been submitted to it by the Executive branch, and which the Executive branch requests be kept secret, such committee shall—

(i) first, notify the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate of such request; and

(ii) second, consult with the Majority Leader and Minority Leader before notifying the President of such vote.

SEC. 6. No employee of the select committee or any person engaged by contract or otherwise to perform services for or at the request of such committee shall be given access to any classified information by such committee unless such employee or person has (1) agreed in writing and under oath to the terms of this section (including the jurisdiction of the Select Committee on Ethics) and of such committee as to the security of such information during and after the employment or the contractual agreement with such committee; and (2) received an appropriate security clearance as determined by such committee in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence. The type of security clearance to be required in the case of any such employee or person engaged by contract or otherwise at the request of such committee shall be commensurate with the sensitivity of the classified information to which such employee or person will be given access by such committee.

SEC. 7. The select committee shall formulate and carry out such rules and procedures as it deems necessary to prevent the disclosure, without the consent of the person or persons concerned, of information in the possession of such committee which unduly infringes upon the privacy or which violates the constitutional rights of such person or persons. Nothing herein shall be construed to preclude the select committee from publicly disclosing any such information in any case in which such committee determines that the national interest in the disclosure of such information would be served by such disclosure.

SEC. 8. (a) The select committee may, subject to the provisions of this section, disclose publicly any information in the possession of such committee after a determination by such committee that the national interest in such information would be served by such disclosure. Whenever committee action is required to disclose any information under this section, the committee shall meet to vote on the matter within five days after any member of the committee requests such a vote. No member of the committee, in exercising his discretion under this section, shall be deemed to be authorizing the disclosure of any information which requires a committee vote, prior to a vote by the committee on the question of the disclosure of such information. Provided further that no vote except in accordance with this section.

(b)(1) In any case in which the select committee determines to disclose any information which has been classified under established security procedures, which has been submitted to it by the Executive branch, and which the Executive branch requests be kept secret, such committee shall—

(i) first, notify the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate of such request; and

(ii) second, consult with the Majority Leader and Minority Leader before notifying the President of such vote.

(b)(2) The select committee may disclose publicly any information in the possession of the committee which requires a public vote under this subsection, but not less than five days after such public vote, at which a vote to disclose such information is taken by the committee. A public vote is required only in cases in which the public interest would be served by such disclosure. Whenever committee action is required to disclose any information under this section, the committee shall meet to vote on the matter within five days after any member of the committee requests such a vote. No member of the committee, in exercising his discretion under this section, shall be deemed to be authorizing the disclosure of any information which requires a committee vote, prior to a vote by the committee on the question of the disclosure of such information. Provided further that no vote except in accordance with this section.
Upon conclusion of the consideration of such matter in closed session, which may not extend beyond the close of the ninth day on which the Senate is in session following the day on which the matter was reported to the Senate, or the close of the fifth day following the day agreed upon jointly by the majority and minority leaders in accordance with subsection (d) of section XVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate (whether the case may be), the Senate shall immediately vote on the disposition of such matter in open session and without debate or any other comment on the information with respect to which the vote is being taken. The Senate shall vote on each matter to which this paragraph applies in more of the means specified in clauses (A), (B), and (C) of the second sentence of this paragraph. Any vote of the Senate to disclose any information pursuant to this paragraph shall be subject to the right of a Member of the Senate to move for reconsideration of the vote within the time and pursuant to the procedures specified in rule XIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and the disclosure of such information shall be made consistent with that right.

(c) In the possession of the select committee relating to the lawful intelligence activities of any department or agency of the United States which has been classified and for which security procedures and which the select committee, pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) of this section, has determined should not be disclosed shall be made available to any person hired by the member, officer, or employee of the Senate except in a closed session of the Senate or as provided in paragraph (2).

(2) The select committee may, under such regulations as the committee shall prescribe to protect the confidentiality of such information, make any information described in paragraph (1) available to any person requested by the select committee or any other Member of the Senate. Whenever the select committee makes such information available, the committee shall keep a written record showing, in the case of any particular information, which committee or which Members of the Senate received such information. No Member of the Senate who, and no committee which, receives any information under this subsection, shall disclose such information except as provided in this section.

(d) It shall be the duty of the Select Committee on Exposures to investigate any unauthorized disclosure of intelligence information by an official or employee of the Senate in violation of subsection (c) and to report to the Senate concerning any allegation which it finds to be substantiated.

The Senate may direct the Select Committee on Exposures to investigate any unauthorized disclosure of intelligence information by an official or employee of the Senate in violation of subsection (c) and to report to the Senate concerning any allegation which it finds to be substantiated.

(e) Upon the request of any person who is subject to any investigation, the Select Committee on Ethics shall release to such individual at the conclusion of its investigation a summary of its investigation together with its findings. If, at the conclusion of its investigation, the Select Committee on Ethics determines that there has been a significant violation of the code of ethics established by the committee membership, or expulsion from the Senate, in the case of a Member, or removal from office or employment or punishment in contempt, in the case of an officer or employee.

SEC. 9. The select committee is authorized to participate in an investigation directed by the President, designated by the President to serve as a liaison to such committee, to attend any closed meeting of such committee. The select committee shall also participate in the Committee on Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities, established by Senate Resolution 21, Ninety-fourth Congress, all records, files, documents, and other materials in the possession, custody, or control of such committee, under any investigation or proceeding, or any system of rules or regulations; and without debate or any other comment on the information with respect to which the vote is being taken. The Senate shall vote on each matter to which this paragraph applies in more of the means specified in clauses (A), (B), and (C) of the second sentence of this paragraph. Any vote of the Senate to disclose any information pursuant to this paragraph shall be subject to the right of a Member of the Senate to move for reconsideration of the vote within the time and pursuant to the procedures specified in rule XIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and the disclosure of such information shall be made consistent with that right.

(c) In the possession of the select committee relating to the lawful intelligence activities of any department or agency of the United States which has been classified and for which security procedures and which the select committee, pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) of this section, has determined should not be disclosed shall be made available to any person hired by the member, officer, or employee of the Senate except in a closed session of the Senate or as provided in paragraph (2).

(2) The select committee may, under such regulations as the committee shall prescribe to protect the confidentiality of such information, make any information described in paragraph (1) available to any person requested by the select committee or any other Member of the Senate. Whenever the select committee makes such information available, the committee shall keep a written record showing, in the case of any particular information, which committee or which Members of the Senate received such information. No Member of the Senate who, and no committee which, receives any information under this subsection, shall disclose such information except as provided in this section.

(d) It shall be the duty of the Select Committee on Exposures to investigate any unauthorized disclosure of intelligence information by an official or employee of the Senate in violation of subsection (c) and to report to the Senate concerning any allegation which it finds to be substantiated.

The Senate may direct the Select Committee on Exposures to investigate any unauthorized disclosure of intelligence information by an official or employee of the Senate in violation of subsection (c) and to report to the Senate concerning any allegation which it finds to be substantiated.

(e) Upon the request of any person who is subject to any investigation, the Select Committee on Ethics shall release to such individual at the conclusion of its investigation a summary of its investigation together with its findings. If, at the conclusion of its investigation, the Select Committee on Ethics determines that there has been a significant violation of the code of ethics established by the committee membership, or expulsion from the Senate, in the case of a Member, or removal from office or employment or punishment in contempt, in the case of an officer or employee.
(b) As used in this resolution, the term "department or agency" includes any organization, committee, council, establishment, or office within the Federal Government.

(c) This resolution, reference to any department, agency, bureau, or subdivision shall include a reference to any successor department, agency, bureau, or subdivision to the extent that such successor engages in intelligence activities now conducted by the department, agency, bureau, or subdivision referred to in this resolution.

SEC. 15. (a) In addition to other committee staff selected by the select Committee, the select Committee shall hire or appoint one employee for each member of the select Committee to serve as such Member's designated representative on the select Committee. The select Committee shall only hire or appoint an employee chosen by the respective Member of the select Committee for whom the employee will serve as the designated representative on the select Committee.

(b) The select Committee shall be afforded a supplemental appropriation, to be determined by the Committee on Rules and Administration, to allow for the hire of each employee who fills the position of designated representative of the Committee. The designated representative shall have office space and appropriate office equipment in the select Committee spaces. Designated personal assistants shall have the same access to Committee staff, information, records, and databases as select Committee staff, as determined by the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

(c) The designated employee shall meet all the requirements of relevant statutes, Senate rules and regulations, and select committee security clearance requirements for employment by the select Committee.

(d) Of the funds made available to the select Committee for personnel—

(1) not more than 60 percent shall be under the control of the Chairman; and

(2) not less than 40 percent shall be under the control of the Vice Chairman.

SEC. 16. Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as acquiescing in the appointment to any position, or in the conduct of any activity, not otherwise authorized by law.

APPENDIX B


TITLE III—COMMITTEE STATUS

Sec. 301(b) Intelligence.—The Select Committee on Intelligence shall be treated as a committee listed under paragraph 2 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate for purposes of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

TITLE IV—INTELLIGENCE-RELATED SUBCOMMITTEES

Sec. 401. Subcommittee Related to Intelligence Oversight.

(a) Establishment.—There is established in the Senate Committee on Appropriations a Subcommittee on Intelligence to oversee the Intelligence Community and the National Security Agency.

(b) Jurisdiction.—The Subcommittee on Intelligence shall have jurisdiction over matters of national security and intelligence, including intelligence activities conducted by the National Intelligence Director, the Director of National Intelligence, the National Security Agency, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

APPENDIX C

RULE 25(b) OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

(REFERRED TO IN COMMITTEE RULE 2.1)

Each meeting of a committee, or any subcommittee thereof, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by a committee or a subcommittee thereof on the same subject for a period of no more than fourteen calendar days following the date of any such meeting or series of meetings shall be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in clauses (1) through (6) would require the meeting to be closed, followed immediately by a record vote in open session by a majority of the members of the committee or subcommittee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(2) will prejudice the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(3) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose information with respect to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

(5) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets of financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(A) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(B) the information has been obtained by the Government on that basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent an investigation or investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

(6) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulations.

TRIBUTE TO DR. CHI WANG

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, today I wish to honor the long and distinguished career of Chi Wang, Ph.D. The year 2018 marked the 90th anniversary of the creation of the Chinese Section at the U.S. Library of Congress in 1928. Dr. Wang spent nearly 50 years working at the Library of Congress, ultimately serving as the head of the Chinese and Korean section until his retirement in 2004.

Dr. Chi Wang came to the United States from China as a high school student in 1949. He completed his undergraduate and graduate degrees at the Washington, DC, area, ultimately earning a Ph.D. in American diplomatic history from Georgetown University in
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TRIBUTE TO PATRICK NEWBOLD
Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, today I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Patrick Newbold for his exemplary dedication as the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management and Comptroller. Mr. Newbold is transitioning from his present assignment to continue his selfless service with the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

TRIBUTE TO JEFFREY WILEY
Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, today I wish to congratulate Ascension Parish Sheriff Jeffrey Wiley on an exceptional career and to thank him for his service to the people of Louisiana. Sheriff Wiley has served Louisiana honorably, putting his life on the line for the protection and safety of his community for many years.

Sheriff Wiley is a Marine Corps veteran and began his law enforcement career while attending advanced military police training at Fort Gordon in Georgia. He joined the Ascension Parish Sheriff’s Department in 1974 as a patrol officer and was quickly promoted to the detective division in 1975, where he specialized in juvenile justice.

It was during this time that Sheriff Wiley helped organize initiatives, including the Junior Deputy Program and the Sheriffs Young Adult League. He would later go on to serve on the Ascension Parish School Board, where he helped establish numerous programs, such as the Substance Abuse Education Program and the placement of substance abuse counselors in the schools.

In 1988, he returned to the Ascension Parish Sheriff’s Department and was appointed chief deputy criminal. He spearheaded the department’s first full-time narcotics division and the implementation of the D.A.R.E. program. After being elected sheriff, he grew the patrol/traffic force by 40 percent, increased police salaries, and put more officers on the streets. His first term was so successful that he became the first sheriff in the history of Ascension Parish to be reelected without opposition. In 2009, he was inducted into the Louisiana Justice Hall of Fame.

Because of his accomplishments and good deeds that we honor Sheriff Wiley. We thank him for his commitment to the people of Ascension Parish and to the people of our State. Our communities are safer because of his dedication to the rule of law. Thank you, Sheriff Wiley, for 22 years in office and for a lifetime of service to Ascension Parish and to Louisiana.

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN McVEY
Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I would like to offer my congratulations to Susan McVey, a fellow Oklahoman, on her exemplary service to the State of Oklahoma as a dedicated librarian for the past 32 years.

Ms. McVey’s distinguished and honorable record of leadership within the Oklahoma Department of Libraries is a model for future generations. Her efforts in developing access to information and education, and information resources for all Oklahomans continues to impress. Additionally, thousands of Oklahomans have been granted access to library services through her work to reform the administration of State aid grants to public libraries. I am confident these efforts will reap benefits for generations.

Ms. McVey’s legacy will be an inspiration for many in the years ahead, and I am proud to call her my fellow Oklahoman. Her congratulations to her on her well-deserved retirement, and I thank her for her commitment to the people of Oklahoma.
TRIBUTE TO AL HODGE

Mr. ISAACKSON. Madam President, today I am honored to recognize the Record Albert M. Hodge, Jr., of Rome, GA.

Al Hodge is an economic development leader whom I have known for many years. He started his work in the community with the Rome Floyd Chamber of Commerce in Rome, GA. His contributions over the years to benefit the community's schools, roads, airport and countless other services. Most recently, he guided development of the Rome Tennis Center at Berry College, the nation's largest single-surface facility, with 60 courts across 30 acres.

While Al has led the chamber, the community has seen the location of major headquarters and manufacturing investments, including Pirelli Tire North America, Suzuki Manufacturing of America, Neaton Auto Products Manufacturing, and a major Lowe's distribution center.

In addition to visits to Rome and seeing him in the State, I have spent time with Al and the Rome chamber at least once a year in Washington, and I have spent the last 15 years working with his daughter as a member of my staff. Of all his professional accomplishments, it is Al's family, friends, and colleagues whom he truly cherishes and champions.

Al is a great guy, and I want to wish Al and his talented wife Cheryl Riner Hodges' continued success in economic development as they go on to launch the next phase of their lives and careers. Many more will benefit from their continued efforts in this field.

TRIBUTE TO TED AMES

Mr. KING. Madam President, today I wish to recognize Mr. Ted Ames, of Stonington, ME, as he retires from the board of directors for Maine Center for Coastal Fisheries, MCCF. Ted has been a lifelong member of the Maine fishing community, and his knowledge and expertise will be missed by the board of MCCF. Maine fishing communities and our entire State are proud of Ted's wisdom, knowledge, and work ethic at MCCF, we wish him and his wife Robin Alden nothing but the best in this new chapter.

Mr. TSAIAKII. Madam President, I speak in loving memory of Barney Gottstein, a patriarch of Alaska's Jewish community, who passed away on October 21 at the age of 91. He was buried in the Anchorage Cemetery on October 22, in accordance with Jewish burial traditions.

I suspect that my colleagues might not be aware that Alaska is home to a thriving Jewish community or that the origins of that community preceded statehood by generations. One might be even more surprised to know that Barney was not the first generation of Gottsteins to occupy a leadership role in prestatehood Alaska, but the second generation. The Gottstein family is up to four generations of leadership, with a fifth—the great-grandchildren—now in place.

The first generation, Barney's father, Jacob B. Gottstein, originally of Des Moines, IA, came to Anchorage in 1915, selling cigars and confections out of the tent city established to construct the Alaska railroad. Jake, as he was known, then opened a wholesale grocery and dry goods business, known as J.B. Gottstein & Co., which made sales calls by dog sled. You can't get more Alaskan than that. Jake passed away in 1963.

Barney was born in Des Moines in 1925, but soon moved to Anchorage, population 2,500, where he was raised. He enlisted in the Army and served in the Army Air Corps. After the war, Barney went to the University of Washington, studying to be an aeronautical engineer. That didn't work out so well. He was told by a counselor
that anti-Semitism would likely prevent Barney from getting a job in his chosen field, so he switched to business and economics and came home to work in the family business, but he didn’t abandon his love for flying. Barney was a licensed private pilot who loved to fly around Alaska in his own plane.

By the time Barney returned home, the family business was growing as fast as the State. The focus had changed from dry goods to wholesale groceries. Barney took it the next step. One of J.B. Carr’s early customers was the Carr Brothers Grocery. The rest is history.

Barney partnered with Larry Carr to grow the retail grocery business and pursue real estate ventures. Carr’s Quality Centers sprung up throughout Alaska, along with an associated chain of Eagle markets. By the late 1980s, the Carr-Gottstein group of companies was the largest Alaska-owned business in the State. Barney and Larry sold the grocery business in 1989 but remained in the real estate business. Today the Carr’s name remains on grocery stores in Anchorage, Eagle River, and the Mat-Su Valley.

In 1989, Barney was inducted into the Alaska Business Hall of Fame, and in 1991, he was awarded an honorary doctor of laws degree by the University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Barney’s business success in Alaska was deeply respected, but his community involvement went on far beyond the business. He served as chair of the Alaska Board of Education and provided financial assistance that enabled hundreds of Alaska Natives to pursue schooling. He was an inaugural member of the Alaska State Commission on Human Rights as well.

Barney was active in Alaska’s political life as well. He was chairman of the Alaska Democratic Party, Alaska’s Democratic National Committeeman, and an Alaska delegate to the Democratic National Convention. I mentioned that Barney was one of the patriarchs of Alaska’s Jewish community. An early supporter of the State of Israel, he was the face of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, AIPAC, in Alaska for many years. Today, Barney’s son David leads the AIPAC group in Alaska and, in that capacity, is a frequent visitor to my office. He provided financial support to enable young Jewish Alaskans to participate in the “March of the Living” so that they might better understand the legacy of the Holocaust. He visited Israel on many occasions and took on the cause of supporting Ethiopian Jews who had made Aliyah to Israel integrate into society and pursue advanced degrees.

Barney was not only a father figure to the Alaska Jewish community. He was the patriarch of a large family himself. Barney is survived by Rachel, his second wife, of 32 years, who not surprisingly met on a trip to Israel. Barney was father to seven children. Some of Barney’s children have followed in their father’s footsteps to achieve positions of great respect and prominence in Alaska. I am proud to count David, Jim, Robert, and Sandy among my friends. A fourth generation of the Gottstein family, the grandchildren, are just beginning to make their mark, and there are great-grandchildren to follow.

On behalf of my Senate colleagues, I proudly pay my respects to Barney Gottstein and his wonderful family. May his memory be a blessing.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:08 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 116. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount that certain banks and savings associations may invest in small business investment companies, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 206. An act to amend the Small Business Act to require senior procurement executives, procurement center representatives, and the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization to assist small business concerns participating in the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 246. An act to amend the Small Business Act to require senior procurement executives, procurement center representatives, and the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization to assist small business concerns participating in the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

MESSURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 116. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount that certain banks and savings associations may invest in small business investment companies, subject to the approval of the appropriate Federal banking agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 206. An act to amend the Small Business Act to require senior procurement executives, procurement center representatives, and the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization to assist small business concerns participating in the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 246. An act to amend the Small Business Act to require senior procurement executives, procurement center representatives, and the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization to assist small business concerns participating in the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following joint resolution was discharged from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, pursuant to section 216(c)(5)(B) of Public Law 115-41, and placed on the calendar:

S.J. Res. 2. Joint resolution disapproving the President’s proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation.

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–72. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a rule entitled “Nuclear Classification and Declassification” (FIRIN99-2A49) (10 CFR Part 1065) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 3, 2019, to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.


EC–78. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report...


EC–82. A communication from the Chair- man of the Council of the District of Colum- bia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22–501, “Rental Housing Afford- ability Re-establishment Amendment Act of 2018”; to the Committee on Homeland Secu- rity and Governmental Affairs.


Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Reserve Bank Capital Stock” (RIN7100–AP27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–115. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Expanded Examination Cycle for Certain Small Insured Institutions and U.S. Branches and Agencies of Foreign Banks” (RIN7100–AF90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–116. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Application of the RFI(CD) Rating System to Savings and Loan Holding Companies” (RIN7100–AF51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–117. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Living Liabilities Quantity Ratio Rule; Treatment of Certain Municipal Obligations as High-Quality Liquid Assets” (RIN7100–AF10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–118. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Community Reinvestment Act Regulations” (RIN7100–AE52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–119. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities; Final Rule” (RIN7100–AE96) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–120. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Margin and Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities; Final Rule” (RIN7100–AE01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–121. 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 “Extension of Import Restrictions on Certain Archaeological and Ecologically Significant Material from Bulgaria” (RIN7155–AE41) (CBP Dec. 19–01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–122. 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 “Extension of Import Restrictions on Certain Archaeological and Ecologically Significant Material from Bulgaria” (RIN7155–AE42) (CBP Dec. 19–02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–123. A communication from the Chief of Negotiations and Restructuring, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification that the Corporation has issued an order partitioning the Plasterers and Cement Masons Local No. 94 Pension and Benefits Plan (RIN7100–AG63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–124. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Expanded Examination Cycle for Certain Small Insured Institutions and U.S. Branches and Agencies of Foreign Banks” (RIN7100–AF90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–125. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program; Final Rule” (RIN7100–AE51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–126. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Liquidity Reinvestment Act Regulations” (RIN7100–AE07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–127. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Per Diem Paid to States for Care of Eligible Veterans in State Homes” (RIN29000–A088) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 2, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC–128. A communication from the Assistant Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Exemption from the Application of 38 U.S.C. section 612 to Disability Loans” (RIN29000–A078) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC–129. A communication from the Assistant Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Veterans Group Life Insurance: Increased Coverage” (RIN29000–A012) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 11, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC–130. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Minimum and Maximum Lengths of Certain Fish Stocks” (RIN90648–XG00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–131. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States: Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfers” (RIN90648–XG07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–132. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States: Atlantic Herring Fishery; 2018 River Herring and Shad Catch Cap Reached for Midwater Trawl Vessels in the Mid-Atlantic/Southern New England Catch Cap Area” (RIN90648–XG06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–133. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States: Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish; 2018 River Herring and Shad Catch Cap Reached for the Directed Atlantic Mackerel Commercial Fishery” (RIN90648–XG04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–134. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Blacktip Sharks, Aggregated Large Costal Sharks, and Hammerhead Sharks in the Western Gulf of Mexico Sub-Region; Closure” (RIN90648–XG01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–135. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish; 2018 River Herring and Shad Catch Cap Reached for Midwater Trawl Vessels in the Mid-Atlantic/Southern New England Catch Cap Area” (RIN90648–XG06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–136. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States: Atlantic Herring Fishery; 2018 River Herring and Shad Catch Cap Reached for Midwater Trawl Vessels in the Mid-Atlantic/Southern New England Catch Cap Area” (RIN90648–XG06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–137. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fishery off the Southern Atlantic States; Closure of the Pemauid Shrimp Fishery Off Georgia” (RIN90648–XG05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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:

S. 115. A bill for the relief of Alemseged Mussie Tesfamical; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. HARRIS):
S. 116. A bill to address maternal mortality and morbidity; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. TOYNE, Ms. MCCONNELL, Mr. WHITE, Mr. BARR, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. PORTMAN):
Mr. Blumenthal, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Casey, Mr. Coons, Ms. Duckworth, Mrs. Gillibrand, Ms. Harris, Ms. Hassan, Mr. Jones, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Murray, Mr. Van Hollen, Ms. Warren, Mr. Tester, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Booker, Mr. Merkley, and Ms. Smith:

S. 118. A bill to require the Director of the National Science Foundation to develop an I-Corps course to support commercialization-ready innovation companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. Rubio (for himself, Mr. Blunt, Mrs. Hyde-Smith, Mr. Risch, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Inhoffe, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Enzi, Ms. Ernst, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Scyphers of South Carolina, and Mr. Perdue):

S. 119. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws of the States to prohibit the taking of children from parents; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. Rubio (for himself, Mr. Blunt, Mrs. Hyde-Smith, Mr. Risch, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Inhoffe, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Enzi, Ms. Ernst, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Scyphers of South Carolina, and Mr. Perdue):

S. 120. A bill to protect victims of stalking from gun violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Jones (for himself, Mr. Alexander, and Mrs. Blackburn):

S. 121. A bill to require a study of the well-being of Native American veterans and similarly situated veterans of other minority groups to ensure that the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense provide and improve appropriate care and services for Native American veterans and similarly situated veterans of other minority groups; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. Perdue (for himself, Mr. Leahy, Mrs. Capito, Ms. Collins, and Mr. Udall):

S. 122. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for penalties for the sale of any Purple Heart awarded to a member of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. Ernst (for herself, Mr. Coons, Mr. Grassley, and Mr. Boozman):

S. 123. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into a contract or other agreement with a third party to review appointees in the Veterans Health Administration who are in a position terminated for cause by a State licensing board for care or services rendered at a non-Veterans Health Administration facility and to provide individuals hired by such an appointee with notice if it is determined that an episode of care or services to which they received was below the standard of care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. Rubio:

S. 124. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to prevent employees from using non-compete agreements in employment contracts for certain non-exempt employees; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. Cortez Masto (for herself and Mr. Lee):

S. 125. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to repeal the forfeiture rule for peanuts under the nonrecourse marketing assistance loan program, prohibit the use of Federal funds for certain activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. Murkowski (for herself and Mr. Hirono, Mr. Menendez, and Mr. Markey):

S. 126. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a demonstration program to adapt best practices in providing foreign aid to underdeveloped economies to the provision of Federal economic development assistance to Native communities in similarly situated remote areas in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. Feinstein (for herself, Ms. Harris, Ms. Warren, Mr. Menendez, and Mr. Markey):

S. 127. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to seek to enter into an agreement with the county of Santa Clara, California, for the transfer of Mare Island Naval Cemetery to Vallejo, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. Murkowski (for herself, Mr. Wyden, Ms. Shaheen, Ms. Hassan, and Mr. Merkley):

S. 128. A bill to regulate certain State impositions on interstate commerce; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. Harris (for herself and Mrs. Feinstein):

S. 129. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national memorial and national monument to commemorate those killed by the collapse of the Saint Francis Dam on March 12, 1928, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. Sasse (for himself, Mr. Barron, Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Braun, Mr. Burr, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Daines, Ms. Ernst, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Hawley, Mr. Hoeven, Mrs. Hyde-Smith, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Lankford, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Moran, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Portman, Mr. Risch, Mr. Roberts of Florida, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Scott of South Carolina, Mr. Thune, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Young, Mr. Graham, Mr. Wicker, and Mr. Enzi):

S. 130. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper duty of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Cassidy (for himself, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Barrasso, Mrs. Hyde-Smith, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Blackburn, and Mr. Perdue):

S. 131. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit Federal Medicaid funding for the administrative costs of providing health benefits to individuals who are unauthorized immigrants; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. Gardner:


By Ms. Murkowski (for herself, Mr. King, Mr. Sullivan, Ms. Cantwell, Senator Gardner, and Mr. Scott):

S. 133. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II, to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. Toomey (for himself and Mr. Casey):

S. 134. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with regard to stalking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Thune:

S. 135. A bill to prioritize the allocation of H-2B visas for States with low unemployment rates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Wyden (for himself, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Van Hollen, and Mr. Murray):

S. 136. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a new employment, training, and supportive services program for the long-term unemployed and individuals with barriers to employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. Manchin (for himself, Mr. Casey, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Brown, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Warner, Mr. Van Hollen, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Reed, Ms. Harris, Ms. Duckworth, Mr. Wyden, Ms. Hassan, Mr. King, Mr. Markey, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Leahy, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Udall, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Smith, Mr. Booker, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Bennet, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Coons, Mr. Schatz, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Jones, Mr. Hirono, Ms. Duckworth, Mr. Murray, Mr. Kaine, Mr. Sanders, Mrs. Gillibrand, Ms. Shaheen, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Peters, Mr. Carper, Mr. Feinstein, Ms. McGovern, Mr. Menendez, and Mr. Cardin):

S. Res. 18. A resolution authorizing the Senate Legal Counsel to represent the Senate in Texas v. United States No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSCOPONSORS

S. 21

At the request of Mr. Thune, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Rounds), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. Stabenow), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Murphy) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. Scott) were added as cosponsors of S. 21, a bill making continuing appropriations for Coast Guard pay in the event an appropriations act expires prior to the enactment of a new appropriations act.

At the request of Mr. Cruz, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Menendez) was added as a cosponsor of S. 34, a bill to require a report on the continuing participation of Cambodia in the Generalized System of Preferences.

S. 39

At the request of Mr. Braun, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. Rosen), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Tillis) and the Senator from
South Dakota (Mr. Rounds) were added as cosponsors of S. 39, a bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

S. 72

At the request of Mr. Schatz, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Merkley), the Senator from New York (Mrs. Gillibrand), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Smith), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Whitehouse), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Menendez), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Jones), the Senator from California (Ms. Feinstein), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Reed) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Udall) were added as cosponsors of S. 72, a bill to suspend the enforcement of certain civil liabilities of Federal employees and contractors during a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes.

S. 94

At the request of Mrs. Capito, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Heinrich) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Cassidy) were added as cosponsors of S. 94, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States.

S. 104

At the request of Mr. Portman, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Crapo) was added as a cosponsor of S. 104, a bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions, and for other purposes.

S. 105

At the request of Mrs. Blackburn, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Barrasso) was added as a cosponsor of S. 105, a bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions, and for other purposes.

S. 109

At the request of Mr. Wicker, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Boozman), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. Fischer), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Graham), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Cramer) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Rounds) were added as cosponsors of S. 109, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

S. 113

At the request of Mr. Johnson, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Hawley), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Tillis), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Roberts), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Barrasso) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Hoeven) were added as cosponsors of S. 113, a bill to appropriate funds for pay and allowances of excepted Federal employees, and for other purposes.

S. J. Res. 3

At the request of Mrs. Hyde-Smith, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. Crapo), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Hoeven), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Rounds) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Barrasso) were added as cosponsors of S. J. Res. 3, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the budget.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. Schumer:

S. 115. A bill for the relief of Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was agreed to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 115

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR ALEMSEGHED MUSSIE TESFAMICAL.

(a) In General.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151) and section 240 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1229a), Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical shall be eligible for the issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1151) or adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) Adjustment of Status.—If Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical enters the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical shall be considered to have entered into and remained lawfully in the United States and, if otherwise eligible for the adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be eligible for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(c) Deadline for Application and Payment of Fees.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if filed on or before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) Reduction of Immigrant Visa Number.—Upon the granting of an immigrant visa or permanent residence to Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical, the Commissioner of the United States shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by 1, during the current or next following fiscal year, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of such country of Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical's birth under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)) or, if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of such country under section 202(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)).

(e) Budgetary Effects.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-139), shall be determined under the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

By Mr. Schumer (for himself, Mr. Gardner, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Bennet, Mr. Blumenthal, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Coons, Ms. Duckworth, Mrs. Gillibrand, Ms. Harris, Ms. Hassan, Mr. Jones, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Markey, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Van Hollen, Ms. Warren, Mr. Tester, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Booker, Mr. Merkley, and Ms. Smith):

S. 117. A bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports with disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was agreed to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 117

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 “Disability Integration Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) Findings.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In enacting the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (referred to in this Act as the “ADA”), Congress:

(A) recognized that “historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem;” and

(B) intended that the ADA assure “full participation” and “independent living” for individuals with disabilities by addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities (that persist in critical areas), including institutionalization.

(2) While Congress expected that the ADA’s integration mandate would be interpreted in a manner that ensures that individuals who are eligible for institutional placement are able to exercise a right to community-based long-term services and supports, that expectation has not been fulfilled.

(3) The holdings of the Supreme Court in Olmstead v. L.C., 527 U.S. 581 (1999), and subsequent court holdings have clearly articulated that individuals with disabilities have a civil right under the ADA to participate in society as equal citizens. However, many States still do not provide sufficient community-based long-term services and supports to individuals with disabilities to end segregation in institutions.

(4) The right to live in the community is necessary for the exercise of the civil rights that the ADA was intended to secure for all individuals with disabilities. The lack of adequate community-based services and supports has imperiled the civil rights of all individuals with disabilities, and has undermined the very promise of the ADA. It is, therefore, necessary to recognize in statute a robust and fully articulated right to community living.
(5) States, with a few exceptions, continue to approach decisions regarding long-term services and supports from social welfare and budgetary perspectives, but for the promise of the values realized. States must approach these decisions from a civil rights perspective.

(6) States have not consistently planned to ensure that family and supports remain focused on individuals with disabilities, including those with the most significant disabilities, to enable individuals with disabilities to live in the residence setting. As a result, many individuals with disabilities who reside in institutions are prevented from residing in the community and individuals with disabilities are prevented from living in the community and institutions find themselves at risk of institutional placement.

(7) The continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary institutionalization scenarios individuals with disabilities have the opportunity to live and participate on an equal basis in the community and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary spending related to perpetuating dependency and unnecessary confinement.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to clarify and strengthen the ADA's integration mandate in a manner that accelerates State compliance;

(2) to clarify that every individual who is eligible for long-term services and supports has a federally protected right to be meaningfully integrated into that individual’s community and receive community-based long-term services and supports;

(3) to ensure that States provide long-term services and supports to individuals with disabilities in a manner that allows individuals with disabilities to live in the most integrated setting, including the individual’s own home, have maximum control over their services and supports, and maintain their rights to live independently in the community and individuals with disabilities are prevented from living in the community and individuals with disabilities are prevented from living in the community and individuals with disabilities are prevented from living in the community.

(4) to establish a comprehensive State planning requirement that includes enforceable, measurable objectives that are designed to transition individuals with all types of disabilities at all ages out of institutions into the most integrated setting; and

(5) to establish a requirement for clear and uniform annual reporting by States that includes reporting about—

(A) the number of individuals with disabilities who are served in the community and the number who are served in institutions; and

(B) the number of individuals with disabilities who have transitioned from an institution to a community-based living situation, and the type of community-based living situation into which those individuals have transitioned.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS AND RULE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIVING.—The term “activities of daily living” has the meaning given the term in section 441.505 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means—

(A) the Administrator of the Administration for Community Living; or

(B) another designee of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(3) COMMUNITY-BASED.—The term “community-based”, when used in reference to services or supports, means services or supports that are provided to an individual with an LTSS disability to enable that individual to live in the community and lead an independent life, and that are delivered in whichever setting the individual with an LTSS disability has chosen out of the following settings with the following qualities:

(A) in the case of a dwelling on a nonresidential setting (such as a setting in which an individual with an LTSS disability receives day services and supported employment), a dwelling or setting that—

(i) that, as a matter of infrastructure, environment, amenities, location, services, and features, is integrated into the greater community and supports, for each individual with an LTSS disability receives services or supports at the setting—

(I) full access to the greater community (including access to opportunities to seek employment, and independent living environments and features, and not regimented individual initiative, autonomy, and independence in making life choices, including choices about daily activities, physical environment, and persons with whom the individual interacts; and

(II) that, as a matter of infrastructure, environment, amenities, location, services, and features, is integrated into the greater community and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary spending related to perpetuating dependency and unnecessary confinement.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to clarify and strengthen the ADA's integration mandate in a manner that accelerates State compliance;

(2) to clarify that every individual who is eligible for long-term services and supports has a federally protected right to be meaningfully integrated into that individual’s community and receive community-based long-term services and supports;

(3) to ensure that States provide long-term services and supports to individuals with disabilities in a manner that allows individuals with disabilities to live in the most integrated setting, including the individual’s own home, have maximum control over their services and supports, and maintain their rights to live independently in the community and individuals with disabilities are prevented from living in the community and individuals with disabilities are prevented from living in the community and individuals with disabilities are prevented from living in the community.

(4) to establish a comprehensive State planning requirement that includes enforceable, measurable objectives that are designed to transition individuals with all types of disabilities at all ages out of institutions into the most integrated setting; and

(5) to establish a requirement for clear and uniform annual reporting by States that includes reporting about—

(A) the number of individuals with disabilities who are served in the community and the number who are served in institutions; and

(B) the number of individuals with disabilities who have transitioned from an institution to a community-based living situation, and the type of community-based living situation into which those individuals have transitioned.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS AND RULE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIVING.—The term “activities of daily living” has the meaning given the term in section 441.505 of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means—

(A) the Administrator of the Administration for Community Living; or

(B) another designee of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(3) COMMUNITY-BASED.—The term “community-based”, when used in reference to services or supports, means services or supports that are provided to an individual with an LTSS disability to enable that individual to live in the community and lead an independent life, and that are delivered in whichever setting the individual with an LTSS disability has chosen out of the following settings with the following qualities:

(A) in the case of a dwelling on a nonresidential setting (such as a setting in which an individual with an LTSS disability receives day services and supported employment), a dwelling or setting that—

(i) that, as a matter of infrastructure, environment, amenities, location, services, and features, is integrated into the greater community and supports, for each individual with an LTSS disability receives services or supports at the setting—

(I) full access to the greater community (including access to opportunities to seek employment, and independent living environments and features, and not regimented individual initiative, autonomy, and independence in making life choices, including choices about daily activities, physical environment, and persons with whom the individual interacts; and

(II) that, as a matter of infrastructure, environment, amenities, location, services, and features, is integrated into the greater community and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary spending related to perpetuating dependency and unnecessary confinement.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to clarify and strengthen the ADA's integration mandate in a manner that accelerates State compliance;

(2) to clarify that every individual who is eligible for long-term services and supports has a federally protected right to be meaningfully integrated into that individual’s community and receive community-based long-term services and supports;

(3) to ensure that States provide long-term services and supports to individuals with disabilities in a manner that allows individuals with disabilities to live in the most integrated setting, including the individual’s own home, have maximum control over their services and supports, and maintain their rights to live independently in the community and individuals with disabilities are prevented from living in the community and individuals with disabilities are prevented from living in the community and individuals with disabilities are prevented from living in the community.

(4) to establish a comprehensive State planning requirement that includes enforceable, measurable objectives that are designed to transition individuals with all types of disabilities at all ages out of institutions into the most integrated setting; and

(5) to establish a requirement for clear and uniform annual reporting by States that includes reporting about—

(A) the number of individuals with disabilities who are served in the community and the number who are served in institutions; and

(B) the number of individuals with disabilities who have transitioned from an institution to a community-based living situation, and the type of community-based living situation into which those individuals have transitioned.
provide reassurance to the individual; and
(iv) help the individual with orientation, memory, and other activities related to independent living.

9. LONG-TERM SERVICE OR SUPPORT.—The terms “long-term service or support” and “LTSS” mean the assistance provided to an individual with a LTSS disability in accomplishing, acquiring the means or ability to accomplish, maintaining, or enhancing:

(A) activities of daily living;
(B) instrumental activities of daily living;
(C) health-related tasks; or
(D) other functions, tasks, or activities related to an activity or task described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).

10. LTSS INSURANCE PROVIDER.—The term “LTSS insurance provider” means a public or private entity that—

(A) provides funds for long-term services and supports; and
(B) is engaged in commerce or in an industry or activity affecting commerce.

11. PUBLIC ENTITY.—(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “public entity” means an entity that—

(i) provides or funds institutional placements for individuals with LTSS disabilities; and
(ii) is—

(I) a State or local government; or
(II) a department, agency, entity administering a special purpose district, or other instrumentality, of a State or local government.

(B) INTERSTATE COMMERCE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a public entity shall be considered to be a person engaged in commerce or in an industry or activity affecting commerce.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection or any other provision of this Act shall be construed to preclude an individual with an LTSS disability from living in the community or lead an independent life.

(c) ADDITIONAL PROHIBITION.—For purposes of this Act, discrimination by a public entity or LTSS insurance provider includes—

(1) shall be construed—

(A) to provide a public entity or LTSS insurance provider from providing community-based long-term services and supports to an individual with an LTSS disability who would otherwise qualify for institutionalization, so as to prevent or eliminate the institutionalization of such individual; and
(B) to limit the rights of an individual with a LTSS disability to live in the community or lead an independent life, including the availability of an option to live in housing where the receipt of LTSS services is not required.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section—

(1) shall be construed—

(A) to permit a public entity or LTSS insurance provider from providing community-based long-term services and supports to an individual with an LTSS disability, or any class of individuals with LTSS disabilities, from receiving a community-based long-term service or support; and
(B) to provide a specific community-based long-term service or support or a type of community-based long-term service or support that is regularly notified of the alternative of community-based long-term services and supports and that those community-based long-term services and supports are provided if the individual with an LTSS disability selects such services and supports; and
(1) shall be construed to affect the scope of obligations imposed by any other provision of law or
(3) shall be construed to prohibit a public entity or LTSS insurance provider from providing community-based long-term services and supports, as prohibited by this Act.

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY.—

(1) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—The Attorney General shall—

(A) conduct studies regarding the nature and extent of institutionalization of individuals with LTSS disabilities in representative communities, including urban, suburban, and rural communities, throughout the United States; and
(B) publish and disseminate reports, recommendations, and information derived from such studies, including an annual report to Congress, specifying—

(i) the nature and extent of progress in the United States in eliminating institutionalization for individuals with LTSS disabilities and in violation of this Act and furthering the purposes of this Act; and
(ii) obstacles that remain in the effort to achieve the provision of community-based long-term services and supports for all individuals with LTSS disabilities;

(iii) recommendations for further legislative or executive action;

(iv) cooperate with LTSS insurance providers for technical assistance to, Federal, State, and local public or private agencies and organizations that are formulating or carrying out programs to prevent or eliminate institutionalization of individuals with LTSS disabilities or to promote the provision of community-based long-term services and supports; and

(v) implement educational and conciliatory activities to further the purposes of this Act.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, in cooperation with the Attorney General, administer this Act and shall—

(i) investigate and take enforcement action for violations of this Act; and
(ii) enforce section 6(c).

(b) COOPERATION OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—Each Federal agency and, in particular, each Federal agency covered by Executive Order 13217 (66 Fed. Reg. 32155, relating to community-based long-term services and supports) shall carry out programs and activities relating to the institutionalization of individuals with LTSS disabilities and the provision of community-based long-term services and supports for individuals with LTSS disabilities in accordance with this Act and shall cooperate with the Attorney General and the Administrator to further the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. REGULATIONS.

(a) ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue, in accordance with section 631 of the United States Code, regulations for carrying out this Act, which shall include the regulations described in subsection (b).

(b) REQUIRED CONTENTS OF REGULATIONS.—

(1) ELIGIBLE RECIPiENTS OF SERVICE.—The regulations shall require each public entity and LTSS insurance provider to offer, and, if accepted, provide community-based long-term services and supports as required under this Act to any individual with an LTSS disability who would otherwise qualify for institutional placement provided or funded by a public entity or LTSS insurance provider.

(2) SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED.—The regulations issued under this section shall require each public entity and LTSS insurance provider to provide the Attorney General and the Administrator with an assurance that
the public entity or LTSS insurance pro-

vider—

(A) ensures that individuals with LTSS disabilities receive assistance through on-site assistance or may not meet the safety monitoring, including access to backup systems, with—

(i) activities of daily living;

(ii) domestic activities of daily living;

(iii) health-related tasks; or

(iv) other functions, tasks, or activities related to an activity or task described in clause (i) or (ii);

(B) coordinates, conducts, performs, provides, or funds discharge planning from acute care, LTSS, and long-term facilities to promote individuals with LTSS disabilities living in the most integrated setting chosen by the individuals;

(C) issues, conducts, performs, provides, or funds policies and programs to promote self-direction and the provision of consumer-directed services and supports for all populations of individuals with LTSS disabilities served;

(D) issues, conducts, performs, provides, or funds policies and programs to support informed choice to provide services for individuals with LTSS disabilities; and

(E) ensures that all individuals with types of LTSS disabilities are able to live in the community in an independent life, including ensuring that the individuals have maximum control over the services and supports that the individuals receive, choose the setting in which the individuals receive those services and supports, and exercise control and direction over their own lives.

(9) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—

(A) PUBLIC ENTITY.—The regulations issued under this section shall require each public entity to carry out an extensive public participation process that involves holding a public hearing, providing an opportunity for public comment, and consultations with individuals with LTSS disabilities, in preparing the LTSS insurance provider's self-evaluation under paragraph (5) and transition plan under paragraph (10).

(B) LTSS INSURANCE PROVIDER.—The regulations issued under this section shall require each LTSS insurance provider to carry out a public participation process that involves holding a public hearing, providing an opportunity for public comment, and consultations with individuals with LTSS disabilities, in preparing the LTSS insurance provider's self-evaluation under paragraph (5).

(10) TRANSITION PLAN.—

(A) PUBLIC ENTITY.—The regulations issued under this section shall require each public entity or LTSS insurance provider to carry out a public participation process that includes holding a public hearing and consultation with individuals with LTSS disabilities, in preparing the public entity or LTSS insurance provider's transition plan under paragraph (5) and transition plan under paragraph (10).

(B) LTSS INSURANCE PROVIDER.—The regulations issued under this section shall require each LTSS insurance provider to carry out a public participation process that includes holding a public hearing and consultation with individuals with LTSS disabilities, in preparing the LTSS insurance provider's transition plan under paragraph (5) and transition plan under paragraph (10).

The regulations issued under this section shall establish the achievement of the objectives of this Act prior to the date of enactment of this Act, to evaluate current services, policies, and practices, and the effects of LTSS, and long-term facilities to promote individuals with LTSS disabilities living in the most integrated setting chosen by the individuals; (C) includes ensuring that the individuals have maximum control over the services and supports that the individuals receive, choose the setting in which the individuals receive those services and supports, and exercise control and direction over their own lives.

(9) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—

(A) PUBLIC ENTITY.—The regulations issued under this section shall require each public entity to carry out an extensive public participation process that involves holding a public hearing, providing an opportunity for public comment, and consultations with individuals with LTSS disabilities, in preparing the LTSS insurance provider's self-evaluation under paragraph (5) and transition plan under paragraph (10).

(B) LTSS INSURANCE PROVIDER.—The regulations issued under this section shall require each LTSS insurance provider to carry out a public participation process that involves holding a public hearing, providing an opportunity for public comment, and consultations with individuals with LTSS disabilities, in preparing the LTSS insurance provider's self-evaluation under paragraph (5) and transition plan under paragraph (10).

The regulations issued under this section shall require each public entity or LTSS insurance provider to adopt and publish grievance procedures providing for prompt and equitable resolution of complaints alleging a violation of this Act.

(9) PROVISION OF SERVICE BY OTHERS.—The regulations issued under this section shall require each public entity and LTSS insurance providers to adopt and publish grievance procedures providing for prompt and equitable resolution of complaints alleging a violation of this Act.

(10) TRANSITION PLAN.—The regulations issued under this section shall require each public entity or LTSS insurance provider to adopt and publish grievance procedures providing for prompt and equitable resolution of complaints alleging a violation of this Act.

(A) self-evaluation described in subparagraph (A) on file, and may be required to produce such self-

evaluation in the event of a review, investiga-

tion, or action described in section 8.

(B) PUBLISH—A public entity, including an LTSS insurance provider that is a public entity, shall—

(i) include in the self-evaluation described in subparagraph (A) an assessment of the availability of ac-

cessible, affordable transportation across the State involved and whether transportation barriers prevent individuals from receiving long-term services and supports in the most integrated setting; and

(ii) an assessment of the availability of in-

tegrated services and supports in the jurisdic-

tion served by the public entity for individuals with LTSS disabilities; and

(ii) provide the self-evaluation described in subparagraph (A) to the Attorney General and the Administrator.

(C) LTSS INSURANCE PROVIDER.—An LTSS insurance provider shall keep the self-eval-

uation on file, and may be required to produce such self-

evaluation in the event of a review, investiga-

tion, or action described in section 8.

(D) establish a process to fund necessary home modifications so that individuals with LTSS disabilities can live independently; and

(E) ensure, and assure the Administrator and the Attorney General, that funds and programs implemented or overseen by the entity or in the public entity's juris-

diction are targeted toward affordable, ac-

cessible, integrated housing for individuals with LTSS disabilities lowest income levels in the jurisdiction as a pri-

ority over any other development until cap-

acity barriers for such housing are removed and unmet needs for such housing have been met.

(7) DESIGNATION OF RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYER.—The regulations issued under this section shall require each public entity and LTSS insurance provider to designate at least one employee to coordinate the entity's or provider's efforts to comply with and carry out the responsibilities under this Act, including the inves-
tigation of any complaint communicated to the entity or provider that alleges a viola-
tion of this Act. Each public entity and LTSS insurance provider shall make available to all interested individuals the name, office address, and telephone number of the employee designated pursuant to this para-

graph.

(8) GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES.—The regula-

tions issued under this section shall require each public entity and LTSS insurance providers to adopt and publish grievance procedures providing for prompt and equitable resolution of complaints alleging a violation of this Act.
(A) IN GENERAL.—The regulations issued under this section shall establish annual reporting requirements for each public entity covered by this section.

(B) PROGRAM OBJECTIVES, TARGETS, AND EFFORTS.—The regulations issued under this section shall require each public entity that has submitted a transition plan to submit to the Administrator an annual report on the progress the public entity has made during the previous year in meeting the measurable objectives, specific annual targets, and specific requirements of this section.

(C) OTHER PROVISIONS.—The regulations issued under this section shall include other provisions and requirements as the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health and Human Services determine are necessary to carry out the objectives of this Act.

(D) INCREASE IN FMAP.—(1) GENERAL.—The Administrator shall review a transition plan submitted in accordance with subsection (b)(10) for the purpose of determining whether the transition plan meets the requirements of this Act, including the regulations issued under this section.

(2) DISAPPROVAL.—If the Administrator determines that a transition plan reviewed under this subsection fails to meet the requirements of this Act, the Administrator shall disapprove the transition plan and notify the public entity that submitted the transition plan of, and the reasons for, such disapproval.

(3) APPLICATION OF DISAPPROVED PLAN.—Not later than 90 days after the date of disapproval of a transition plan under this subsection, the public entity that submitted the transition plan shall modify the transition plan to meet the requirements of this section and shall submit the Administrator a revised transition plan that modifies the public entity that submitted the transition plan or modified transition plan the State or other public entity submitted, and obtained approval for, under this section. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines under this paragraph a public entity or community-based services described in subparagraph (B) is receiving a payment based on an increase described in subparagraph (B) with respect to the previous fiscal year or fiscal year 2019, whichever was the greater reported amount, the Secretary shall provide for a reduction in the payment to the State based on the increase.

(E) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

(1) FMAP.—The term ‘FMAP’ means the Federal medical assistance percentage (as determined under section 1905(a)(26) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(b)) without regard to any increases in that percentage applicable under other subsections of that section or other provision of law, including this section.

(2) HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED SERVICES DEFINED.—The term ‘home and community-based services’ means any of the following services provided under a State Medicaid plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) or a waiver of such plan:

(I) Home and community-based services provided under subsection (c), (d), or (i) of section 1915 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396n).

(II) Home health care services.

(III) Personal care services.

(IV) Services described in section 1905(a)(26) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(a)(26)) (relating to FACE program services).

(V) Self-directed personal assistance services provided in accordance with section 1915(j) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396n(j)).

(VI) Community-based attendant services and supports provided in accordance with section 1915(k) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396n(k)).

(VII) Rehabilitative services, within the meaning of section 1905(a)(13) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(a)(13)).

(VIII) REPORTING YEAR.—The term ‘reporting year’ means fiscal year preceding the date of a report under subparagraph (D)(i).

(B) ADDITIONAL CONDITION FOR PAYMENT.—(1) STATE REPORT.—As a condition for the receipt of a payment based on an increase described in subparagraph (B) with respect to the previous fiscal year or fiscal year 2019, whichever was the greater reported amount, the Secretary shall provide for a reduction in the payment to the State based on the increase.

(2) MAINTAIN EFFORT.—If the amount reported under clause (i) by a State with respect to a reporting year is less than the amount reported under clause (i) with respect to the previous fiscal year or fiscal year 2019, whichever was the greater reported amount, the Secretary shall provide for a reduction in the payment to the State based on the increase.

(3) POTENTIAL VIOLATION.—If the court finds that a violation of this Act has occurred or is about to occur, the court may award to the complainant:

(A) actual and punitive damages;

(B) immediate injunctive relief to prevent institutionalization;

(C) as the court determines to be appropriate any permanent injunction (including an order to immediately provide or maintain community-based long-term services or supports for an individual to prevent institutionalization (as defined in subparagraph (A)), temporary restraining order, or other order (including an order enjoining the defendant from engaging in a practice that violates this Act or ordering such affirmative action as may be appropriate); and

(D) in an appropriate case, injunctive relief to require the modification of a policy, practice, or procedure, or the provision of an alternative method of providing LTSS, to the extent required by this Act.

(2) ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(A) DUTY TO INVESTIGATE.—The Attorney General shall investigate alleged violations of this Act, or who has reasonable grounds for believing that such individual is about to be subjected to such a violation.

(B) STANDING.—An individual with a disability shall have standing to institute a civil action under this subsection if the individual makes a prima facie showing that the individual—

(1) is an individual with an LTSS disability; and

(2) is being subjected to, or about to be subjected to, such a violation (including a violation of section 4(b)(11)).

(3) APPOINTMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL TO COMPARE.—In any application by the complainant described in paragraph (2) and in such circumstances as the court may determine to be just, the court may appoint an attorney for the complainant, and may authorize the commencement of such civil action without the payment of fees, costs, or security.

(C) FUTILE GESTURE NOT REQUIRED.—Nothing in this section shall require an individual with an LTSS disability to engage in a futile gesture if such person has actual notice that the public entity or LTSS insurance provider does not intend to comply with the provisions of this Act.

(D) DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—If the court finds that a violation of this Act has occurred or is about to occur, the court may award to the complainant:

(A) actual and punitive damages;

(B) immediate injunctive relief to prevent institutionalization;

(C) as the court determines to be appropriate any permanent injunction (including an order to immediately provide or maintain community-based long-term services or supports for an individual to prevent institutionalization (as defined in subparagraph (A)), temporary restraining order, or other order (including an order enjoining the defendant from engaging in a practice that violates this Act or ordering such affirmative action as may be appropriate); and

(D) in an appropriate case, injunctive relief to require the modification of a policy, practice, or procedure, or the provision of an alternative method of providing LTSS, to the extent required by this Act.
appropriate Federal district court if the Attorney General has reasonable cause to believe that—

(i) any public entity or LTSS insurance provider, including a group of public entities or LTSS insurance providers, is engaged in a pattern or practice of violations of this Act; or

(ii) any individual, including a group, has been subjected to a violation of this Act and the violation raises an issue of general public importance.

(2) AUTHORITY OF COURT.—In a civil action under paragraph (1)(B), the court—

(A) may grant any equitable relief that such court considers to be appropriate, including, to the extent authorized by this Act—

(i) granting temporary, preliminary, or permanent relief; and

(ii) requiring the modification of a policy, practice, or procedure, or the provision of an alternative method of providing LTSS;

(B) may award such other relief as the court considers to be appropriate, including civil penalty against the public entity or LTSS insurance provider in an amount—

(1) not exceeding $100,000 for a first violation; and

(2) not exceeding $200,000 for any subsequent violation.

(3) SINGLE VIOLATION.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(C), in determining whether a first or subsequent violation has occurred, a determination in a single action, by judgment, or other settlement, that the public entity or LTSS insurance provider has engaged in more than one violation of this Act shall be counted as a single violation.

SEC. 9. CONSTRUCTION.

For purposes of construing this Act—

(1) section 4(b)(11) shall be construed in a manner that takes into account its similarities with section 323(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii));

(2) the first sentence of section 6(b)(5)(A) shall be construed in a manner that takes into account its similarities with section 35.105(a) of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act); and

(3) section 7 shall be construed in a manner that takes into account its similarities with section 807(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3607(a)).

(4) section 8(a)(2) shall be construed in a manner that takes into account its similarities with section 503(a) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12188(a)(1)); and

(5) section 8(d)(1)(B) shall be construed in a manner that takes into account its similarities with section 808(b)(1)(B) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12188(b)(1)(B)).

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARNEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 127. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to seek to enter into an agreement with the city of Vallejo, California, for the transfer of the Mare Island Naval Cemetery in Vallejo, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. President, today I reintroduce the Mare Island Naval Cemetery Transfer Act, which would transfer control of the Mare Island Naval Cemetery from the City of Vallejo in California to the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) where it belongs.

The Mare Island Naval Cemetery is the oldest military cemetery on the West Coast. Opened in 1856, it was originally part of Mare Island Naval Shipyard, the first U.S. naval base established on the Pacific Ocean. The historic cemetery is the final resting place for 860 veterans and their loved ones, including three Medal of Honor recipients. Anna Arnold Key, the daughter of the President, is also buried there, next to her husband who fought in the War of 1812. After the base closed in 1996, the nearby City of Vallejo assumed control of the naval property and cemetery.

Unfortunately, the city doesn’t have the necessary funds to properly care for the cemetery. The city is also ineligible for VA support since it’s not part of the State or Federal government. The maintenance, therefore, is left to volunteers and resources who lack the expertise necessary to maintain this historic cemetery.

The cemetery has fallen into disrepair and is no longer a fitting tribute to the brave men and women buried there. Gravestones are toppled over, broken, or sinking into the ground. Plants and weeds are overgrown, and water is pooling due to the lack of proper drainage. The cemetery’s current condition requires urgent action. Our bill would accomplish this by transferring control to the VA’s National Cemetery Administration.

The transfer would not only allow the VA to restore the cemetery, but also ensure it’s maintained for future generations to pay their respects to the heroes buried there. I want to thank Congressmen MIKE THOMPSON (D-CA) for leading this effort in the House. Passing this bill would be a small, but important, token of our gratitude to the veterans to whom we owe so much.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 18—AUTHORIZING THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL TO REPRESENT THE SENATE IN TEXAS V. UNITED STATES

Whereas Texas, Wisconsin, Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Paul LePage (Governor of Maine), Mississippi (by and through Governor Phil Bryant), Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, West Virginia, and individual plaintiffs have filed suit in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to strike down the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148; 124 Stat. 119) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152; 124 Stat. 1829) unconstitutional and should be enjoined, by asserting that the requirement under those Acts to maintain minimum essential coverage (commonly known as the “individual responsibility provision”) in section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is unconstitutional following the amendment of the Affordable Care Act—

(i) as a matter of law, the District Court for the Northern District of Texas did not have jurisdiction over the constitutional and statutory claims of Texas, Wisconsin, Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Paul LePage (Governor of Maine), Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, West Virginia, and the individual plaintiffs; and

(ii) the arguments of the Department of Justice regarding severability of the individual responsibility provision and the Community Rating and Guenther Annuity provisions of the Affordable Care Act are not severable and should be enjoined, by asserting that severability of those provisions is unnecessary and not required by the Constitution of the United States.

Whereas the District Court in Texas v. United States, No. 1:16–CV–00167–O (N.D. Tex.), including seeking to—

(1) intervene as a party in the matter and assert its interests in the matter; and

(2) defend all provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, the amendments to those Acts to other provisions of law, and any amendments to such provisions, including

(3) section 300gg(a)(1), 300gg–3, 300gg–4(a), and 300gg–4(b), must now be struck down as not severable from the individual responsibility provision; and

Whereas the Department of Justice not only refused to defend the amended individual responsibility provision, but also argued that this provision is unconstitutional and that the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act guaranteeing issuance of insurance coverage regardless of health status or pre-existing conditions (commonly known as the “guaranteed issue provision”), sections 2701 and 2704(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–1, 300gg–3, 300gg–4(a)), and prohibiting discriminatory premium rates (commonly known as the “community rating provision”), sections 2701 and 2705(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg(a)(1), 300gg–4(b)), must now be struck down as not severable from the individual responsibility provision; and

Whereas the district court in Texas v. United States, No. 4:18–cv–00167–O (N.D. Tex.) issued an order on December 14, 2018 declares unconstitutional following the amendment of the Affordable Care Act the individual responsibility provision in section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is unconstitutional and that all the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act are not severable and therefore are invalid: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized and directed to represent the Senate in Texas v. United States, No. 4:18–cv–00167–O (N.D. Tex.), including seeking to—

(1) intervene as a party in the matter and any appellate or related proceedings; and

(2) defend all provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, the amendments to those Acts to other provisions of law, and any amendments to such provisions, including
Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the Medicaid Program and in particular that story that came to our attention this past weekend.

This is the headline from a story dated January 11, late in the day, and it is by The Hill newspaper. You will not be able to see it from a distance, but the headline reads: "Trump officials consider allowing Medicaid block grants for states."

Here is what just the first two short paragraphs outline. The story begins as follows:

The Trump administration is considering moving forward with a major conservative change to Medicaid by allowing states to get block grants for the program, sources say. Capping the amount of federal dollars the federal government spends on the health insurance program for the poor through a block grant has long been a conservative goal. It was a controversial part of the ObamaCare repeal debate in 2017, with much of the public rallying against cuts to Medicaid.

After the failure of that repeal effort, the Trump administration is now considering issuing guidance to states encouraging them to apply for caps on federal Medicaid spending in exchange for additional flexibility on how they run the program, according to people familiar with the discussions.

I will not read the rest of the story, and I will not enter the whole story into the RECORD because folks can look it up, and there are other stories as well that cover this same news. So, in a sense, it is a big new development, but it is an old story.

It is an old story of Members of Congress and the administration coming together to try to make changes to the Medicaid Program. In this case, it differs only slightly in that, so far at least, this seems to be an initiative that is an administration-led initiative. We are not aware of any—as far as I know—congressional involvement, but it is not all that much different, right? It is the same thing.

We had a long debate in 2017 about whether we should not only repeal the Affordable Care Act but thereby do two things to Medicaid—one is to end over time Medicaid expansion, and second would be to have cuts to Medicaid that would result from this same idea, the so-called block granting of Medicaid.

I believe we litigated—if we can use that word in a legislative sense—that in 2017. The repeal bill did not pass the Senate in the summer of 2017. There were other attempts that didn’t come to a vote on full repeal. Then we had an election in 2018. Healthcare was a major part of that debate, most of it centering on protections for pre-existing conditions and other consumer protections in the run of the ObamaCare.

If you look at the last 2 years, we had one-party rule in Washington—Republican House, and Senate. There were major efforts by the administration and by both majorities in the Houses of Congress to make substantial changes to Medicaid, and it did not happen. So failing all those attempts, now the administration, I would assume, is trying to do it secretly but, exposed, wants to make changes to Medicaid by way of granting waivers and inviting States to, in essence, change Medicaid at the State level.

This initiative will not affect Pennsylvania—or it is highly unlikely to affect Pennsylvania in the near term. So this is about major parts of the country but not every State. It is a bad idea, in short order, because what this block granting means is benefits get cut.

It is very simple. When you cut a program that is focused on healthcare for low-income children, healthcare coverage for those with disabilities, children and adults, and helping seniors some of the things that are really hard to do in a nursing home—that is another benefit of Medicaid—you are talking about benefits being cut over time. Maybe there will be more cuts in one State versus the other, depending upon the nature of the waiver and the particulars of the program in that State, but it is going to be cutting Medicaid. It is a bad idea, and I think the American people understand that, especially after the debate in 2017. It is a bad idea, and I think the American people understand that.

Maybe there are some folks who didn’t really appreciate Medicaid; probably a lot of them in Washington didn’t appreciate Medicaid at the 2017 and 2018 debates. Maybe there are folks who weren’t paying attention for a lot of years and didn’t realize the scope of Medicaid, didn’t realize it covers 70 million Americans. I know that is why some of my Republican colleagues in the Congress are very hostile to it: they think it covers too many people. But after 2017, those who were misinformed or had forgotten or just were never aware of the benefits of Medicaid got a real good reminder because of the debate we had. That was one positive outgrowth of that long and difficult debate in the Congress over the last couple of years, hurts basically those three groups of Americans. It hurts kids, hurts people with disabilities, and hurts our seniors.

I think the part of it that people tend to forget is that this program helps middle-class families as well. If you have a disability, your income might be higher than low income, but you get the benefit of Medicaid. A lot of middle-class families have a loved one in a nursing home who would not be able to afford that kind of long-term care without the benefit of Medicaid. A lot of those families are middle class.

When it comes to children, of course, it is for children from low-income families, but those children are getting...
what many believe to be the gold standard for children's healthcare. I like to say that in Pennsylvania, Medicaid is a 40-50-60 program. It is real simple: 40 percent of the kids in our State, thankfully, have the benefit of Medicaid. The percentage of people with disabilities—roughly, about half of the people in our State with disabilities get the benefit of Medicaid. Thank goodness they do. Thirdly, 60 percent of people for long-term care in Pennsylvania could not get it without the benefit of Medicaid.

In some States, the percentages might be higher or lower than that, but when you have a program that covers 40 percent of you children, 50 percent of your population with disabilities, and 60 percent of your seniors could get long-term care, which they need—those folks who have long-term care need it and have to have it. When you have that kind of program, which covers roughly 2 million people in Pennsylvania and 70 million nationwide, you are going to get the attention of a lot of people when you are messing with it. That kind of thing, “messing with it.” By saying, to some degree, under the cover of darkness—not having a debate on the floor of the Senate but sending guidance to States, inviting them to apply for a waiver, and it takes a while to approve the waiver, then all of a sudden it comes out, and the waiver is granted—guess what. If you live in a State where that happens and you are on Medicaid, you might not have Medicaid a year from now, 2 years from now, 3 years from now, 15 years from now, 25 years from now. At some point, you may be adversely affected by that. This is very serious business when it comes to those very vulnerable Americans.

In so many ways, Medicaid, like a lot of things we debate here,covetously covers 40 percent of your children, 50 percent of people with disabilities—roughly, about half of the people in our State with disabilities get the benefit of Medicaid, but Medicaid is one of many examples we could cite—tells us who we are as a nation. People around the world don’t respect America simply because America has the strongest, best military. The best fighting men and women in the world; no one is even close. But there are a lot of nations that spend a lot on their military and have strong, fighting men and women; they have a strong military, and they are not respected like we are. Thank God we have a strong military and the strongest economy in the world. We are blessed by that.

But one of the other ways the world respects us is that they often conclude that we treat our own people better than some other places do. Medicaid, which is a 50-year-old program, is a program that tells us who we are as a nation, whom we value, and whom we are not on behalf of. It tells us a lot about who we are. America is great because we care deeply about those 70 million people who get the benefit of that program, just as we care deeply about other Americans who benefit or have a connection to our government.

Before any administration or any part of our government takes an action that will lead to the cutting back of a program like Medicaid—whether it is by way of legislation or by way of waiver or regulation—they need to hear from us.

I, for one, am willing to fight on this for a long time. If I do nothing else but fight this battle, sign me up because we are going to fight hard. I am not certain we will win, but I think we will win this battle. Medicaid tells us who we are. Why do I say that? Well, because we hear from families all the time. I got a letter at the beginning of the debate in 2017 from a mom. Like a lot of Members of the Senate, you get a letter from a mom or a dad or a family member who sits down to put pen to paper—in a sense, to write you a letter or send you an email or to express what their lives will be like without a program, what their lives will be like if a change goes forward.

In this case it was Pam, a mom talking about her son Rowan. Rowan is on the autism spectrum. This mom talks about the prospect of not just learning that and what that meant to her and her family if she lost it, obviously, but also the benefits she received because of Medicaid—in Pennsylvania we call it Medical Assistance, or by the shorthand, MA.

I will not read the whole letter, but Pam talks about, in just one example of what Medicaid means, the wrap-around services—all of the services that a child who has a disability gets, maybe on either the autism spectrum or a physical disability or maybe a child who has Down syndrome.

In this case, Rowan is on the autism spectrum. She talks about the behavioral specialist consultant and the therapeutic staff support work that helps her and the benefits of that and what that means to Pam, as a mom, and to her family—but also what it means to her son Rowan. She talks about Rowan benefiting “immensely from a program called the Child Guidance Program. Recently, she’s started a new program called the CREATE Program. It is a social skills program specifically for autistic children ages 3 to 21.” She enrolled Rowan in that so-called CREATE Program.

She goes on to say: “I am thrilled by Rowan’s daily progress. I cannot say enough great things about this program.” That program would not be part of the life of that family, absent Medicaid. That program would not be part of the life of that family in the instance where that family was living in a State that had been granted a waiver that allowed block grants that, thereby, are going to result in that family not getting that kind of service. Thankfully, she is in a State where the Medicaid Program is strong and will be defended aggressively. But I don’t want a Rowan in another State or a Pam—a mom in another State—not having the benefit that Rowan in Pennsylvania has and that Pam in Pennsylvania has.

Pam goes on to say: “Without medical assistance, our family would be bankrupt or my son would go without the therapies he sincerely needs.”

At the end of the letter, she concludes by asking me, as her representa-tive to think about her family when we are debating these issues. She talks about her husband and her son Rowan first, and then she concludes the letter this way:

Please think of my 9-month-old daughter, Luna, who smiles and laughs at her brother who will have to wait in his life after we are gone. Overall, we are desperately in need of Rowan’s Medical Assistance and would be devastated if we lost these benefits.

That is what one mom said about the importance of Medicaid to that family.

My point in raising this issue—even though, thankfully, we have backed down to legislating to legislatively change the Medicaid Program for the worse. We now have an administrative effort to undermine the program, but I raise this simply to say that family in America should not have to worry for 10 minutes about whether their government is going to continue those important benefits to their daughter, whatever the case may be. Maybe their mom is in a nursing home or maybe a neighbor has a son or a daughter who, because of income levels, is getting Medicaid. They shouldn’t have to worry for minutes about that because we are America. We made the decision 50 years ago—and it was a good decision—to take care of those families and to do everything we could. Some days we will not get it right; some days we will make mistakes. But on most days, a program like that is helping lots of families, tens of millions of them, and the bureaucrats or the elected officials or the administration officials in Washington should seek to make changes that will adversely affect even one of those families has to look those families in the eye—or should look them in the eye—and tell them why that is good, not just for that family but why that is good for America. How is that going to help us?

I know what the argument will be. I hear it over and over again. They say that the program is unsustainable, right? We are not going to be able to afford this much Medicaid 10 years from now, 15 years from now, 25 years from now. Well, when they say “unsustainable” around here, I want to translate for you. That means they are not willing to make people spend money for it. Let me say it bluntly: If we have to charge someone or someone who has a high income to preserve Medicaid, sign me up for that too.

Let’s be very clear about this. This program is that important. I believe there are a lot of Americans of means—of high incomes—who would want to be included in this program. I know there are some politicians around here who are always talking about how you have to make sure that they have
low tax rates, but I think a lot of those Americans want to preserve the Medi-
caid Program, want to strengthen it, want to make changes that are appro-
 priate, want to make it more efficient where we can, but there are a lot of Americans out there of great means who want this program preserved. So we have a lot of work to do to make sure we move in the right direction.

Let me make one or two more final points, and I will conclude.

One of the questions is, What happens if a block grant proposal goes through nationwide but even in more limited instances?

Way back in November of 2016, one of the many organizations that track this kind of a program over time—the Medicaid Program or healthcare pro-
grams—issued a report. It has issued many of these reports, but here is just one for your consideration. The name of the organization is Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. It is here in Washington and has been around a long time. It was very helpful in the debate on healthcare and about the impact of various proposals.

Here is what the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities said in November of 2016. The date was November 30, 2016. In order to save some space, I will not read the whole report, and I will not enter it into the RECORD. People can look it up, right?

Here is the headline: "Medicaid Block Grant Would Slash Federal Funding, Shift Costs to States, and Leave Millions More Uninsured."

Here are some of the headlines say in the report. The first one reads “A block grant would cap Federal Med-
caid funding in order to achieve sav-
ings for the Federal Government.” That is what the proposal is intended to do.

No. 2. “The likely magnitude of the Federal funding cuts and resulting cost-shift to States would be very large.”

No. 3. “Such a block grant would push states to cut their Medicaid pro-
grams deeply.”

The last two are as follows: “Med-
caid is already efficient and innova-
tive.” That is true. We don’t talk about that enough, but it is true.

The last headline is “A Medicaid block grant would lead to draconian cuts to eligibility, benefits, and pro-
vider payment rates.” What they didn’t mention is there is that cuts to Medicaid would affect hospitals, espe-
cially rural hospitals.

Here is the number from the House Republican budget plan for fiscal year 2017. We are going back now to the latter part of 2016. Here is what the report concluded, and this is in the instance of being implemented as law: “It would have cut federal Medicaid funding by $1 trillion—or nearly 25 percent—over ten years, relative to current law, on top of the cuts the plan would secure from repealing the ACA’s Medicaid expan-
sion.”

I realize that number is bigger than what we are talking about here because we are talking about a number of States changing their Medicaid Pro-
grams because of a block granting waiver that was granted to that par-
ticular State, but I am not too con-
cerned about the overall number be-
cause that is impossible to predict.

Even if they were to be granted this kind of a waiver in imple-
mented block grants, a lot of people in that State would lose their Medicaid. I think we should be concerned if it were one or two States because of the fact that, let alone thousands or tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands or, in fact, millions. If block granting were to be granted for the whole country, you would be talking about double-fig-
ure millions losing that kind of cov-
erage. Even if it were to be a much smaller number, we should be very con-
cerned about this.

Here is another reason not to mess around with Medicaid in a way that ad-
versely impacts people or undermines the spending and the politi-
cians in Washington from both Houses and both parties. I think, in almost every instance—and there is probably an exception to this—they speak from their hearts and do truly care about what is happening to their commu-
unities and in their States because of the opioid crisis. It is everywhere. It is urban, rural, and suburban. It is every-
where, and it is devastating. We have never seen a public health problem like that, least not anything worse than it. It is a problem in Pennsylvania, and it is a problem in every State, as I am sure the President Officer would agree. Yet here is the part they don’t talk about. Sometimes the same people say, “I really am wor-
rried about the opioid crisis, and I want to do the following to help people who are in the grip of that addiction, and I want to institute a program or provide funding or otherwise,” and that is won-
derful when they have that initiative. Yet sometimes people above middle class—
spend down. Middle-class families—
people above middle class—
spend down. They can’t afford the cost
of nursing home care, and the State
says and the Federal Government says: We want to help you.

That is why Medicaid is so critical to nursing homes. If you look at the dol-
ars spent, it would not be entirely in-
accurate to say that Medicaid is a nursing home program with help for children and people with disabilities as well.

I am just putting the administration on notice that if it wants to continue to pursue this, we are going to have a big fight about it, and it is a fight that
will go on for a long time. It will go on in the courts. We will litigate it on this
floor. We will litigate it in committees and fight about it in the House and in
the Senate. We will fight in the streets of States, and we will fight about it for a long time until we win because we have other things to do to lift people up around here. We have to do more on healthcare—lower the cost of healthcare, lower the cost of prescrip-
tion drugs—and make sure that these programs work well. We don’t have time for throwing millions of people off of healthcare or tens of millions off of healthcare. There is a broad, bipartisan consensus on a whole range of things we could do on healthcare. That is what we should work on.

The administration, if it is doing the right thing, would abandon these reck-
less, extreme ideas on Medicaid and
join us—join both parties in both Houses—in trying to do something positive and constructive and Amer-
ican on healthcare. I don’t think it is American to say to a child, “Yes, you had Medicaid before, but we couldn’t afford it. You are not going to have healthcare any longer” or to say that to someone with a disability or to a senior.

If the administration wants to fight, we are going to be ready to fight, and
we will punch hard in that fight—figuratively speaking, of course. We will fight every minute of every day against this. I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:10 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, January 16, 2019, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

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 12211:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRIG. GEN. PAUL J. BOCK, JR.
BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH F. SHADBOLT
BRIG. GEN. STEVEN D. BRENKA

The following officers for appointment in the United States marine corps to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. MARCUS R. ANNABLE
COL. MELVIN D. CARTER
COL. ROBERT C. FULFORD
COL. DANIEL Q. GREENWOOD
COL. JOSEPH A. MATOS III
COL. JASON L. MORRIS
COL. ROY J. SLAVAGE
COL. DANIEL L. SHIPLEY
COL. JAMES R. WOLLONS
COL. BRIAN N. WOLFORD

The following officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States marine corps under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

SALIEH P. DAGHER
JAMAAL K. EVANS
JOE N. MIRELES
NEVILLE A. WELCH

The following officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States marine corps under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be major general

RICO ACOSTA
JAY S. ENSLEY
BRIAN A. ADAMS
MICHAEL M. ALEXANDER
CLINT W. ALANS
ANDREW J. ALLENDORF
CHRISTOPHER D. ALVINO
MARY C. ANDERSON
KYLE J. ANDREWS
CHARLES E. ANKAM II
JASON T. APPLEY
ANDREW B. APOLO
WILLIAM C. ARNOLD
ROBERT C. ARBAGAST
RICHARD M. ARBOGAST
OMAR G. ARGUELLO
PHILIP T. ASH
KELLY E. ATTWOOD
MICHAEL J. AUBRY
AARON M. AYWY
DOUGLAS P. BAHNNS
GLEN P. BAKER
LISA A. BAKKE
JOHN E. BALLINGHAM
JOSEPH N. BAKER
JONATHAN F. BARR
PAUL R. BARRON
MATTHEW D. BARTLETT
ROBERT J. BASKIN
MATTHEW J. BAUMANN
ELDON W. BECK
MATTHEW J. BECK
CORY J. BEGLEY
BRANDT N. BENNER
CASEY H. BENNETT
ERIK N. BERNARD
JOHN T. BERSWELL
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT D. BARTER
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT M. BARTER
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT W. BARTER

The following officers for appointment in the United States navy to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LRH) BONNY L. JACKSON

IN THE NAVY

The following officer for appointment in the United States navy to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be rear admiral

BRIG. GEN. WILIAM W. LING

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following officer for appointment in the United States marine corps to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be major general

COL. FRANK A. RODMAN

IN THE ARMY

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 officer for appointment in the reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Sections 12203 and 12212:

COL. JASON L. MORRIS

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:

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States marine corps under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

COL. BRIAN N. WOLFORD
COL. JAMES B. WELLONS
COL. JASON L. MORRIS
COL. ROBERT C. FULFORD

The following officer for appointment in the United States army to the grade indicated under Title 10, U.S.C., Section 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

SUZANNE M. DEMPSEY
HONORING MERCED NAACP PRESIDENT DARRYL DAVIS

HON. JIM COSTA OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor outgoing Merced NAACP President Darryl Davis. Mr. Davis’s tenure as president and his various leadership roles highlight his distinguished lifetime of public service and commitment to serving our community.

Mr. Davis began his decades of service to the greater Merced community in 1987 when he was stationed at Castle Air Force Base. After his time in the military and graduation from the Criminal Justice Training Center (Police Academy) at Modesto Junior College, Mr. Davis began his career in law enforcement. Throughout his career, he worked in multiple capacities with the Merced County Sheriff’s and District Attorney’s Offices and then as an officer at UC Merced. In each of these roles and in his current job as a fraud investigator with Merced County, Mr. Davis has served with distinction and exhibited strong professionalism, leadership, and integrity, which have made him a well-respected member of the community.

Having been a member of the NAACP for many years, Mr. Davis was sworn in as the Merced branch president in 2015 and has since used his unique perspective gained throughout his career to further the NAACP’s mission to ensure equal rights and eliminate race-based discrimination. During his four years as president, Mr. Davis has continued to build the organization’s membership and relationships to further educate others about the social issues facing our country and community, including topics such as the effects of gangs and incarceration on minority youths, police encounters, and lawful protests.

Mr. Davis has exhibited the same level of commitment, integrity, and professionalism during his time as the local NAACP president that he has had during his law enforcement career. The unique perspective he has as a police officer, combined with his ability to bring people together and desire to help others have undoubtedly had a positive impact on the greater Merced community.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring a man who has made significant contributions to our country and community through his distinguished career and extensive civic involvement. It is both fitting and appropriate that we honor Darryl Davis and wish him the best as he concludes his term as president of the Merced NAACP branch.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EARL L. “BUDDY” CARTER OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on Roll Call No. 30.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KAY GRANGER OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, due to circumstances outside of my control, I was unable to be present for this vote. Had I been present, I would have voted YES on Roll Call No. 28.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JEFF DUNCAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, on the evening of January 14, 2019, I missed Roll Call vote No. 30, as I was at a meeting between President Donald Trump and my constituents—the National Champion Clemson Tiger football team. Had I been present, I would have voted YES on H.R. 116, the Investing in Main Street Act.

HONORING BARBARA PLANTE

HON. DEBBIE LESKO OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the incredible work Barbara Plante has done for the United States Air Force and Luke Air Force Base in my home district. Barbara is retiring this month after an incredibly distinguished career serving our country. She has served the Air Force for 35 years, including 26 of those years at Luke Air Force Base.

Currently, Barbara serves as the Deputy Director of the Community Initiatives Team at Luke Air Force Base. She was on the public affairs team for Luke Air Force Base from 1995 until 2013, except for when she was deployed to Afghanistan in 2011 and 2012. During those years, she welcomed local officials to the base, educated the public, and helped Luke Air Force Base with recruitment. In 2013, she transitioned from public affairs to help lead the Community Initiatives Team, where she learned and concentrated on state laws and zoning.

Luke Air Force Base is home to one of the largest fighter wings in the world, the 56th Fighter Wing, in the middle of a growing metropolitan area. The Air Force strives for safe and supportive environments around its bases, leading to Luke Air Force Base’s creation of the Community Initiatives Team in 2003. While not every base has one, Barbara’s leadership has demonstrated how successful they can be. She has been essential to the base and the 56th Fighter Wing’s success.

Barbara has built tremendous support for the base in West Valley. Her commitment to educating city officials, real estate professionals, politicians and residents about the state laws restricting development around the base and why they are important has helped secure Luke Air Force Base’s future for years to come. As of 2017, the base supports approximately 15,070 jobs, $923 million in wages, and $2.4 billion in direct and indirect economic impact to Arizona.

Barbara’s warm personality and desire to build and maintain strong relationships has helped her successfully manage the growth at Luke Air Force Base and the surrounding community. Her team works with 11 cities, Arizona state government and the federal government. Her efforts have seen direct results, including how our surrounding cities work together for the greater good of the community and the base. Barbara’s work has created a fantastic and trusting relationship between our communities and Luke Air Force Base. Barbara’s great achievements reflect her selfless dedication to serving our community in Arizona. Her passion for Luke Air Force Base and her devotion to her work for the Air Force has opened many doors for the base. It is an honor to be among the many in congratulating her on this most worthy accomplishment.

I wish her my sincerest congratulations and hope her well-earned retirement is filled with good health and much happiness.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF PFC GARFIELD M. LANGHORN

HON. LEE M. ZELDIN OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor the service and sacrifice of hometown hero and Medal of Honor recipient PFC Garfield M. Langhorn, from Riverhead, New York, who, 50 years ago today, saved the lives of his platoon members at just 20 years old, by throwing himself on a live grenade in Pleiku Province in Vietnam on January 15, 1969.

PFC Langhorn served as a radio operator with Troop C, 7th Squadron, 17th Cavalry Regiment, 1st Aviation Brigade, when his unit
attempted to rescue the crew of a downed American helicopter. Finding no surviving crew, PFC Langhorn and his unit were returning the fallen aviators when they came under heavy fire from North Vietnamese forces. Under the cover of darkness, the North Vietnamese began to advance, throwing a hand grenade in front of PFC Langhorn who was just a few feet from his injured comrades.

It was in that moment, PFC Langhorn selflessly chose the courageous act President Lincoln once referred to as "the last full measure of devotion"—to his brothers, his fellow soldiers and his country. In that moment, he "unhesitatingly threw himself on the grenade, scooped it beneath his body and absorbed the blast," according to his Medal of Honor Citation and the first-hand accounts of his fellow soldiers he saved.

For his extraordinary act of bravery, PFC Langhorn received a series of awards, including the highest, most prestigious personal military decoration—the Medal of Honor; and, most recently, the Riverhead Post Office was named in his honor. There is no doubt, PFC Langhorn has earned these commendations, but they mean little if we forget to look beyond the decorations and forever remember and honor the actions of the 20-year-old young man who earned them.

In saving his fellow soldiers, PFC Langhorn’s life was extinguished too soon, but as President Lincoln continued, "we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain." Today, we must challenge ourselves as Americans to pick up that torch, to embody the bravery, selflessness and commitment to our great country. There is no memorial, no medal and no post office that can bring back PFC Langhorn, but he can live eternally in all of us, in our actions and in our hearts.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF ANTHONY JOHN YORK

HON. TIM RYAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Anthony John York, age 35, who passed away on Friday, December 7, 2018.

Anthony was born on August 3, 1983 in Youngstown, Ohio to Denise DeBartolo York and John York. After graduating from Cardinal Mooney High School, he attended Tulane University. Tony resided in Sausalito, California where he founded the company Koda. The company focuses on preparing young people for their first jobs after college. His passion was philanthropy, and he always looked for ways to serve those around him.

He is survived by his parents, brother Jed, sisters Jenna and Mara, and nephews Jaxon and Brixton.

I extend my deepest condolences to Tony’s family and friends.
When he was not working, he spent his time within his beloved community. His love of airplanes persisted throughout his entire life, evident by his membership to the Pueblo Historical Aircraft Society and the 22 years he spent volunteering at the local aircraft museum. He was also an avid amateur radio operator, member of the American Radio Relay League, and the local Ham Club. He was a member of numerous veteran's organizations including the Navy League, American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Retired Enlisted Association. Mr. Pearce also participated in organizations such as Elks Lodge No. 90, Masonic Lodge No. 95, Al Kaly Shrine, and the Southern Colorado Consistory.

Mrs. Collier, Mr. Pearce's dedication and love of family will long be remembered. It is my privilege to acknowledge him here today, and express gratitude for his dutiful service to his community and this nation.

IN MEMORY OF MRS. JOHNNIE LEE BROWN COLLIER

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR. OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a dedicated woman of God, great wife, steadfast mother, and friend of long standing, Mrs. Johnnie Lee Brown Collier. She passed away on December 27, 2018. Her funeral service was held on Thursday, January 3, 2019 at 11 am at the Fourth Street Missionary Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia.

Mrs. Johnnie Lee Brown Collier was born on October 22, 1926, in Columbus, Georgia to the union of Cleola Daniel Brown and John Brown, Sr. She gave her life to Christ and was baptized at an early age at Rosehill Memorial Baptist Church. From that time on, God continued to be the center of her life until her passing. She served as the Sunday School Superintendent and Church Clerk at Rosehill before moving her membership to the Fourth Street Missionary Baptist Church in 1957. Her first pastor at Fourth Street was the late Reverend Henry Harris. Mrs. Collier paved the way for others as she was the first Church Secretary at Fourth Street. She was a natural and gifted leader as she served in a variety of leadership positions at Fourth Street to include the Deacon’s Wives (she served as Chairperson for two terms), PICCM Community Leader in Zebulon Community, Women’s Day Speaker, 1961, Chairperson of Program and Pastoral Relations Committee, and was the Roast and Toast Honoree n 1996.

Mrs. Collier was the epitome of a great wife and mother. She married the late Deacon Samuel Lee Collier on April 26, 1950. God blessed this union for forty years until Deacon Collier’s untimely death on May 27, 1984. Six children were born to this union to include two sets of twins: Bernice Collier Collins, Bernard Collier (deceased), Agnes Collier Averett, Samuel Lee Collier, Jr., Michelle Collier McClain, and Michael Collier. Fred Rogers once said, “It’s not so much what you have in life that matters, It’s what we do with what we have.” Mrs. Collier did a lot for others with what she had. In addition to her own children, she served as a mother figure to her siblings and countless others she found in need of guidance and a helping hand.

Former Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm once said that, “Service is the rent that we pay for the space that we occupy here on this earth.” Mrs. Collier paid her rent and she paid it well. She served in a variety of community organizations to include: Electric City Chapter 482 of the Order of the Eastern Stars (Worthy Matron), Spencer High Alumni (Class of 1943), and she was a Muscogee County Board of Elections Voting Precinct Manager and she traveled to various state conventions to further her knowledge of the voting process. She was also an entrepreneur and a photographer. Her professional career took her to the Medical Center, the Area Mental Health Clinic, and the Enrichment Services Program. Her benevolence extended throughout the community and she often used her influence and networking to help others to find gainful employment.

Madam Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 730,000 constituents of the Second Congressional District of Georgia, salute and honor the life of Mrs. Johnnie Lee Brown Collier. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest condolences to Mrs. Collier’s family during this time of bereavement. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

HONORING JOHNSON COUNTY SHERIFF STEVE KOZISEK’S RETIREMENT

HON. LIZ CHENEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to Johnson County Sheriff Steve Kozisek on his retirement.

Sheriff Kozisek retired after 46 years of dedicated service for the people of Wyoming. After serving his country in the U.S. Army, Sheriff Kozisek began his distinguished career as a police officer in his hometown of Newcastle, Wyoming. Having served as Johnson County Sheriff for 16 years, Sheriff Kozisek has decided to lay down his badge and his gun and pursue a quiet retirement spending time with his wife and grandchildren.

The people of Johnson County are incredibly proud of Sheriff Kozisek and grateful for his decades of service. Again, Madam Speaker, I wish to extend my sincere congratulations to Sheriff Kozisek on his retirement and I thank him for his dedication to service and helping others like Sheriff Kozisek that make the state of Wyoming great.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES R. BAIRD

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, due to weather-related transportation issues beyond my control, I was unable to vote on January 14, 2019. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on Roll Call No. 30.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF CRAIG M. STEPHENS

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Craig M. Stephens, age 74, who passed away peacefully at his home on August 28, 2018, surrounded by his family. Craig was born in Columbus, Kansas in 1944, the son of two teachers. After moving to Ohio in 1956, he attended Kent State University High School before graduating from Kent State University in 1968. Craig was actively involved in student government. He was elected as the first Student Body President at Kent State, where he also managed the Democrat Club, and he was invited to the White House.

After graduation, Craig enlisted in the U.S. Army and served as Special-Agent Military Intelligence for 3 years. Following his honorable discharge, Craig enrolled in Akron University Law School where he began his career in the law offices of Giulitto and Dickinson after graduating in 1973. Soon after, he started his own private practice where he represented the rights of the working class specializing in criminal law. Craig was well respected throughout the region as an intelligent, straight shooting attorney who always told it like it is. Beyond his practice though, Craig volunteered his time and expertise to organizations such as the NAACP, Boys & Girls Club, NECAP, Juvenile Detention Center, Portage County Community Action Council, and Waterloo School District. Until his death, Craig continued to selflessly serve his community as the Chairman of the Portage County Democratic Party and Member and Chairman of the Portage County Board of Elections.

Over 50 years of service, Craig played a critical role in the campaigns of over 60 local, state and national officials turning Portage County into a stronghold for the Democratic Party with his labeled “green machine” featuring his candidates’ signature green political signs. Labeled the “King Maker”, Craig was known for challenging the Democratic establishment and introducing new candidates into the party. Over the same time period, Craig took similar pride turning the family property in Randolph from an old farm into a showpiece that held every County Democratic Picnic since the early 1990s, numerous wedding and birthday events, and countless camping overnights. He could typically be found working in his barn or out operating equipment, most recently joined by his grandson, Xavier, who liked nothing more than working on equipment with his Grandpa.

Craig was married to the love of his life and his better half, Ruth (Enlow), for 42 years. Together they have two children, Justin Stephens and Samantha (Hank) Stephens/Brooks; and two grandchildren, Xavier and...
Simone. Craig is survived by his sisters, Sylvia (Pete) Klas of Minnesota, and Pam Valentine of Ravenna; nephews Matt (Ashley) and Rob Valentine and Paul (Angela) Klas and numerous family and friends. He was preceded in death by his parents, Bill and Adalyn Stephens and his brother, Chuck Stephens.

Craig Stephens leaves a lasting impact. I know he is dearly missed by his family and the entire community. I extend my deepest and sincerest condolences.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STEPHEN STRANAHAN

HON. MARCY KAPTUR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Stephen Stranahan, an outstanding, accomplished, and uniquely generous lifelong citizen of the Toledo area. A veteran, civic leader, and philanthropist who never forgot his roots. He persevered in uplifting the economic, civic, and cultural life of our region.

Steve was born on May 3, 1934 to Virginia Secon Stranahan and Duane Stranahan, Sr. His father was the only child of Frank D. Stranahan, who with his brother R.A. Stranahan, Sr., formed the Champion Spark Plug Co. The product was regarded as the finest in the world during its time, and its dependency contributed to U.S. victory in World War II. Steve’s mother grew up in the Old West End, her father a Toledo resident since the 1850s and a prominent banker. She helped found the Junior League of Toledo and the League of Women Voters in Perrysburg.

Steve attended Maumee Valley Country Day School, Brooks School in North Andover, and Dartmouth College, where he majored in music.

He served as a specialist in the 107th Armored Cavalry Regiment of the Ohio Army National Guard.

Steve’s first job was in the marketing department of the legendary Champion Spark Plug and where he worked his way up to serve as the director of the company.

An entrepreneurial, creative business leader, he found an opportunity to buy a small airport at Telegraph and Alexis roads, National Airport, and operated National Flight Services, which later moved to Toledo Express Airport as a fixed-base operator. He became a dealer of Beechcraft airplanes, tracing his affinity for flight back to his father, who was a pioneer of Champion Spark Plug for aircraft.

Throughout the 1960s, Steve took the mantra of community wide leadership and became a rising civic leader, serving as president of Downtown Toledo Associates, the Toledo Area Chamber of Commerce, and Civic Pride Inc., which owned the Toledo Blades hockey team.

In 1964, he, along with Ned Skeldon, Willard I. Webb III, and Henry Morse, arranged for the return of the minor league baseball team—the Mud Hens—to Toledo.

Steve joined Paul Block, Jr., Ned Skeldon, and Thomas Anderson to form Clear Water Inc. to campaign for cleaning up the Lake Erie watershed. His firm, Riverview One, erected Fiberglas Tower in downtown Toledo and he was a leader in Arrowhead Park, a Maumee business development.

A pianist himself, he took his love of music and applied it to the Toledo Symphony, an institution his paternal grandmother, Marie Celeste Stranahan, helped to found. Having served as a long-time board member and board president of the Toledo Symphony, he stressed financial prudence and Steve and his wife were recognized in 2015 by the Toledo Symphony for their stewardship of the institution.

Steve’s overarching influence was most impactful on the University of Toledo, having served as chairman of the Board of Trustees and as chairman of the University of Toledo Foundation trustees. His insistence on having an endowment fund set up for the University and his leadership through much of the institutional growth helped transform the University of Toledo from a municipal school to a state university.

Toledo has been blessed with his life as a rare leader. Though an “Ivy League” success story, he dedicated his substance to the advancement of life for all in the Toledo area.

Steve will ultimately be remembered for his dedication not only to his family, but the family of greater Toledo. On behalf of a grateful community, please let me offer his wife Ann Anderson Stranahan, his children Frances Parry, Abbot Stranahan Ward, Stephen “Joshi” Stranahan and Daniel Stranahan, his eight grandchildren and great-grandson, his sister Mary Stranahan and brothers Michael, George, and Duane “Pat” Stranahan, Jr., and his many friends and associates our prayers and hope that they find comfort in the wonderful memories and lasting accomplishments of Steve, and of his inspirational role in bettering our way of life. His legacy lives on.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF FATHER JEROME LEDOUX

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. RICHMOND. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Father Jerome Ledoux, a beloved Catholic priest who pastored St. Augustine Catholic Church in New Orleans. Father Ledoux passed away on Monday, January 7, 2019 at the age of 88.

Father Ledoux was born in Lake Charles, Louisiana, in 1930. He attended Sacred Heart Elementary School and at the age of 13, he traveled to Bay St. Louis, Mississippi, to attend high school at St. Augustine Seminary. This was the only seminary in the nation that trained African-American men for the priesthood. His spiritual training continued in Illinois and Iowa, and he returned to St. Augustine Seminary for further study.

Father Ledoux was ordained to the Catholic priesthood on May 11, 1957. Following ordination, he studied in Rome, where he earned a master’s degree in sacred theology and a doctorate in church law. He returned to St. Augustine Seminary in Mississippi and taught theology and church law for six years. In 1969, he began teaching at Xavier University and continued in this role for more than a decade.

In 1981, Father Ledoux became pastor of St. Martin de Porres Church in Praire View, Texas. He moved back to Louisiana in 1984 to lead Baton Rouge’s St. Paul the Apostle Church. And in 1990, his 16-year pastorate began at St. Augustine Parish in New Orleans.

In 2006, Father Ledoux accepted an assignment from his order, the Society of Divine Word, to become pastor of Our Mother of Mercy Parish in Fort Worth, Texas. Since 1969, Father Ledoux would write a weekly column entitled “Reflections on Life,” syndicated in several Catholic weeklies, Louisiana Weekly in New Orleans, and Seacoast Echo in Bay St. Louis.

Father Ledoux loved the city and the people of New Orleans. His legacy will forever be a part of the city and his dedication to community embodies the spirit of New Orleans. We cannot match the sacrifices made by Father Ledoux, but surely, we can try to match his sense of service. We cannot match his courage, but we can strive to match his devotion.

Father Ledoux’s survivor’s include a sister and two brothers.

Madam Speaker, I celebrate the life and legacy of Father Jerome Ledoux.

PERSONAL EXPLAINTION

HON. BOB GIBBS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Speaker, I was unable to attend votes on January 14th due to a doctor’s appointment in my home state of Ohio. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on Roll Call No. 30.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

HON. DAVID P. ROE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. ROE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the sesquicentennial of my hometown of Johnson City, Tennessee.

The City of Johnson City was founded in Northeast Tennessee, where three railroads—East Tennessee and Western North Carolina Railroad, Clinchfield Railroad, and Southern Railway—converged, holding its first election on Jan. 3, 1870, with 60 registered voters.

Voters elected entrepreneur Henry Johnson, owner of Johnson’s Depot, to serve as the City’s first mayor. The City charter defined the city limits as being the area within a half-mile radius of Johnson’s Depot, the city’s first commercial business. Johnson’s Depot operated as a railway depot, freight station, and post office, and also served as a hotel, restaurant, and store.

The Watauga Tannery, the city’s first major industry, was established in November 1883 covering 130 acres and employing as many as 300 men. Today, Johnson City boasts a diverse economy led by healthcare and education.

The Mountain Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers opened in 1903. Now known as the James H. Quillen VA
Medical Center, it serves more than 170,000 veterans living in a 41-county area of Tennessee, Virginia, and Kentucky.

The City’s first professional hospital, Appalachian Hospital and School of Nursing, opened in 1921 with the support of citizens who foresaw the need for the facility. Johnson City has become home to three major hospitals—Johnson City Medical Center, Franklin Woods Community Hospital, and Niswonger Children’s Hospital.

In 1911, the teacher-training institute known as East Tennessee State Normal School, predecessor of East Tennessee State University, was founded. Today, as the fourth largest university in the State of Tennessee, ETSU also includes the highly regarded Quillen College of Medicine and Gatton College of Pharmacy.

In 1939 the Johnson City Board of Commissioners adopted the charter that established the council-manager form of government, under which it operates today. Through a collaborative process of elected officials working closely with citizens, Johnson City has created a city recognized by a variety of publications as a great place to live.

Johnson City has operated its own Transit System since 1979 and established Tennessee’s first citywide curbside recycling program in 1989. Additionally, the city has 18 parks, 40 athletic fields and a host of multi-use trails. Johnson City is also home to Freedom Hall Civic Center, Memorial Park Community Center, a large public library and a robust senior services program.

Although Johnson City’s local economy includes national and regional companies, it also embodies the entrepreneurial spirit of Henry Johnson, supporting countless small business owners who operate in city limits, particularly the downtown area.

The City of Johnson City, which kicked off its Sesquicentennial on Jan. 3, 2019, has become a thriving community of more than 66,000 residents with city limits expanded to 43.3 square miles. I look forward to what the next 150 years holds for Johnson City.

On roll call vote 26, had I been present, I would have voted “NAY.”

On roll call vote 27, had I been present, I would have voted “YEA.”

On roll call vote 28, had I been present, I would have voted “YEA.”

On roll call vote 29, had I been present, I would have voted “YEA.”

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE FAIR TREATMENT ACT OF 2019

SPEECH OF
HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 11, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 24, the Government Employee Fair Treatment Act of 2019. Saturday marked the longest federal government shutdown in history. It is true that we have been able to get back pay for federal employees who were furloughed or who worked without pay for every shutdown in recent history. However, Congress has acted not out of the kindness of its heart with respect to workers who worked without pay; we acted because, under the Constitution, specifically the Fifth and Thirteenth Amendments, people cannot be made to work without compensation, particularly if they are federal employees. That would be a constitutional violation, and Congress knows it, and that is why we provide back pay to those employees who are forced to work during a shutdown without pay. We must also protect those who were not allowed to work during the shutdown, but, nevertheless, still incurred all their normal living expenses. We cannot be sure that the necessary appropriations will be forthcoming, especially in a government where one party controls both the Presidency and the Senate. The Government Employee Fair Treatment Act of 2019, guaranteeing back pay, is an essential safeguard that federal employees are due.

At the same time, furloughed federal contract employees are deprived of the same jobs as federal employees, are not being paid. Therefore, I have introduced a bill that would grant back pay to low-wage federally contracted retail, food, custodial and security service workers who are furloughed during the current and any other federal government shutdown this fiscal year (fiscal year 2019).

Polls have consistently shown that Americans oppose this shutdown and are anxious for the president and for Congress to get on with the essential tasks of governing. The Government Employee Fair Treatment Act of 2019 will operate as an IOU to federal employees who deserve no less, but, indeed, much more.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF DONALD F. GUERRA

HON. TIM RYAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my cousin Donald F. Guerra, age 73, who passed away peacefully on Thursday, December 13, 2018, at the Hospice of The Valley Hospice House in Poland.

Donnie was the life of our family parties. He was the family member who remembered and told all the best family stories. He captured the love and humor of our Italian immigrant family.

He treated our family and was always there for all of us. He helped on my first campaigns by getting family and friends to ride their motorcycles in local parades wearing my campaign tee shirts. He was a staunch Democrat and a Union man through and through.

He was born February 11, 1945, in Warren, Ohio to Fabian and Rita Bologna Guerra. He graduated from Niles McKinley High School in 1964 and following that, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University in Daytona, Florida. Upon completing his university studies, Don was employed as a journeyman pipe fitter at WCI, Thomas Steel and Delphi Packard and retired in 2000. He also owned and operated Guerra’s Dental Lab in Youngstown for 10 years and was a flight instructor for 50 years.

Don was a United States Army veteran, serving with the 101st Airborne Division in Vietnam for 13 months and then returning to the United States to serve at NORAD in the Cheyenne Mountain Complex.

He was a member of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish in Niles and a Trumbull County Democratic Precinct Committee Member. Don was an avid Green Bay Packers and New York Yankees fan and enjoyed golfing, riding his motorcycle, spending time with his grandchildren.

He will be sadly missed by his wife, Donna Stabile Guerra whom he married November 23, 1972; his son Donald Guerra and his wife Andria and their children Sophia and Gabriella of Niles; David Guerra and his wife Cathy, and their children Macey and Anna of McDonald; a brother Fabian Guerra, Jr. and his wife Nancy of Pasadena, Maryland; a sister Nina Miller and her husband Jim of Amelia Island, Florida; and several nieces and nephews. He was preceded in death by his parents.

We will miss Cooge. Life just won’t be the same without him.
Rhonda, a retired librarian with the Ascension Parish School Board with 40 years of service. Her father, Allen, is a retired professional football player. Ms. Dunbar is a dual-degreed scientist and engineer with 19 years of experience in the areas of process and plant design, research and development, product quality management, and environmental regulation.

In 2013, Ms. Dunbar used her experience from her professional career as a senior scientist and process engineer to form the STEM GEMS Mentoring Project, which highlights Girls Excelling in Math and Science. Through this program, Ms. Dunbar mentors girls who excel in math and science and encourages them to pursue careers and advanced degrees in STEM majors where women and minorities are underrepresented. This program has mentored more than 650 girls in conjunction with the Ascension Parish School Board, with six participants receiving Student of the Year distinctions. The program has since expanded to several surrounding parishes including Iberville, St. Helena, St. Charles, St. James, St. John the Baptist and East Baton Rouge.

In addition to recently being selected to be a part of the 2019 Baton Rouge Area Chamber’s Leadership Class and the highly competitive Greater Baton Rouge Business Report’s Executive Leadership Academy, Ms. Dunbar was appointed to serve on the Regional Council for STAR (Sexual Trauma Awareness and Response) and the Advisory Board for Emerge Louisiana. The 2017 LSU Esprit de Femme Honoree was also selected to serve on the 2018 LSU Esprit de Femme Honorary Chair this past Spring for her continued professional accolades and community endeavors.

Ms. Dunbar also serves on the executive Board of Directors for the Ascension Fund, Volunteer Ascension, the Louisiana Coalition for Healthier Communities, APEX STEM College Academy, the chartering chapter of The National Coalition of 100 Black Women for Metropolitan Baton Rouge, and the Arc of Ascension.

During Ms. Dunbar’s tenure as President-Elect for the Arc of Ascension, she was instrumental in helping the Arc raise over $100,000 last year for its annual Dancing for a Cause fundraiser.

Madam Speaker, I celebrate the work that Ms. Alsie R. Dunbar has done to make her community a better place.

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR. OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 15, 2019

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, today I include in the Recurring Dissenting Views to the Activity Report of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the U.S. House of Representatives for the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress (Activity Report). The Activity Report, which was filed by the Republican majority on January 2, 2019, should have included these dissenting views, however, they were not included. I am taking this action to ensure that the House Energy and Commerce Committee Democrats can exercise their right under House Rule XI to submit these dissenting views to the House record.

House Rule XI gives the majority party authority and responsibility for setting our committee’s agenda and to determine which jurisdictional areas and matters (and the extent to which) it will oversee or investigate. The Energy and Commerce Committee marked up and reported out important bipartisan legislation in the 115th Congress, like H.R. 6, H.R. 304, H.R. 931, H.R. 1320, H.R. 2430, H.R. 2345, H.R. 3367, H.R. 5333, and H.R. 6378. Each of these bills was considered pursuant to regular order at every major legislative stage and should be seen as being displays of some of our greater legislative accomplishments.

We would have been more successful as a committee if Congress had our Republican majority believed in and followed regular order more consistently. Regular order was nowhere to be found at the beginning of the 115th Congress. Republican House leaders and committee chairs exiled regular order at the start of the 115th Congress on their party’s promise to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act as soon as possible after assuming unified government following the 2016 Presidential and federal elections.

Less than two months from the Committee’s organization at the beginning of 2017, our Committee’s majority hurriedly noticed for full Committee markup a draft print, titled the American Health Care Act (AHCA). The AHCA was subsequently introduced and numbered as H.R. 1628. As we noted in our Minority Views to that bill’s legislative report that accompanied it to the House floor:

Despite the wide-ranging, serious implications of this legislation for the health and financial security of all Americans, the Committee did not hear on the details and effect of the legislation. Notably, stakeholders have not had the ability to weigh in on the impacts of the bill to the health care system. The Committee received letters from hospitals, doctors, and patient and advocacy groups outlining their significant concerns with the legislation. Additionally, despite Speaker Ryan’s claims that the bill would be considered through regular order and through a transparent process, the repeal bill was drafted in secret and introduced less than two days before markup.

The minority is deeply concerned by the decision to proceed to markup without first hearing the details and effect of this legislation on health insurance coverage, costs, and the federal budget.

This exercise, which signaled that Committee Republicans might apply regular order sparingly and unpredictably, set the tone for the 115th Congress.

Bills that the Republican majority chose not to put through regular order were appreciably more partisan and controversial. These included H.R. 1628 and other troublesome bills to change the Clean Power Plan standards or to amend the Clean Air Act, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission regula...
their families, regardless of whose policy it is or the objectives behind that policy, is suspect on its face and must be balanced by (our thorough) input, as a separate and co-equal branch of the federal government. Our Committee should not allow or tolerate further delay but this Administration in providing answers to our questions or soliciting our advice and reactions regarding this unabated crisis. In order to perform our sworn duties as elected representatives and leaders, we must convene an oversight hearing as soon as possible. For these reasons, H. Res. 982 should have been favorably reported.

While our Committee continued its important bipartisan traditions this Congress, in the 115th Congress the Republican majority failed to conduct any legitimate oversight of the Trump Administration, failing to hold them accountable for the cost of their policies to undermine critical health care, environmental and consumer protections. Republicans also failed to prioritize the lives of everyday Americans. Energy and Commerce Committee Democrats pursue policies that help everyday people by building a stronger economy, creating more good paying jobs, and protecting consumers from skyrocketing costs that make it increasingly difficult to make ends meet.
Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S187–S231

Measures Introduced: Twenty-two bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 115–136, and S. Res. 18.

Measures Considered:

Strengthening America’s Security in the Middle East Act: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1, to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriation of funds to Israel, to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people.

Sanctions With Respect to the Russian Federation—Agreement: Senate began consideration of S. J. Res. 2, disapproving the President’s proposal to take an action relating to the application of certain sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, after agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Prior to the consideration of this measure, Senate took the following action:

By 42 yeas to 57 nays (Vote No. 4), Senate failed to table the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution.

By 57 yeas to 42 nays (Vote No. 5), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution.

A motion was entered to close further debate on the joint resolution, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of Tuesday, January 15, 2019, a vote on cloture will occur at 12:30 p.m., on Wednesday, January 16, 2019.

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the joint resolution at approximately 10 a.m., on Wednesday, January 16, 2019, with the time until 12:30 p.m. equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees; and that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the joint resolution occur at 12:30 p.m., and if the motion to invoke cloture is not agreed to, the joint resolution be returned to the calendar.

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

1 Air Force nomination in the rank of general.
6 Army nominations in the rank of general.
26 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.
1 Navy nomination in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Marine Corps

Messages from the House:

Measures Referred:

Executive Communications:

Additional Cosponsors:

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Additional Statements:

Privileges of the Floor:

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—5)

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:10 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, January 16, 2019. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S227.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee began hearings to examine the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice, after the nominee, who was introduced by former Senator Orrin G. Hatch, testified and answered questions in his own behalf, but did not complete action thereon.
Hearing recessed subject to the call and will meet again at 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, January 16, 2019.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 116th Congress.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 36 public bills, H.R. 545–580; 1 private bill, H.R. 581; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 29–30; and H. Res. 42, 44–45, were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 43, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 268) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (H. Rept. 116–2).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Welch to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Recess: The House recessed at 11:03 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 42, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives.

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:


All-American Flag Act: H.R. 113, to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government; Pages H566–67

Federal CIO Authorization Act of 2019: H.R. 247, to amend chapter 36 of title 44, United States Code, to make certain changes relating to electronic Government services; and

Suspensions:


Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

Grant Reporting Efficiency and Agreements Transparency Act of 2019: H.R. 150, to modernize Federal grant reporting.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H556.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H578–79, H579–80, and H580. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:44 p.m.
Committee Meetings
SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 268, the “Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2019”. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–4, a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 268. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–2, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the Committee report, shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides that clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in part B of the Committee report. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in this report, may be offered only by a Member designated in this report, shall be debatable for the time specified in this report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in this report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule waives clause 6(a) of rule XIII (requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Rules Committee) with respect to resolutions reported from the Rules Committee through the legislative day of January 23, 2019, making or continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019. Testimony was heard from Chairman Lowey, and Representatives Granger, Garamendi, Dunn, González-Colón of Puerto Rico, Panetta, Graves of Louisiana, Mullin, and Westerman.

Joint Meetings
No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 16, 2019
(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate
Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine the future of nuclear power, focusing on advanced reactors, 2:30 p.m., SD–138.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: organizational business meeting to consider committee rules for the 116th Congress, 10 a.m., SD–106.
Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, 10 a.m., SD–406.
Committee on the Judiciary: to continue hearings to examine the nomination of William Pelham Barr, of Virginia, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.
Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 10 a.m., SH–219.
Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine fighting elder fraud, focusing on progress made and work to be done, 9:30 a.m., SD–562.

House
Committee on Rules: Full Committee, hearing on legislation on the Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019, 3:45 p.m., H–313 Capitol.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Wednesday, January 16

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of S. J. Res. 2, Sanctions with Respect to the Russian Federation, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the joint resolution at 12:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
10 a.m., Wednesday, January 16

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 268—Disaster Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2019 (Subject to a Rule).
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